# A HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY

ON

# THE OLD TESTAMENT,

WITH

## A NEW TRANSLATION,

BY

M. M. KALISCH, Phil. Doc., M. A.

## ויקרא—LEVITICUS.

### PART I.

Containing Chapters I to X,

With Treatises on Sacrifices and the Hebrew Priesthood.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER.
1867.

PRINTED BY CARL B. LORCK IN LEIPZIG.

# PREFACE.

NINE years have elapsed since the publication of the second volume of this Commentary. But the author trusts that he has with some advantage adhered to the severe rule of the old master, "nonum prematur in annum". For though he devoted a considerable portion of the interval to the composition of his Hebrew Grammar, he never lost sight of the continuation of the work which he has made the task of his life, and which forms the centre of his studies and his reading. However, delay appeared to him, in one important respect, even more than desirable; it seemed to him almost imperative. For a survey of the intellectual history of England during the last decennium will render it manifest that a change has been wrought which it is not too much to describe as an intellectual revolution. The highest questions that concern mankind were discussed in works, which fell upon the public mind with the force of decisive battles, roused a spirit of regenerating enquiry, and tended perceptibly to alter the entire current of national thought. In general history, a new impulse was given by the labours of Buckle, who, ignoring the idea of a supernatural education of our race, attempted consistently, if too sweepingly, to deduce the stages of human progress from psychological principles no less unfailing in their operation than the laws

which govern the physical world. In the natural sciences, something like an overpowering shock was produced by the fearless and penetrating investigations of Darwin, Huxley, and Lyell, who, striving to exhibit man and the planet he inhabits, as organic parts of universal creation, courageously pierced into the mystery of the very genesis of men and things, and arrived at results startling by their boldness and incalculable in their scope and final bearing. And in the sphere of theology, an almost unprecedented commotion was caused by the "Essays and Reviews", moderate as they are in tendency and reserved in enunciation, by the acute and incisive demonstrations of Colenso, unsettling and in many cases uprooting long-cherished opinions or prejudices, and by the writings of Rénan and Strauss, which, thanks to the close literary intercommunion that has sprung up between the continent and England found here a no less powerful echo than in the countries to which they owed their origin. Thus traditional views are questioned in every branch of science and learning; and habits of logical thought, trained and fostered by works like those of John Stuart Mill, prove an invaluable auxiliary to comprehensive and trustworthy inferences. Our own time, disdaining to receive opinions from the past as an unalterable heirloom and with unsuspecting reliance, is determined to assert the right of forming its own convictions with unfettered independence.

This general fermentation of minds, which the author could not but watch with intense interest, appeared to him peculiarly propitious for the reception of the conclusions to which he has been led by his Biblical researches. He would fain hope that he has furnished a few available stones for that new edifice which it is the labour of our age to erect; that he has aided, however humbly and modestly, in supporting by arguments derived

from his special department of study, the philosophical ideas which all genuine science at present seems eager to establish; and that he has in some slight degree succeeded in assigning to the Biblical documents their proper place in the future phases and struggles of our civilisation.

But he ventures to prefer a double request to those into whose hands this volume may fall. First, he begs them not to judge of the results unless they have patiently followed him through the chain of arguments by which the conclusions were obtained; for he has endeavoured so to arrange the facts and proofs that an attentive perusal will, he trusts, disclose their force and cogency, whereas desultory reading must lead to hasty and unjust opinions. The second request he cannot make better than in the words with which Spinoza concludes the Introduction to his *Tractatus Theologico-politicus:* "To those who are not accustomed to think rationally, I do not desire to recommend this book, since I have no reason to hope that they will in any way be gratified by it. For I know how stubbornly the mind clings to those prejudices which it has adopted under the appearance of religion. I know moreover, that it is as impossible to free the mass of men from superstition as it is to free them from fear... These therefore and all those who obstinately insist upon preconceived opinions, I do not invite to read this book, nay I would much rather wish them to leave it unnoticed, than to call forth strife by interpreting its contents perversely, and while gaining no advantage for themselves, to cause injury to others who would argue with greater freedom if they were not checked by the one fatal belief that reason must be the handmaid of theology."

It may be expedient to add a few explanations with regard to the economy of this volume.

The Biblical text may be considered from three distinct points of view:

(1.) It may be explained simply in a *positive* or *objective* manner: the expositor investigates how the last compiler or reviser understood the meaning of the parts and the connection of the whole, and he endeavours to point out both the one and the other with the utmost care and completeness; he owes this tribute of respect and reverence especially to the superior genius of the man who conceived so vast a plan as that of the Pentateuch, and who must be allowed to have possessed the ability of logical thought and style. This task has been chiefly attempted in the *general* notes of the Commentary.

(2.) Or the text may be explained *critically* and *analytically:* the expositor resolves the entire composition into its component parts; he examines and compares them, decides whether they contain differences in the conceptions or discrepancies in the statements, pursues the traces of older sources or original documents, which he distinguishes from later additions or modifications, and searches after the date and authorship of each portion; and then, on the basis of these enquiries, he draws conclusions with regard to the gradual development of religious culture among the Hebrews, and to the epoch when it attained the stage revealed in the section under consideration. This has mainly been undertaken in the *philological* remarks of the Commentary.

(3.) Or, lastly, the text may be explained *philosophically* and treated *constructively:* the expositor analyses the *absolute* truth and the *absolute* value of the records; he ascertains how far the facts are historically reliable, and how far the religious notions are philosophically true; he compares the Biblical documents with the historical traditions and religious systems of other nations; and he tests them especially by the most recent discoveries of science and the best results of speculative thought; thus he is enabled to determine to what extent

they deserve authority, and in what degree they are binding on his own time; and then he may venture, as a last step, to build up the political or spiritual history of the Bible on its own intrinsic probability, and to propound religious and philosophical truths in harmony with all the scientific and literary aids at his disposal. This has principally been aimed at in the *Treatises*, which therefore form, in a certain sense, the most important and distinctive portions of the book; and for this reason, the great extent which they occupy will neither be found surprising nor require justification; though they have rendered it impossible to compress the commentary on the whole of Leviticus into one volume.

By separating these three methods, the author believes to be enabled to do full justice to the Hebrew writers, without curtailing the claims due to science, history, and philosophy.

As of the preceding volumes, so of this one also, an abridged edition is published, omitting all philological observations and all except Biblical references, and specially adapted for more cursory reading, though the author would strongly recommend the use of this larger edition to all those who desire to be acquainted with the sources of his facts and the critical evidences of his opinions. — The next volume which will conclude Leviticus, and will contain, besides the Commentary, essays on the dietary precepts, the ordinances of purification, the marriage-laws, the festivals, and the moral teaching of the Bible, will, it is hoped, be issued in the course of the following year, as it is in an advanced stage of preparation.

The author has every reason to feel grateful for the encouraging reception accorded to the earlier parts of this work; if, on a fair and dispassionate examination,

their present successor meet even approximately with a like approval, he will be fortified hopefully to continue his labours, for the success of which he is chiefly anxious because he is convinced that the purpose to which they are devoted is intimately allied with our progress, our happiness, and even the practical regulation of our lives.

M. KALISCH.

*London, April* 22, 1867.

# CONTENTS.

# INTRODUCTION.

## I. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN EXODUS AND LEVITICUS.

THE ordinances concerning the public worship of the Hebrews which were commenced in the Book of Exodus, are continued, and in some respects completed, in Leviticus. They related, in the former Book, chiefly to the construction of the Sanctuary, and to the vestments and consecration of its ministers; while they refer in the latter, to sacrifices deemed to form the principal means of religious service, and to the duties and privileges of the priests. But the third Book unfolds, moreover, the laws and institutions designed to embody and to realise Israel's mission as "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation."[1] It culminates in the doctrine "You shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy."[2] Thus its scope is immeasurably extended. It points out the means by which the covenant before concluded between God and Israel may be perpetually preserved and renewed. It impresses by manifold commands and symbols that the covenant can only be maintained by obedience and piety on the part of Israel, and by grace and forgiveness on the part of their God. It shows that this lofty aim is attainable, first and directly, by diligent service at the Sanctuary, by the absolute rejection of idolatry, and by the removal of every external impurity; but more unfailingly still, though less directly, by a life of virtue and rectitude. Therefore, the sacrificial and priestly regulations are followed by denunciations against every form of idolatry and superstition; by precepts upon purity in diet and in the general intercourse of life; by statutes on festivals and

[1] Exod. XIX. 6. [2] Lev. XIX. 2; comp. XI. 46; XX. 7, 8, 26; XXII. 32.

holy seasons; by rules settling the relations between God, the invisible King, and the persons or the land of the Israelites[1]; by commands relating to men or things sanctified by a vow[2]; and especially by a series of laws directing the moral conduct of individuals, both in reference to their families and their fellow-men generally, defining the ties of consanguinity and the rights of property, and securing the protection of the poor and the helpless: and all these injunctions are properly concluded by a solemn blessing promised to attend their observance, and a vehement curse certain to follow their transgression. The Book, therefore, carries onward all the chief objects introduced in the preceding portion — the religious and theocratic, the political and civil, and the purely ethical. It was evidently intended as a complete and organic work, twice wound up as it is by a formula of conclusion.[3] It was meant to serve as a spiritual code both for individuals and the chosen people as a community. The election of Israel by Divine grace was to be justified and merited by Israel's zealous devotion. The covenant mercifully offered by God was to be converted into a covenant yearned for and treasured by Israel. Jehovah had manifested Himself as the God of the Hebrews; the Hebrews were now to prove themselves the people of God, by deed and thought, in life and faith.

## II. DIVISION OF LEVITICUS.

HOWEVER, the execution of the composition falls very considerably short of its conception. The arrangement discloses indeed, in general outlines, the three great divisions of *Sacrifices*, *Purity*, and *Morals:* but the details are desultory and often illogical. Statutes which should form one division, are scattered throughout the Book, and laws belonging to different sections, are agglomerated rather than combined. The Book possesses, therefore, in many respects, a fragmentary character. It leaves to the reader the laborious task of effecting, by

---

[1] The year of release (שְׁמִטָּה) and of jubilee (יוֹבֵל).

[2] נָזִיר and חֵרֶם.

[3] Comp. XXVI. 46; XXVII. 34.

constant separation and connection of its elements, a unity of design, the absence of which painfully strikes him on careful examination. This will be obvious from the following classified survey.

I. Laws concerning Sacrifices and public Worship, Ch. I to X.
  A. The principal Sacrifices, ch. I to VII.
    a. First Code, ch. I to V.
      1. Burnt-Offering (עֹלָה), ch. I.
      2. The Bloodless Offering (מִנְחָה), ch. II.
      3. The Thank-Offering (שְׁלָמִים), ch. III.
      4. Expiatory Offering, ch. IV and V.
        α. Sin-offering (חַטָּאת), ch. IV. 1—V. 13.
        β. Trespass-offering (אָשָׁם), ch. V. 14—26.
    b. Another Code, Ch. VI and VII.
      1. On the Service of the Altar of Burnt-Offering, ch. VI. 1—6.
      2. On Bloodless Offerings, ch. VI. 7—11.
      3. On the Bloodless Offering of the High-priest on the Day of his Initiation, ch. VI. 12—16.
      4. On Sin-Offerings, ch. VI. 17—23.
      5. On Trespass-Offerings, ch. VII. 1—7.
      6. The Portions of Burnt-Offerings and Bloodless Offerings to be left to the Priests, ch. VII. 8—10.
      7. Regulations regarding Thank-Offerings, ch. VII. 11—21.
      8. Prohibition against eating the Blood and Fat of Animals, ch. VII. 22—27.
      9. The Portions of Thank-Offerings falling to the Share of the Priests, ch. VII. 28—34.
      10. Conclusion of this Code, ch. VII. 35—38.
  B. The Consecration of the Sanctuary and its Utensils, and of Aaron and his Sons as Priests, ch. VIII to X.
    a. Consecration of the Sanctuary and of Aaron and his Sons, ch. VIII.
    b. The first public Sacrifices performed by Aaron and his Sons, ch. IX.
    c. Offence of Aaron's two eldest Sons against the sacrificial Precepts; their Death; and Commands regarding the Holiness of the Priests and their Functions, ch. X.

II. Precepts respecting Purity in Diet and Person, ch. XI to XV.
  A. Distinction between clean and unclean Animals, and Commandments with respect to them, ch. XI.

B. On the Purity of Persons, their Garments, and their Houses, and the Means of Purification, ch. XII to XV.
   a. Impurity of Women by Childbirth, ch. XII. 1—8.
   b. Impurity by Leprosy, ch. XIII and XIV.
      1. Leprosy of Persons, ch. XIII. 1—46.
      2. Leprosy of Garments and their Purification, ch. XIII. 47—59.
      3. Purification of a leprous Person, ch. XIV. 1—32.
      4. Leprosy of Houses and their Purification, ch. XIV. 33—53.
   c. Uncleanness in Consequence of sexual Issues, ch. XV.
      1. Running Issue of Men, ch. XV. 1—15.
      2. Spontaneous or accidental Emission of Semen, ch. XV. 16, 17.
      3. Sexual Intercourse, ch. XV. 18.
      4. Regular Menstruation of Women, ch. XV. 19—24.
      5. Irregular or protracted Menstruation of Women, ch. XV. 25—30.

III. Supplementary Laws respecting Sacrifices, ch. XVI. 1—XVII. 14.
   A. The Sacrifices on the Day of Atonement, ch. XVI.
   B. Ordinances as to the Place of Sacrifice, ch. XVII. 1—9.
   C. Repeated Prohibition of Blood, ch. XVII. 10—14.

IV. Supplementary Ordinances regarding Purity, ch. XVII. 15, 16.

V. Moral and civil Laws, ch. XVIII—XX.
   A. On the forbidden Degrees of Matrimony, and other Laws on sexual Intercourse, ch. XVIII (with the exception of ver. 21 treating of the Sacrifices of Moloch).
   B. Various moral Precepts, irregularly intermixed with religious, ceremonial, and sacrificial Ordinances, ch. XIX and XX; viz.
      a. On the Sabbath, ch. XIX. 3, 30 first half;
      b. On idolatrous Worship and Witchcraft, ch. XIX. 4, 26 second half, 31; XX. 6, 27;
      c. On Thank-Offerings, ch. XIX. 5—8;
      d. On mixing different Species of Beasts or different Seeds (כִּלְאַיִם), ch. XIX. 19;
      e. On the Produce of young Fruit-trees, ch. XIX. 23—25;
      f. On the Eating of Blood, ch. XIX. 26 first half;
      g. On the Inviolability of the human Body, ch. XIX. 27, 28;
      h. Holiness of the Sanctuary, ch. XIX. 30 second half;
      i. Against Sacrifices offered to Moloch, ch. XX. 1—5;

k. Repetition of some Laws regarding the forbidden Degrees of Matrimony, and sexual Intercourse in general, ch. XX. 10—21; and

l. Repetition of the fundamental Command concerning clean and unclean Animals, ch. XX. 25.

VI. Supplementary Precepts respecting the Priests, their Qualifications, Rights, and Duties, ch. XXI 1—XXII. 16.

VII. Other supplementary Laws relating to Sacrifices, the Qualification of the Victims, their Age, and other Points, ch. XXII. 17—33.

VIII. On the Sabbaths and the Festivals — Passover, Pentecost, the Day of Memorial, the Day of Atonement, and Tabernacles, ch. XXIII.

IX. Supplementary Laws on the Service of the Sanctuary — the Light of the Candlestick and the Shew-bread, ch. XXIV. 1—9.

X. An Incident and Law regarding Blasphemy, ch. XXIV. 10—16.

XI. Some Laws — mostly repetitions — concerning Violence committed against Persons or Property, ch. XXIV. 17—21.

XII. On the Year of Release and Jubilee, and the Right of Persons and Property in Connection therewith, ch. XXV (except vers. 35—38 which refer to Usury practised against the Poor).

XIII. Renewed Injunctions against Polytheism and Idol- worship (XXVI. 1), and Repetition of a Precept concerning the Sabbaths and the Sanctuary (XXVI. 2).

XIV. Blessing for the Observance, and Curse for the Neglect of the Divine Commandments, ch. XXVI. 3—45.

XV. Some supplementary Laws, ch. XXVII; viz.

a. On Persons hallowed by a Vow, vers. 1—8;

b. On Animals or other Property consecrated (קֹדֶשׁ) or devoted (חֵרֶם) to God, vers. 9—29; and

c. On Tithes (vers. 30—33).

## III. ITS ILLOGICAL ARRANGEMENT.

Let the reader carefully examine this digest, and he cannot fail to be struck by bounds and gaps, repetitions, and interpolations almost too numerous to point out. The precept with regard to the hides of burnt-offerings stands entirely isolated.[1] The laws on the portions of bloodless offerings to be left to the priests are dismembered.[2] The injunction which forbids the eating of fat and blood,[3] which should conclude the laws of sacri-

---

[1] VII. 8. [2] VI. 7—11 and VII. 9, 10. [3] VII. 22—27.

fice, interrupts the regulations on thank-offerings,[1] and is later repeated in an unexpected context.[2] The interdiction of the worship of Moloch occurs in the midst of ordinances relating to unlawful marriages[3] and a renewed enactment against wizards and necromancy[4] is so abrupt in the place which it occupies, that it has given offence even to orthodox writers.[5] The introductory section on sacrifices[6] is repeatedly supplemented, after commands on totally different subjects.[7] The same irregularity is observed in the laws concerning the priests,[8] and the service of the Sanctuary.[9] The acts and means of purification ordained for lepers,[10] are, by an intervening clause,[11] unsymmetrically disjoined from the description of leprosy.[12] But above all, the portion designed to treat of moral and civil laws,[13] is perplexingly intermixed with a vast variety of heterogeneous precepts destroying all unity, nay every trace of continuity;[14] it is impossible that a thoughtful legislator should have composed and promulgated such an agglomeration of laws, from which he could hardly expect any practical effect. It is of no avail to attempt a systematic classification; all efforts, however able and laborious, so far from successful, prove the incongruity still more strikingly by the forced expedients which they necessitate. Some combinations might, at first glance, recommend themselves, as for instance, the connection of the Day of Atonement[15] with Purification,[16] because that Day was intended to cleanse the whole nation from impurity; and so also might laws on forbidden marriages[17] be brought into proximity with those on purification.[18] But a closer scrutiny proves that these proposals create new difficulties which more than counterbalance the supposed advantages: for the Day of Atonement was intended to remove not

---

1 VIII. 11—21 and 28—34.

2 XVII. 10—14. 3 XVIII. 21. 4 XX. 27.

5 "It must be confessed", observes J. J. S. Perowne (in Smith's Diction. of the Bible, II. 112), "that the enactment in ver. 27 stands very awkwardly at the end of the chapter, completely isolated as it is from all other enactments."

6 Ch. I to VII.

7 XVI. 1—XVII. 14; XXII. 17—33.

8 XXI. 1—XXII. 16. 9 XXIV. 1—9.

10 XIV. 1—32. 11 XIII. 47—59.

12 XIII. 1—46. 13 Ch. XIX and XX.

14 See *supra* sub V. B.

15 Ch. XVI. 16 Ch. XI to XV.

17 Ch. XVIII.

18 Comp. XVIII. 24 *sqq*.

only all kinds of external impurity, which were, in fact, expiated by special sacrifices throughout the year, but chiefly all moral defilement.[19] Abarbanel[20] contents himself with a general division into two parts, of which he considers the first to extend to XVIII. 5, and to treat of "the holiness of the priests and the mode of their service", whereas the latter relates to the holiness of the people, and to the things to be done and to be avoided by them; but he admits that the latter portion is largely interwoven with priestly ordinances, "because the holiness of the people depends on the holiness of the priests, and the holiness of the priests on that of the people", which is in a certain respect true, but which, if taken as a guide or principle of arrangement, would produce the utmost confusion. Again, some have urged a correspondence between the Day of Atonement[21] and the Year of Release and Jubilee,[22] which institutions they supposed to form the crowning points of the two series of laws contained in Leviticus;[23] but this correspondence is more specious than real; for the first series also[24] includes not only sacrificial precepts of various kinds, but also very important injunctions regarding the "impurity" of life, as on forbidden marriages, which perhaps more than any other offence fell within the operation of the Day of Atonement. It is, therefore, bold indeed to speak of "the internal unity of the laws of Leviticus", and more hazardous still to assert "their organic arrangement." The mode in which another apologist[25] attempts to prove a systematic sequence, although establishing a few plausible connections, is too artificial and strained to convince; in order to effect even apparent relations, he is compelled to have recourse to the subtlest artifices of dialectic ingenuity; for instance, he contends that the law on the Day of Atonement[26] occupies its place in Leviticus "because it was, negatively, after the installation of the priests to be observed in so far as the priests were.

---

19 XVI. 21, 30, 34.

20 Introduction to Leviticus.

21 Ch. XVI.

22 XXV.

23 So among other writers, *Keil*, Commentary on Leviticus pp. 4, 5, the summary of contents there offered is not satisfactory.

24 Viz. that which precedes ch. XVI.

25 *Ranke*, Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch, I. 99—111.

26 Ch. XVI.

not allowed to enter the Holy of Holies except on that single Day"; but that law refers essentially to the ceremonials of the Day of Atonement, and touches but incidentally on the prohibition that the High-priest was not to come into the Holy of Holies at all times (ver. 2); moreover, it is by a long chain of ordinances on impurity[1] separated from the regulations on the sacrifices in the Sanctuary. But even more unsuccessful is the same writer's justification of the twenty-fourth chapter, which treats of the light of the candlestick, the shew-bread, desecration of the Divine name and its punishment, and a cycle of laws on acts of bloodshed and violence — a congeries of materials which indeed no sagacity, however penetrating, can hope to combine into organic unity.[2] Nor is it permitted to palliate the confusion of the arrangement by observing, "The Book exhibits the *historical* progress of the legislation; consequently we must not expect to find the *laws* detailed in it in a systematic form";[3] for all the laws of Leviticus were, according to its own statements, promulgated in mount Sinai[4] within one month, from the first day of the first month to the first day of the second in the year after the exodus.[5] The inevitable result which forces itself upon the mind of the attentive reader, coincides with that which historical and internal evidences force upon the critic, namely, that the Book of Leviticus cannot possibly be the work of one author and of one age; but that it is composed of various portions written, enlarged, and modified by different authors, in harmony with the necessities and altered conditions of their respective times.

---

[1] Chap. XI to XV.

[2] See also *Hävernick*, Einleitung in den Pentateuch, § 130, pp. 409—422; comp., on the other hand, *Vater*, Pentateuch, III. 449—452, 639, 640; *De Wette*, Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament, II. pp. 289—300 (his result is: "later expounders of the Law or priests had written down in various treatises the statutes which they found at hand, whether these were still in force or had fallen into disuse, and they had sanctioned them by the authority and name of Moses as the law-giver of the nation. The treatises themselves were then joined together by the compilers of the Pentateuch, and connected with the history of Moses"); Einleitung in das Alte Testament, § 152; *George*, Jüdische Feste, pp. 71—75, 120—144.

[3] *Hävernick* in Kitto's Cyclopaedia, II. 243.

[4] VII. 38; XXVI. 46; XXVII. 34.

[5] Comp. Exod. XL. 17 and Num. I. 1.

The desultory character of the Book will appear more manifestly still by the following synopsis of the portions arranged with reference to their matter, and proving at a glance, how numerous transpositions are required to effect even a tolerable sequence, and how many omissions are desirable to avoid useless redundancy.

I. Laws concerning Sacrifices.

1. Burnt-Offering, I. 1—9; VII. 8; I. 10—17; VI. 1—6.
2. Bloodless Offering, II. 1—3; VI. 7—11 (with the necessary modifications); II. 4—16; VII. 9, 10; VI. 12—16.
3. Thank-Offering, III. 1—16; VII. 11—21, 28—34; XIX. 5—8;[6] XXII. 29, 30.[7]
4. Expiatory Offering, IV. 1—5, 26; VI. 17 — VII. 7.
5. General Injunctions, XVI. 1, 2; XVII. 1—9; XXII. 17—28; 31—33 (a general conclusion).
6. Prohibition of Fat and Blood,[8] III. 17; VII. 22—27; XVII. 10—14; XIX. 26 (first half).[9]

II. Laws on the Priests and the Sanctuary, VIII to X; XXI. 1 — XXII. 16; XIX. 30; XXVI. 2 (second half);[10] XXIV. 1—4,[11] 5—9,[12] followed by Ordinances on Vows and Sacred Property, XXVII. 1—33.[13]

---

[6] Repetition of VII. 16—18.

[7] Also partial repetition of the same laws.

[8] Four times repeated. The efforts made to justify these repetitions (e. g. by *Eichhorn*, Einleit. III. 284) are unavailing.

[9] It is, therefore, not easy to understand the assertion that "in Leviticus I to VII, the strictest logical order exists" (*Stähelin*, Kritische Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch etc. p. 5, and in general pp. 4—11; though he is obliged to admit several irregularities, for which not even the ablest apologists have succeeded in accounting, p. 10).

[10] Repetition of XIX. 30.

[11] On the oil of the candlestick and the perpetual light, almost verbally repeated from Exod. XXVII. 20, 21; comp. *Ewald*, Geschichte, I. 115.

[12] Comp. Exod. XXV. 30, where the second command (on the shew-bread), though but briefly stated, stands more fitly. Hävernick (l. c. p. 244) believes that these commands on the oil and the shew-bread (vers. 1—9) were "judiciously placed after chapt. XXIII", which treats of the festivals, because "they refer to the agricultural relation of the Israelites to Jehovah stated in that chapter": but they have reference to the service of the Sanctuary and to nothing else; and the twenty-third chapter does not treat of the agricultural festivals only, but also of the Day of Memorial and the Day of Atonement. This is a fair specimen of that vagueness of conception which even attempts to prove that the 27th chapter has its "appropriate" place.

[13] Comp. Num. XXX. 3—16. — Lev. XXVII. 26, 27, ordaining the redemption of the firstborn unclean animals for their value increased by one fifth, is at variance with Exod. XIII. 13 and

III. Laws on Purity.

1. Clean and unclean Animals, and unlawful Food, XI. 1—47; XVII. 15, 16;[1] XX. 25.[2]
2. Impurity by Childbirth, XII. 1—8.
3. Impurity by Leprosy, XIII. 1—46; XIV. 1—32; XIII. 47—59; XIV. 33—53.
4. Impurity of the Body, XV. 1—33.

IV. Civil and Moral Laws.

1. Unlawful Marriages and Intercourse, XVIII. 1—20; 22—30; XIX. 20—22; XX. 10—21.[3]
2. Various Moral Precepts, XIX. 1—3 (first half),[4] 9; XXIII. 22;[5] XIX. 10—18,[6] 29, 32—37;[7] XX. 7—9, 22—24, 26; XXIV. 17—21;[8] XXV. 35—38.
3. On the Holiness of God, XXIV. 10—16.[9]
4. Against Idol-Worship and Witchcraft, XIX. 4, 26 (second half), 31; XX. 6 and 27;[10] XXVI. 1.[11]
5. Against the Worship of Moloch, XVIII. 21; XX. 1—5.
6. Inviolability of the human Body, XIX. 27, 28.
7. On the Produce of young Fruit-trees, XIX. 23—25.
8. On כלאים, XIX. 19.

V. On the Sabbath and Festivals, XIX. 3, 30; XXVI. 2 (first half);[12] XXIII. 1—21,[13] 23—44; XVI. 3—34; XXV. 9.[14]

VI. On the Sabbath-Year and the Year of Jubilee, XXV. 1—34, 39—55.[15]

VII. Blessing for the Observance, Curse for the Transgression of the Law, XXVI. 3—46.

---

XXXIV. 20, which prescribe the redemption by a lamb, and with Num. XVIII. 15, which fixes the price of redemption simply at five shekels; see p. 610.

[1] Partly repetition of XI. 39, 40; Exod. XXII. 30; comp. Deut. XIV. 21.

[2] Comp. Exod. XXIII. 20; XXXIV. 26; Deut. XIV. 21 — threefold repetition of the same law concerning the kid and its mother's milk.

[3] Comp. Exod. XX. 13; XXII. 15, 16.

[4] Comp. Exod. XX. 12; XXI. 15, 17.

[5] Almost verbally repeated from XIX. 9, 10.

[6] Ad ver. 12 comp. Exod. XX. 15.

[7] Ad ver. 34 comp. Exod. XXII. 20; XXIII. 9.

[8] Ver. 21 is almost a repetition of vers. 17 and 18; ad vers. 17 and 21 on murder comp. Gen. IX. 5, 6; Exod. XX. 13; XXI. 12—14: vers. 19, 20 on retaliation of limb for limb, are a close repetition of Exod. XXI. 23—25; comp. also Exod. XXII. 21—26; XXIII. 1—8.

[9] Comp. Exod. XX. 7; XXII. 27.

[10] Repetitions of XIX. 26.

[11] Comp. Exod. XX. 3—5; XXII. 19; XXIII. 24, 25.

[12] Repetition of XIX. 30.

[13] Ver. 18 on the victims to be killed at Pentecost, at variance with Num. XXVIII. 27—30.

[14] Comp. Exod. XII. 1—20, 43—49; XVI. 23 *sqq.*; XX. 8—11; XXIII. 12, 14—18; XXX. 10; Num. IX. 6—14.

[15] Vers. 39—46, a law on Hebrew slaves, at variance with Exod. XXI. 1—11; comp. also Exod. XXIII. 10, 11; Lev. XXVII. 17—24.

It is, therefore, unwarranted to affirm that "the individual laws are grouped in larger classes in which the kindred portions are placed together."[16] This is decidedly not the case with respect to any of the chief divisions of the Book. Its imperfect arrangement appears in still stronger light if we consider that the fourth and fifth Books contain numerous Levitical ordinances which ought logically to have been joined to the analogous regulations set forth in the third, namely

1. Election and Census of the Levites, Num. III. 5—39.
2. Substitution of Levites for firstborn Israelites, III. 44—53.
3. Service of the Priests and Levites at the Sanctuary, ch. IV.
4. A comprehensive Ordinance on Trespass-Offerings, V. 5—10.
5. The "Offering of Jealousy", V. 11—31.[17]
6. Once more an Account of the Erection, Anointing, and Consecration of the Tabernacle and its Utensils; and Sacrifices of the Chiefs of the twelve Tribes in Honour of the Dedication of the Altar, VII. 1—88.
7. On the Candlestick and its Lights, VIII. 1—4.
8. Initiation of the Levites, VIII. 5—22.
9. On the Period of Life during which the Levites are bound to do active Service at the Sanctuary, VIII. 23—26.
10. On the Drink-Offering, XV. 1—16.
11. The "Firstfruit of the Dough", XV. 17—21.
12. The Sin-Offering of the Community and of Individuals, XV. 22—31.
13. Functions and relative Position of Priests and Levites, XVIII. 1—7.
14. Revenues of Priests and Levites, XVIII. 8—32.[18]
15. The Ordinance of the "Red Cow" and Laws of Purification, ch. XIX.
16. The Sacrifices to be presented on Week-days, New-moons, and the five great Festivals, ch. XXVIII and XXIX.
17. On Levitical Towns, XXXV. 1—8.
18. Sacrifices at the central Sanctuary, Deut. XII. 11—18, 26, 27.
19. Laws of Tithes, XIV. 22—29 (comp. XXVI. 12—15).

---

[16] *George*, Jüd. Feste, p. 25. A judicious digest of the contents of Leviticus, with valuable general observations will be found in *Davidson's* excellent Introduction to the Old Testament, I. 256 *sqq.*

[17] Hence Ewald (Gesch. I. 116) and Lengerke (Kenaan, p. 476) have contended that the two last portions (Num. V. 5—31) ought properly to follow after Lev. I to V; comp. in general *Ewald* l. c. pp. 115—120.

[18] Comp. Exod. XXII. 28, 29; XXIII. 19.

20. Laws on Firstborn Animals, XV. 19—23.
21. On Festivals (Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles), XVI. 1—17.
22. On Faultlessness of the Victims, XVII. 1.
23. Priestly Revenues, XVIII. 1—8.
24. On Vows, XXIII. 22—24.
25. Directions of Priests to be obeyed in cases of Leprosy, XXIV. 8.
26. Offering of the Firstfruits, XXVI. 1—11.

It will be seen that these portions would also demand very considerable transpositions to produce anything like systematic sequence among themselves; while in order to insert them into their fit places in the code of Leviticus, they would require to be totally disjoined. These circumstances throw light on the origin and peculiar composition of the whole Pentateuch, which will be discussed in its due place.[1]

## IV. ITS COMPONENT PARTS.

INDEED the Book of Leviticus may be recognized, with sufficient distinctness, as a compilation of various smaller collections or treatises, mostly introduced under separate headings, and often terminated by proper conclusions. Thus

1. The general ceremonial of the older classes of sacrifice — holocausts, bloodless oblation, and thank-offering (ch. I to III) — formed evidently a complete section by itself, introduced by the words, "And the Lord called to Moses, and spoke to him out of the Tent of Meeting, saying, Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them", etc. So also

2. The portion treating of the fourth and latest class of sacrifice — the expiatory offerings — (ch. IV and V), headed by almost exactly the same terms (IV. 1, 2), and sub-divided into sin-offering (חַטָּאת) and trespass-offering (אָשָׁם), the latter beginning with the words, "And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying" (V. 14), and these

[1] Kuenen (Histoire critique des livres de l'Ancien Testament, trad. par Pierson, p. 56) observes: "la législation de l'Exode, du Lévitique et des Nombres n'a jamais pu former un grand organism, un tout fini auquel les fragments historiques n'auraient été ajoutés que plus tard."

again distinguished into those presented for intentional and violent offences, and those offered for inadvertent sins, both being separated by thė same formula, "And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying" (V. 20), entirely in harmony with the history and gradual development of expiatory offerings.[2]

3. A section containing general precepts with regard to sacrifices (ch. VI and VII), written from a different point of view, but also facilitating, by separate headings, the subdivision into the four classes — holocausts (VI. 1), bloodless oblations (VI. 12), expiatory sacrifices (VI. 17), and thank-offerings (VII. 28).[3]

4. A special prohibition of fat and blood with an initial phrase (VII. 22—27). But all the parts just reviewed (ch. I to VII) were no doubt intended as a complete sacrificial code, as is clearly proved by the general conclusion, "This is the law of the burnt-offering, of the bloodless offering, and of the sin-offering, and of the trespass-offering, and of the offering of consecration, and of the sacrifice of the thank-offerings, which the Lord commanded Moses in mount Sinai, in the day that He commanded the children of Israel to offer their oblations to the Lord in the wilderness of Sinai" (VII. 37, 38).

5. Then follow accounts of the consecration of Aaron and his sons, and of their first official acts (VIII and IX) with a heading (VIII. 1);

6. The death of Nadab and Abihu and some laws brought into connection with it (ch. X, comp. vers. 8, 12); and

7. Dietary laws (ch. XI) with heading (ver. 1) and conclusion (vers. 46, 47);

Then the commandments relating to impurity (ch. XII to XV), namely

8. On women in childbirth (XII. 1—8, comp. ver. 1);

9. On leprosy, whether of persons or of garments and houses with a heading (XIII. 1) and comprehensive conclusion, "This is the law for all manner of plague of leprosy, and scall, and for the leprosy of a garment and of a house, and for a rising, and for a scab, and

[2] See pp. 272, 273; comp. *infra* pp. XXXIII, XXXIV.

[3] Comp., however, VI, 7—11; VII, 11—21.

for a bright spot; to teach when it is unclean, and when it is clean: this is the law of leprosy" (XIV. 54—57); and

10. On running issues (זוב) of various kinds similarly introduced (XV. 1) and finished (vers. 32, 33).

11. Next comes, in a separate section, the law respecting the Day of Atonement, with heading (XVI. 1) and conclusion (ver. 34); then follow

12. Some sacrificial precepts (XVII), to which is joined the prohibition of blood (vers. 10—14), with heading (ver. 1);

13. Injunctions against illicit marriages and intercourse (XVIII), with heading and introduction (vers. 1—5), and with conclusion and emphatic final warning (vers. 24—30); but the prohibition of the worship of Moloch is inappropriately inserted (ver. 21);

14. A group of laws, chiefly of moral import but interspersed with various other precepts (ch. XIX); it was evidently written independently of the preceding portions, as is proved by the manifold repetitions of anterior commands; and it has its own heading and introduction (vers. 1, 2), and a distinct conclusion, "Therefore shall you observe all My statutes, and all My judgments, and do them; I am the Lord" (XIX. 37); then

15. Another and similar group (ch. XX) with analogous beginning (ver. 1), but without conclusion (ver. 27);[1]

16. Various pontifical laws (XXI. 1—XXII. 16) with several headings (XXI. 1, 16; XXII. 1) and unmistakeable though vague conclusion (XXI. 24);

17. Some additional sacrificial laws (XXII. 17—33), with heading (vers. 17, 18) and full conclusion and peroration (vers. 31—33);

18. Copious ordinances concerning the festivals (XXIII) with headings and introductions (vers. 1, 2, 4, 23, 26, 33), and a comprehensive conclusion, "So Moses declared to the children of Israel the feasts of the Lord" (ver. 44), and

19. Once more precepts on the service of the Sanctuary (XXIV. 1—9), with heading (ver. 1). Then follow

[1] "Cette collection" (viz. ch. XVIII to XX) observes Kuenen (l. c. p. 10), "se détache en quelque sorte de l'ensemble du livre"; a similar judgment has been pronounced by Ewald, Lengerke, and many others.

20. An episode concerning the theocratic offence of the son of a Hebrew woman and an Egyptian man, with which some moral and civil ordinances are coupled (XXIV. 10—23), and

21. A section upon the Sabbath-year and the year of Jubilee (ch. XXV), with heading (ver. 1) and conclusion (ver. 55).

22. After some isolated moral and religious injunctions (XXV. 35—38; XXVI. 1, 2),[2] we find

23. A portion containing the blessing and the curse complete in itself (XXVI. 3—45).

Here the whole collection was at first concluded as is evident from the last words, "These are the statutes, and the judgments, and the laws, which the Lord made between Him and the children of Israel in mount Sinai by the hand of Moses" (XXVI. 46). Nevertheless

24. Another section is appended concerning vows and devoted property (ch. XXVII) with a separate heading (ver. 1); after which another conclusion follows, though not so full and comprehensive as the former one, "These are the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses for the children of Israel in mount Sinai" (XXVII. 34).

We are far from contending that the Book of Leviticus was compiled of the 24 portions, as of so many fragments, and composed at so many different times: on the contrary, some sections treating of distinct subjects, and even some treating of analogous matters, may have been and probably were written at about the same period, and are possibly the productions of the same author;[3] and the frequent occurrence of the same phrases,

[2] These verses stand indeed so disconnected and abrupt that their admission has been termed "bootless", and was supposed to have been "accidental": "the compiler who found these laws, desirous to prevent their being lost, embodied them in his collection" (*De Wette*, Beiträge, II. 299).

[3] The remark of De Wette (Beiträge, II. 292) can, therefore, not be applied with confidence: "Entscheidender für die fragmentarische Natur des Leviticus ist die innere Abgeschlossenheit der meisten Stücke"; a safer criterion is the difference of style and manner (l. c. pp. 296, 297), though that can in most cases be felt rather than proved. Eichhorn (Einleitung in das Alte Testament, III. 281, 282, § 435) believes the Book to be composed of five "essays" viz. 1. ch. I to VII; 2. VIII to X; 3. XI to XV; 4. XVI to XXVI; 5. XXVII: but the fourth "essay" at least, if not the first also, is a miscellany of laws not attributable to one writer, as is extensively admitted.

as "I am the Lord"[1] or "I am the Lord your God",[2] possibly permits the inference of an identity of authorship. But a careful examination of the whole context compels the conclusion that a few older portions formed the ground-work of the Book; that this collection of laws was enlarged and qualified by the addition and insertion of new sections or single precepts dating from later periods, till the Book finally assumed the chequered and heterogeneous form in which it was received into the canon.

Now, the questions arise, which are those older sections that may be considered the foundation or nucleus of Leviticus? When were they composed? when were the other portions added? and when was the Book closed and finally revised? It lies in the nature of the subject that questions like these can, in detail, be answered with the greatest caution only; not even the finest critical tact and intuition can guard the scholar from error; for the criteria are eminently subtle and fluctuating, and the matter is ramified with a thousand complications of Hebrew history and antiquities. For the latter reason especially, we shall here confine ourselves to a chronological analysis of the first ten chapters on which the present volume contains the commentary, and in it the arguments in support of our opinions; it seems undesirable to state results without being able to refer to the proofs which the notes on the various sections can alone adequately unfold; and the arrangement of the whole Book and the discussion on the date of its composition will, therefore, more appropriately be reserved for the next volume. The reader will, however, find scattered in the essays on Sacrifices and the Priesthood, numerous facts and arguments which will almost enable him to decide for himself upon these important points.[3] On the first part of the Book we may propose the following conjectures with some degree of confidence.

---

[1] אני יהוה, XVIII. 5, 6, 21; XIX. 12, 14, 16, 18, 28, 30, 32, 37; XXII. 2, 3, 8, 9 and 16 (אני יהוה מקדשם), 30—33; XXVI. 2; comp. Num. III. 13, 41, 45.

[2] אני יהוה אלהיכם, XVIII. 2, 4, 30; XIX. 2, 3, 4, 10, 25, 31, 34, 36; XXIII. 12, 43; XXIV. 22; XXV. 38, 55; XXVI. 1.

[3] Comp. esp. pp. 43—47, 640—654.

## V. CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF THE LAWS CONTAINED IN THE FIRST TEN CHAPTERS.

I. Chapters VIII to X: Consecration of Aaron and his sons as priests, and the sanctification of the Tabernacle and its vessels, in close connection with the command in Exodus (XXIX), to which, no doubt, it was originally joined as a continuous composition:[4] the consecration (ch. VIII) is succeeded by a record of the sacrifices offered for the priests and the people on the first day after the conclusion of that ceremony, and meant to complete the preparations for the permanent service of Aaron and his sons; the last verses (23 and 24), the account of fire miraculously descending from heaven to burn the sacrifices on the altar, was appended, on the whole unskilfully and inappropriately, from an earlier document or tradition;[5] then follows the notice of the death of Aaron's sons Nadab and Abihu in consequence of unlawful fumigation, their burial, and some laws occasioned by the event (vers. 1—7); then a fragment (vers. 8—11) containing one very special ordinance respecting abstinence from wine and other strong drink and a very comprehensive statement of sacerdotal duties; next commands concerning the priestly portions in thank-offerings (vers. 12—15); and lastly, a remarkable argument between Moses and Aaron in reference to the meat of the people's sin-offering which had been presented on the day after the consecration (vers. 16—20), an addition manifestly borrowed from another source older than that of the preceding chapter (comp. IX. 15), because it shows the sacrificial laws in a less advanced stage of development,[6] while Moses appears in greater independence of action, and not as a mere agent absolutely guided by a higher will.[7]

---

[4] See notes on VIII. 1—5.

[5] See notes on IX. 22—24.

[6] See notes on IX. 5—21.

[7] See notes on X. 16—20. The Talmud, starting from the principle that the Law does not observe chronological sequence (אין מוקדם ומאוחר בתורה) proposes the following order: 1. The ceremonial of consecration during seven days (ch. VIII), with the provisional erection of the Tabernacle; 2. Then the definitive erection on the first day of Nisan in the second year of the exodus (Ex. XL. 17); 3. The "eighth day", or the first sacrifices of the consecrated priests (ch. IX.); 4. The

II. Chapter VI. 1—11: a short and first sketch of the sacrificial ritual, especially of the *public* burnt-offerings, written for the guidance of the *priests* and probably by a priest,[1] comprising 1. Regulations on the ceremonies to be observed at the daily holocausts, and on the perpetual fire to be maintained on the brazen altar (vers. 1—6); and 2. Directions as to the bloodless offerings (מנחה, vers. 7—11) probably with some additions in both parts[2] made by the same writer who subjoined the next portions.[3] This section contains therefore nothing but what concerned the proceedings and privileges of the priests, without alluding to the duties devolving upon the offering Israelite, and it refers merely to the two oldest classes of sacrifice — the holocaust and the *minchah*.

III. Chapter VI. 12—16: likewise an ordinance of a specifically sacerdotal character, relating to the bloodless offering of the High-priest on the day of his consecration, possibly of the same date as the preceding verses; it is, no doubt, of early origin; for half an omer, or the twentieth part of an ephah of flour, sufficed for a מנחה, while later at least one tenth was demanded, and the ritual is infinitely more simple than that afterwards described (in ch. VIII).[4] But considerably later is the following section,

IV. Chapter VI. 17 to VII. 7. It consists of two divisions, each introduced by the words "This is the law of" (זאת תורה), namely 1. VII. 1—7 on the trespass-offering (אשם); and 2. VI. 17—23 on the sin-offering (חטאת); both are added as first injunctions on these new and later classes of sacrifice, and from the same point of view as the previous precepts concerning the holocaust and *minchah* (VI. 1—11), namely, as directions for the priests; but the section concerning the trespass-offering is older; and it illustrates the regulations re-

sacrificial code (Lev. I to VII). Of this arrangement the one feature only is correct that the sacrificial laws occupy the last place; but it is entirely inadmissible to separate Leviticus VIII and IX; and it is evident that, at the consecration of the priests, the Tabernacle was already definitively erected.

1 Comp. VI. 2, 18.

2 Namely, in ver. 5 (והקטיר עליה חלבי השלמים) and in ver. 10 (כחטאת וכאשם).

3 Namely, vers. 12—23 and VII. 1—10; comp. VII. 7; see notes on VI. 1—11.

4 See notes on VI. 12—16.

specting this latter class by reference to the primitive holocausts: the last verse of the sixth chapter is probably a later addition.[5]

V. Chapter VII. 8—10. A subsequent compiler who found the sacrificial code completed so far (VI. 1—VII. 7) appended a few ordinances on the burnt-offering and the *minchah* which appeared to him important, and he did so from the same point of view, which pervades the whole code, namely, in the interest of the priests, determining their share in those two kinds of offering. These additions are probably even later than chapters I and II, as they claim the hides of the holocausts for the priest, and classify the priestly shares in the *minchah* on a more advanced principle.[6]

But now it was found that enactments concerning a chief class of sacrifice were entirely wanting, namely respecting the thank-offerings (שלמים): as these were earlier in origin than the expiatory sacrifices, they ought to have been treated of immediately after the holocaust and *minchah*; but as the latter series of laws was concluded, nothing was left but to append the ordinances on thank-offerings at the end, and in order to establish some kind of connection with the preceding series, they were likewise introduced with the words וזאת תורת; these laws form the next portion

VI. Chapter VII. 11—21: but meanwhile a considerable period had elapsed, during which sacrifices had been habitually and numerously offered, and the sacrificial system had developed itself under the influence of an increasing priesthood; therefore the injunctions respecting the שלמים are much more elaborate and more detailed than those concerning the other kinds of sacrifice; the class is separated into two subdivisions, "the praise-offering"[7] and the "vow and free-will offering";[8] but in spite of the external connection by זאת תורת, the principle of the preceding commands, namely the exclusive reference to the priesthood, is not maintained; the precepts relate partly to the mode of sacrifice and the manner

[5] See notes on VI. 17—23 and VII. 1—7.

[6] See Comm. in loc.

[7] על־תודה, vers. 12—15.

[8] נדר או נדבה, vers. 16 *sqq.*

of the disposal of the flesh by the Israelites; the "most holy" character of the meat is enjoined with excessive severity; and everything breathes a later and rigorously Levitical character.

VII. Chapter VII. 22—27: two very old laws against eating blood and fat, founded on long usage, and added at the same time as the preceding portion or somewhat later; it was evidently desired that these prohibitions should be expressly and emphatically enforced, though they were probably familiar to everyone.

Now it might be supposed that, after so many additions and appendices, the first code was finally completed. But a later priest discovered that the share of his order in the שלמים was not mentioned, and he supplied the omission by another appendix, in which he either recorded, fixed, or extended the actual usage of his time in that respect, and thus endeavoured to secure for his class one of the most important sources of its revenue; this is

VIII. Chapter VII. 28—34. Now he believed that the whole system of sacrifices was indeed fully treated of, and he concluded the collection of laws with a formula which it is impossible to conceive more general or more comprehensive (vers. 35—38).

---

Independently of the code just analysed and, on the whole, contemporaneously with it, another one was composed by a different hand (ch. I to III); it embraces, like the first, the oldest and principal sacrifices: but the point of view from which it is compiled is different; it is intended as much for the guidance of the *people* as of the priests, and is mainly confined to *private* offerings. This collection contains indeed but few contradictions if compared with the preceding one, but they are sufficient to prove the distinct origin of both. In the former, a perpetual fire on the altar is ordained (VI. 2, 5, 6), the other does not suppose such a fire to be entertained (I. 7);[1] and in the former, the hides of the holocausts are assigned to the priests (VII. 8), in

[1] See notes in loc.

the other this is at least not expressly mentioned, and the whole animal appears to have been burnt (I. 6, 9). This code begins

IX. Chapter I. 1—13, with laws on private and voluntary burnt-offerings consisting of quadrupeds; they date, on the whole, from a comparatively early time; they are indeed less Levitical than the corresponding section in the other code (VI. 1—6), as the contradictions just pointed out prove, but the language and general character argue their later origin. They were placed at the beginning of the Book because, in connection with the next chapters, they contain an apparently coherent system of the principal sacrifices. Then follows,

X. Chapter II. 1—13, a series of laws on bloodless oblations (מנחה), much more elaborate and detailed, and manifestly evincing larger experience than the analogous ordinances in VI. 12—16; and

XI. Chapter III. 1—16, on thank-offerings (שלמים), if not more minute, certainly more logical and systematic than VII. 11—21.

To each of these three chapters later additions were made, it may be from the same hand, namely

XII. Chapter I. 14—17, on the burnt-offerings of birds, that is of pigeons and turtle-doves, which were but gradually admitted for such sacrifices;[2]

XIII. Chapter II. 14—16, of the firstfruit-offering (מנחת בכורים), and the use of salt, leaven, and honey, in connection with sacrifices; though the special ordinance with respect to the firstfruit-offering would more logically have been inserted before the general regulations with regard to all classes of *minchah* (or after ver. 10);[3] and

XIV. Chapter III. 17, the prohibition of fat and blood, appended as abruptly as in the former code.[4]

At a considerably later period, the next portion concerning expiatory sacrifices[5] was added. This complicated section must be subdivided on the following leading principles: 1. At first, intentional sins alone

[2] See notes on I. 1—9. This addition is probably contemporary in origin with V. 7—10 which refers to it (ver. 10); see notes in loc.

[3] See p. 487.

[4] VII. 22—27; see pp. 490, 491, and *supra* p. XXI.

[5] Chapters IV and V.

## VII. ITS IMPORTANCE.

The peculiar significance of Leviticus in the system of the Pentateuch is obvious. The sacrifices, constituting the centre of public worship, were the principal bond of union between the Israelites and their God; they formed a powerful agency of moral and religious training;[1] and they helped, more effectually than any other institution, to keep alive within the nation the consciousness of its unity and its mission. But the importance of Leviticus in the economy of the New Testament is hardly less manifest: the notions of vicarious suffering and sacrificial death as a means of expiation and grace, in which the later dispensation is centred, cannot be thoroughly understood without an exact knowledge of the spirit of the Levitical laws;[2] hence the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews exerted himself, by every effort of sagacity and dialectic ingenuity, to point out the analogy between the sacrificial doctrines of the Old and the New Covenant; for he felt how much was gained by making the precepts of Leviticus the foundation of the new creed of atonement.[3]

Laws are the concrete expression of a nation's life; they reflect both its history and its political struggles; but the religious statutes reveal with singular distinctness its spiritual aspirations and higher aims; and they reveal them even if they should virtually be nothing else but proposals, and should long remain no more than ideal demands.

---

[1] See p. 57.

[2] See pp. 291—307.

[3] Whether this justifies the *typical* acceptation of the Hebrew sacrifices, has been examined in its due place, pp. 142—166.

# LEVITICUS.

## I.
## LAWS CONCERNING SACRIFICES AND PUBLIC WORSHIP.
CHAPTERS I TO X.

## A. THE PRINCIPAL SACRIFICES.
CHAPTERS I. TO VII.

### PRELIMINARY ESSAY.
#### ON THE SACRIFICES OF THE HEBREWS AND OF OTHER NATIONS.

#### I. THE ORIGIN OF SACRIFICES.

WHEREVER the rite of sacrifice existed, it was the principal and most significant means of manifesting piety. It formed the centre and kernel of religious worship. It mainly called forth altars, temples, and priests. But sacrifices were offered by nearly every nation of antiquity, with rare exceptions, like that of the Derbices, at Mount Caucasus.[1] Their origin must, therefore, be intimately connected with the very essence of religion.

Indeed it appears that the earliest sacrifices were presented, as holocausts, from motives of *awe* and *fear*. They were designed to appease the terrible beings that were imagined to sway nature and its elements, and arbitrarily to rule over the life and death of man. They disclosed the offerer and the deity in the relative position of *slave* and *master*.

When gradually the powers of the universe were understood and partially subdued; when the fields, however reluctantly, yielded their produce, and herds and flocks multiplied on fertile pastures: an emotion of *reverential gratitude* stimulated the agriculturist and the breeder of cattle to devote the firstlings and choicest fruits of their labour to those divinities who had blessed their work, and whose future favour was implored. A feeling as between *father* and *child* prompted the offerings.

[1] Comp. *Strab.* XI. xi. 8.

But when men finally triumphed in the hard struggle for material existence, and secured a life of ease and comfort; they were induced, by a sentiment of *joy*, to *share* with the gods to whom they owed it, the best part of their property: sacrificial repasts were held, over which presided a spirit akin to familiarity, though exalted by veneration. It was essentially the relation between *friend* and *friend* which characterised this class of sacrifice.[1]

Few nations proceeded beyond the three classes just specified: they presented either fear-offerings, or thank-offerings, or joy-offerings.[2] They had indeed made most important progress in their religious education, when their feelings towards the deity had from those of the slave been refined into those of the child and of the friend; and within this circle they moved with ample freedom. Occasionally they combined two classes of sacrifice. If they had achieved a success which they attributed, not to their own strength and ability, but to the aid of a god; they devoted to him a part of their gain with mingled feelings of gratitude and submission. Thus, after military victories, they presented the most honourable part of the spoil,[3] and not unfrequently the first captives of war.[4] It is this frame of mind that gave existence to an important class of religious offerings — to *vows*: a person engaged in some uncertain but momentous enterprise, or menaced by some impending danger, pledged himself, in case of good fortune and deliverance, to do homage, by a self-imposed sacrifice, to the deity that had assisted him.

Yet, though vows are most valuable as a manifestation of religious sentiment, they do not advance beyond the sphere of worldliness: like the three classes of sacrifice above described, they contain an element of calculating selfishness. Two most essential steps remained to be made. It was felt in the process of time, that the worshipper must not simply pray for and accept benefits, but that he must try to deserve

---

[1] Hence the definition that sacrifices are "the expression of the feeling of dependence" (Scholl, Baur), is incomplete, as it does not include the third class; and Schenkel observes correctly, "not till the feeling of dependence is ethically induced — not that is to say till it arises from a function of the conscience — does it properly pass into religion" (*Herzog's* Real-Encyclopaedie, I. p. 64); comp. also *Mansell*, Limits of Religious Thought, Lect. IV.

[2] Thus Porphyry (De Abstin. II. 24) observes that sacrifices are offered ἢ διὰ τιμὴν ἢ διὰ χάριν ἢ διὰ χρείαν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, which classification includes the third kind of offerings, because sacrificial repasts were connected with the thank-offerings (διὰ χάριν); comp., however, *Jamblich.* De Myst. V. 5; see also *Fr. P. Cobbe,* Religious Duty, ch. I; *Bernays,* Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit, pp. 103, 106.

[3] *Spolia opima,* comp. *Liv.* I. 10; IV. 20; XXIII. 46; *Virg.* Aen. VI. 856; X. 449.

[4] Ἀπαρχαὶ τοῦ πολέμου; see Sect. XXI. 2, of this treatise.

them; that he places a barrier between himself and the divine favour by *guilt*, which much be expiated before the altar can be approached. Thus originated *sin-offerings* and *purifications*. A last effort crowned and concluded the system of sacrifices: it centred in the consciousness of the frailty of human nature, of the "deceitfulness" of the human heart, of its evil desires and propensities. Now it appeared no longer sufficient to offer sacrifices for individual sins by which the mind felt oppressed. It was deemed necessary, incessantly to invoke the mercy of heaven to shield the heart from transgressions. Thus *humility-offerings* were presented. In this disposition, the mind yearns to realise the injunction, "you shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy";[5] it passes even to the extreme boundary of sacrifice, which it might overstep with one resolute effort, to enter the purer spheres of elevation by *prayer*.[6] The two last classes of sacrifice, the sin- and humility-offerings, have a tendency entirely different from that of the three former categories. They convert the altar into a tribunal, to which the offerer spontaneously submits: but while, in the sin-offering, God bears to him, the transgressor, the relation of *Judge*; in the humility-offering, the majesty of the Law itself appeals to his conscience and the divine part of his nature. Both prevailed, therefore, among nations in proportion to the refinement of their views and the spiritualisation of their religion; they were unknown to many uncultivated tribes lost in egotism and sensuality;[7] and even the Israelites had to pass through several intermediate stages before they arrived at the highest form of expiatory offerings.[8] But the ancient Hebrews were not permitted to proceed farther. Even the most enlightened among them, regarding, in common with the mass of the people, the oblation of material gifts as an efficient means of Divine worship, were content with preventing, as much as was in their power, the gross abuses to which that practice is liable; and with framing sacrificial laws in which they embodied their own better notions. It was reserved for a later development of religion to recognise the ceremonies as the "shadows" of the Law; though even that dispensation retained the idea of sacrifice, and made it the very centre of its scheme of redemption.[9]

Such appears, in general outline, to have been the origin and succession of the different kinds of sacrifice. Hence it is evident that not thank-offerings, and much less sin-offerings, can have been the

[5] Lev. XIX. 2, comp. XI. 44, 45; XX. 7, 26; Num. XV. 40.

[6] Comp. Gen. IV. 3, 4 and 28.

[7] Comp. Sect. XX.

[8] See Sect. XV.

[9] See Sect. IV and XIX.

earliest species of sacrifices.[1] Burnt-offerings seem, in fact, for long periods, to have been the only form of sacrifice; they appear to have been offered on all occasions, and to have included the various classes later separated and distinguished. But it must be admitted, that the infinite variety of crude conceits entertained with respect to the nature of the gods by different tribes and races, gave rise to numerous other conceptions of sacrificial worship which seriously impeded religious progress.

Some regarded the offerings simply as *presents* given to the gods in order to secure their good graces: just as in many primitive polities, subjects are not allowed to approach their *king* without a gift, that they may constantly be reminded that all their possessions properly belong to *him*. It was an old aphorism, "Presents win gods as well as kings".[2] The ancient Hebrews were not strangers to a similar notion; they were commanded "not to appear before God empty";[3] the Hebrew names for sacrifice in general mean properly *gift* or *present*;[4] and writers in the latest periods warned the people not to offer faulty or valueless animals, such as, if presented to a prince or a governor, would fail to secure his gracious reception;[5] though, of course, enlightened men proclaimed that God, the Lord of the universe, does not *require* man's poor offerings.[6] Hence arose the idea that the richer the gift, the greater the favour which it secured. The Athenians could never understand why the gods so often allowed them to be defeated by the Lacedaemonians, since they always offered the fairest and most numerous, their enemies scanty and paltry sacrifices.[7] In every invocation to the gods, an allusion to generous offerings previously presented, was deemed most efficacious, and to determine the final issue.[8] Roman authors attributed the security and growth of the empire to the scrupulous observance of sacrificial and other rites;[9] while, on the other hand, it is reported that the Thoes, a tribe at the confines of Thrace, who entirely neglected sacrifices, vanished

---

[1] The former view is defended by Rosenmüller (Excurs. I. in Lev. p. 198), the latter by Kurtz (Opfercultus, § 117); comp. Sect. XV.

[2] *Δῶρα θεοὺς πείθει, δῶρ' αἰδοίους βασιλῆας*; comp. *Plat.* Rep. III. 4 (390 E); *Eurip.* Medea 964 (*πείθειν δῶρα καὶ θεοὺς λόγος*); *Ovid*, Ars amat. III. 653, 654 (Munera, crede mihi, capiunt hominesque deosque; Placatur donis Juppiter ipse datis); *Hom.* Il. IX. 493.

[3] Exod. XXIII. 15; XXXIV. 20; Deut. XVI. 16, 17; comp. Gen. IV. 3, 4; see also XXXII. 21; Ps. XLV. 13.

[4] קרבן and מנחה; see Sect. V.

[5] Mal. I. 8.

[6] Ps. L. 8—13; Isai. XL. 16; comp. *Talm.* Menach. 110 *a*.

[7] Comp. *Plato*, Alcib. II. 12, 13 (p. 149).

[8] Comp. *Hom.* Il. I. 37—42; IV. 48, 49.

[9] *Val. Max.* I. 8; comp. *Plut.* Marcell. IV. 5; *Porphyr.* Abstin. II. 16, 37 *fin.*, 61.

utterly from the earth with their towns and property.[10] It was made a matter of calculation or barter, how much was required to attain a certain end: for "the gods do nothing gratuitously (ἀμισθί); they sell their goods to men; health might be purchased by a calf, wealth by four oxen; a royal crown costs a hecatomb; while more trifling bounties might be acquired by a cock, a wreath of flowers, or even a handful of frankincense."[11] On ordinary occasions, and when no great boon was demanded, no efforts were made to offer valuable gifts. The Greeks often appropriated to the gods insignificant, if not absolutely worthless parts of the victims; they were therefore taunted and ridiculed by the comic poets for the folly and selfishness which expected benefits for nothing.[12] But when important objects were to be gained, or great events to be signalised, the *number* of sacrifices was deemed most essential. It became a matter of ambition and self-interest to slaughter hecatombs.[13] Marius vowed one in the Cimbric war, Aemilius Paulus in the Macedonian. After the discomfiture at Lake Thrasymene, 300 bulls were sacrificed to Jupiter; white cattle to many other gods of the first rank; and to the rest victims of less value. On one occasion, the Syracusans offered 450 oxen to Jupiter.[14] The Athenians killed annually, in commemoration of the battle of Marathon, 500 goats in honour of Artemis Agrotera.[15] Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great, offered a thousand animals of every domestic kind.[16] At the death of Tiberius and the accession of Caligula, it is computed that about 160,000 victims, principally oxen and calves, were slaughtered in Rome.[17] In fact, the opulent, however wicked, believed that they possessed the power of obtaining from the gods whatever they desired, and of thus triumphing over the poor or the thrifty.[18] From this conception there is but one step to the idea that the gods can be *forced* into compliance with the petitions of the worshippers, and this idea frequently occurs in the Hindoo mythology of later periods.[19] The Hebrews also occasionally carried the number of sacrifices to an excess. It is reported that David, when conveying the Ark of the Covenant from

[10] *Porphyr.* l. c. II. 8; *Thuc.* IV. 109.

[11] Comp. *Lucian*, De Sacrif. 2.

[12] See *Clem. Alex.* Strom. VII. 716, 719.

[13] Comp. *Athen.* Deipnos. I. 5.

[14] *Diod. Sic.* XI. 72.

[15] *Plut.* De Malignit. Herod. c. 26; comp. also *Herod.* VII. 43; *Xen.* Hell. VI. iv. 29 (Jason is supposed to have offered, on one occasion, 1,000 oxen and 10,000 other cattle).

[16] *πάντα χίλια*, *Porphyr.* De Abstin. II. 60; comp. cc. 15, 17; see however, Sect. IV.

[17] *Sueton.* Calig. 14; comp. *Ammian. Marcell.* XXII. 4; XXV. 4; *Seneca*, De Benef. III. 27 (Rufus optaverat, ne Caesar salvus rediret ex ea peregrinatione, quam parabat; et adjecerat, *idem omnes et tauros et vitulos optare*); see also *Burton*, Mission to Gelele, II. p. 332.

[18] Comp. *Plato*, Alcib. II. 13 (p. 150).

[19] Comp. *Wilson*, Introduct. to Rig-Veda-Sanhita, p. XXVI.

the house of Obed-Edom to Jerusalem, killed an ox and a fatling after every sixth step;[1] that Solomon, when his succession was secured, offered 1,000 animals;[2] when he was anointed, 1,000 bullocks, 1,000 rams, and 1,000 lambs;[3] and when he consecrated the Temple, 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep.[4] It is indeed more than probable that most of these numbers are largely exaggerated; as, in fact, Solomon is finally related to have killed animals "that could not be told nor numbered for multitude."[5] But they prove at least that the Hebrew historians not only regarded them as possible, but wished them to be considered as historical, for the greater glorification of their heroes and of the events which they recorded.[6]

In other cases, the sacrifices were conceived as real *food* presented to the gods, who were supposed actually to consume the offering, either by eating it bodily, or by inhaling the smoke when burnt. "The gods", says Lucian,[7] "feed on ambrosia and nectar; but they delight most in the steam of the fat that rises with the smoke of the sacrifices, and in the blood of the victims poured by the offerer round the altar."[8] This notion has by many antiquarians been considered the first origin of sacrifices.[9] The *lectisternia* of various ancient nations require but a passing allusion. They generally consisted of tables covered with the most delicious viands, and of sumptuous couches on which the images of the gods were placed reposing, as if actually partaking of the dainties. They were customary among the Persians. They occur in the apocryphal narrative of Bel and the Dragon in Babylon. They have been noticed among some Tartar tribes.[10] They were familiar to the Greeks and Romans. In Homer, Neptune is described as "sitting down to the sacrificial meal and enjoying it."[11] The gods were even considered to eat the flesh of human sacrifices; and Dionysos bore distinctive names descriptive of that attribute.[12] The early Romans offered to Jupiter Dapalis a piece

---

1 2 Sam. VI. 13.

2 1 Ki. III. 4.

3 1 Chr. XXIX. 21.

4 1 Ki. VIII. 63; 2 Chr. VII. 5; comp. Ezra VI. 17; VIII. 35; 2 Chr. XV. 11; XXIX. 32, 33; XXX. 24; XXXV. 7 *sqq.*

5 1 Ki. VIII. 5.

6 See Sect. III; *Bauer*, Gott. Verf. I. 184; comp., however, Sect. IV.

7 Ikaromenippus, c. 28.

8 Comp. also *Hom.* Il. IV. 48; *Aristoph.* Aves, 1516—1524; *Plin.* Hist. Nat. II. 5.

9 *Spencer*, De Legg. Hebr. Ritt. Lib. III, Dissert. 2, cap. 3 (p. 756); *Meiners*, Gesch. der Religg. II. 1, 7, 9, etc.; *Winer*, Real-Wörterb. II. 176; *Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, p. 103; *Feuerbach*, Wesen des Christenthums, p. 20 of the Engl. transl.

10 *Marco Polo*, De Regionibus orientalibus, III. 24. See also Sect. X. 12.

11 Odyss. I. 26, ἔνθ' ὅγε τέρπετο δαιτὶ παρήμενος; comp. Il. I. 424.

12 He was called ὠμηστής, ὠμάδιος, or ὠμοφάγος; see Sect. XXI. *init.*

of *roast* pork with wine.[13] We have a detailed description of the first grand *lectisternia* prepared, at Rome, in honour of Apollo, Mercury, and Neptune, Latona, Diana, and Hercules.[14] On the Capitol, the Romans gave annually to Jupiter a banquet or *epulum*, to which Juno and Minerva were invited, and at which the gods reclined on a couch, while the goddesses, in accordance with Roman views of propriety, sat in chairs.[15] Some ordinances and expressions of the Old Testament compel us to suppose, that similar notions were, in early times, entertained by the Hebrews also. The shew-bread table with the constant and regularly renewed loaves, the type of the ordinary and daily sustenance in the East, points unmistakeably to the cereal food primitively placed before the deity, though, of course, in the Pentateuch, that origin is effaced as much as was at all possible.[16] Animal sacrifices were to be accompanied by vegetable and drink-offerings,[17] and all oblations whatever were to be presented with salt;[18] evidently because human repasts consist not of meat alone, but of bread and wine, and salt is indispensable in the preparation of food. The term "an offering made by fire to the Lord,"[19] used in reference to every class of sacrifice,[20] is in some passages explained by the phrase "food of the offering made by fire to the Lord",[21] or "food of the offering made by fire for a sweet odour";[22] and the offering itself is repeatedly called *food of God*.[23] These phrases

---

[13] Assaria pecunia, *Cato*, De Re Rust. 132. [14] *Liv*. V. 13.

[15] *Valer. Max*. I. i. 1; comp. *Liv*. VII. 2, 27; VIII. 25; XL. 59; *Plin*. XXXII. 10; *Arnob*. Adv. Nat. VII. 24, 25, 29, and in general cc. 1—34; *Aristoph*. Plut. 676—680; *Macrob*. Saturn. III. 11. At Rome, however, the food belonged generally to the *epulones* who prepared it; comp. *Cic*. De Orat. III. 19 (73); *Liv*. XXXIII. 42.

[16] See Comm. on Exod. p. 481. — The objections of Bähr (Symb. I. 426 sqq.) have no bearing upon the *early* notions of the Hebrews.

[17] מִנְחָה and נֶסֶךְ; see Sect. XI. and XII. [18] See Sect. IX. 1.

[19] אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה.

[20] Lev. II. 3, 10, 11, 16; VII. 27; Num. XV. 3, 13, 14.

[21] לֶחֶם אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה; Lev. III. 11.

[22] לֶחֶם אִשֶּׁה לְרֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ; Lev. III. 16; Num. XXVIII. 24; comp. Exod. XXIX. 18; Lev. I. 9, 13, 17; II. 2, 9, 12; III. 5; IV. 31; VIII. 21; XXVI. 31; Num. XV. 7, 10, 13, 14; XXVIII. 6, 13; XXIX. 2, 6; comp. also Gen. VIII. 21; 1 Sam. XXVI. 19; Ezra VI. 10; Ephes. V. 2; and Judg. IX. 13; compare κνίσης ἡδὺς ἀϋτμή (*Hom*. Od. XII. 369; see *Lucian*, Prometh. 19).

[23] לחם אלהים; Lev. XXI. 6, 8, 17; XXII. 25; Ezek. XLIV. 7; especially Num. XXVIII. 2 (קרבני לחמי) and Mal. I. 7, 12 (where the altar is designed *table* שלחן, and the sacrifice *food* אכל). Jehuda Halevi (Cusari II. 26) explains קרבני לחמי לאשי (Num. XXVIII. 2) "My offering and My bread belong to My fire which I send down upon My altar" (comp. Lev. IX. 24); and Abarbanel (Indroduct. to Lev. c. IV, p. 294 ed. Veil) "the offering was to be dedicated not to God, but to the fire which consumed it" שלא היה הקרבן לגבוה אלא לשתאכלנו אש המזבח: two interpretations equally

undeniably betray the rude conceptions held by the people in its earliest stages:[1] and even, while in exile at Babylon, the Jews, imitating the custom of the land, "prepared tables to Gad,[2] and filled the goblet for Meni."[3] But it is equally indisputable that the terms in question were gradually understood in a more spiritual or refined sense, and that they were so taken in the Pentateuch.[4] For it is evident, that the expression an offering "for sweet odour" (לריח ניחוח) must have originated when the chief sacrifices consisted of incense and other fragrant substances; yet in the Pentateuch, it is retained for the most offensive smell of burnt meat and fat, hides, feathers, and flour; while, on the other hand, it is never employed with reference to the burning of frankincense.[5] It took indeed such deep root in the language that even Josephus spoke of sacrifices as the "daily food" of God;[6] and the apostle Paul described the voluntary gifts sent to him by the congregations as "an odour of sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God." [7]

Viewing the matter in this light, we are enabled to do justice to the progress of the Hebrew mind without forcing the spirit of the Pentateuch. Though acknowledging that "the incense offering burnt to Jehovah every morning and every evening in the sanctuary, corresponds with the Eastern custom of fumigating the apartments and of honouring the guests by perfumes";[8] we are not tempted to attribute this meaning

artificial and untenable; while the rendering of Keil (Levit. pp. 13, 32; comp. Archaeol. I. 199) "eine Speise, die der Mensch wirkt und als Feuerung seinem Gotte zum Geruche der Befriedigung aufsteigen lässt", is forced and philologically impossible.

[1] Comp. Deut. XXXII. 38.

[2] גַּד, Jupiter.

[3] מְנִי, Venus; Isai. LXV. 11; comp. Jer. VII. 18; Ezek. XVI. 18, 19; XXIII. 41; Daniel Sept. XIV. 3—15; Baruch. VI. 27.

[4] Comp. לֹא אָרִיחַ בְּעַצְּרֹתֵיכֶם (Am. V. 21) *I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies*; see also Exod. V. 21. The Samaritan translator repeatedly renders רצה by ריח (so Lev. I. 4; XXVI. 41); while Onkelos interprets ריח by רעוא (Gen. VIII. 21; Lev. I. 9; etc.; see *Ebn Ezra* on Gen. VIII. 21); comp. Ezek. XX. 41 (בריח ניחח ארצה אתכם); Isai. XI. 3; *Maimon.* Mor. Neb. I. 47; *Clericus*, Dissertat. de ling. Hebr. V. (pp. 6, 7), prefixed to his Commentary on the Pentateuch. Thus Bähr (Symb. II. 348) connecting ניחוח with נוח *to rest*, explains, "the notion of rest is, like that of peace, equivalent with pleasure or well-being, so that the formula means, the ascending sacrifice is agreeable or welcome to God" (comp. also I. 461—465). Winer (Real-Wört. I. 193) believes, therefore, the phrase אשה ריח ניחוח ליהוה to coincide in sense with the words לרצנו לפני יהוה (Lev. I. 3; see Comm. *in loc.*); while Theodoretus (Quaest. 62 in Exod.) explains it by *τὴν κατὰ νόμον γενομένην ἱερουργίαν*.

[5] Comp. Exod. XXX. 7, 34—38.

[6] Bell. Jud. VI. ii. 1 (*τὴν καθ' ἡμέραν τροφήν*).

[7] *Philipp.* IV. 18, *ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας κτλ.*; comp. Ephes. V. 2; Wisd. III. 6.

[8] *Knobel*, Levit. p. 347; comp. *Bauer*, Theologie des Alt. Test. p. 312; *Kaiser*, Bibl. Theol. II. 123; *Rosenmüller*, Ex-

to the precept in the Levitical law. A critical knowledge of the date and origin of the latter removes the prejudices against the purity of its teaching. At the time of its compilation, the stage of gross anthropomorphism was passed. It exhibits a high degree of abstract thought in its conceptions of the deity.[9] All admit that the Pentateuch, in the form handed down to us, shows indeed few traces of a materialistic theology; but it is asserted that most of them were carefully removed by "the revisors of the Old Testament". It is evident that a safe advance is impossible on such shifting ground: for we cannot by any possibility hope to discover the supposed original readings. Had the framers of the sacrificial laws started from anthropomorphic views, they would not have forbidden the use of leaven and honey, since leaven was considered to render the bread more palatable and more nutritious,[10] and honey is in the East regarded as one of the choicest delicacies;[11] while, on the other hand, instead of appointing the blood as the chief means of atonement, they would have rigorously excluded its use, because it was an abomination to taste it.[12] Indeed the very opposite doctrine has been pronounced by a Hebrew writer of so early a date as Asaph. "I will", says God, "take no bullock out of thy house, nor he-goats out of thy folds . . . Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?"[13] and it cannot be urged with too great emphasis, that in the expiatory or holiest class of sacrifices, the most important ritual was not the burning of the fat or of other parts of the victim, but the sprinkling of its blood.[14]

However, the two theories just discussed, viz. that the first sacrifices were intended as *presents*, or as *food*, offered to the gods, though correct as matters of fact and experience during long periods, are so entirely unconnected with true emotions of religion, that they could form no first links in a history of the progress of sacrifices. They necessarily remained barren and isolated. For as the culture of the nations that entertained them, advanced, they were refined, modified, and improved, to be finally superseded by a very different train of ideas. They may have formed the original basis of the Hebrew holocausts and thank-offerings; but they had certainly no share in the introduction of the Hebrew sin-offerings, which were prompted by a higher discipline both with regard to the requirements of the soul and the attributes of the deity.

---

chrs. in Lev. p. 197; *Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, p. 369.

[9] Comp. Comm. on Gen. p. 199.

[10] Comp. *Plin.* H. N. XVIII. 26.

[11] See Sect. IX. 9, 10; comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. 322.

[12] See Sect. IX. 7.

[13] Ps. L. 9, 13.

[14] Comp. Sect. IX. 7; XV.

Other opinions are still less plausible. We shall only mention one more. It is supposed, that the first sacrifices were offered as "a federal rite", since common meals were the known and ordinary symbols of friendship, and usually accompanied the conclusion of covenants or leagues.[1] It is evident that the idea of "friendship" with the gods is not the first, but a much later phase of religious life; moreover, the opinion stated neither applies to burnt-offerings nor to sin-offerings, of which those who presented them did not partake at all.

## II. RELATIVE AGE OF THE ANIMAL AND VEGETABLE SACRIFICES.

It is not devoid of interest to enquire, in what order the two great classes of sacrifice, the animal and vegetable, were originally introduced and cultivated. The question might seem capable of a summary decision from the simple consideration that vegetables were the first and most natural food of men in the earliest generations; and that hence vegetable offerings preceded all animal sacrifices. This view might derive support from that narrative in Genesis which represents the elder brother Cain as offering a bloodless, the younger Abel as slaying an animal sacrifice. It has indeed, at first glance, an appearance of probability, and has been advocated by ancient and modern authorities.[2]

However, it is open to discussion, if not objection, from various points. First, it rests on the questionable assumption that sacrifices were presented in the very first stages of primitive existence. But the idea of sacrifices offered up to immortal beings who govern the world, presupposes a degree of culture and experience hardly acquired in the course of centuries. A decisive epoch is reached when the terrors and blessings of nature are traced to a supernatural cause, and the variable chances of human events disclose the direction of a higher wisdom: from that point again, long periods must elapse to the dawn of the notion of a divine power to be worshipped and appeased by acts of submission and self-denial — periods certainly protracted enough to allow the first

[1] Gen. XV. 9—21; XXVI. 27—30; XXXI. 46, 54; comp. *Sykes*, Essay on Sacrifices, p. 73; *Mede*, Works, II. ch. 7; *Magee*, On the Atonement, II. p. 22.

[2] Comp. *Aristot*. Eth. Eud. VIII. 11 (who believes that the earliest offerings were the firstlings presented, from an impulse of gratitude, after the completion of the harvest, when agriculturists are most at leisure); *Ovid*, Fast. I. 337—348 (Ante deos homini quod conciliare valeret, Far erat et puri lucida mica salis .... Si quis erat, factis prati de flore coronis Qui posset violas addere, dives erat); comp. III. 727 *sqq*.; *Plato*, Legg. VI. 22. Moreover, *θύειν* and *θυσία* were etymologically connected with *thus*.

attempts at breeding of cattle, and to secure the first successes. When, therefore, the impulse was felt to honour the gods by gifts, the choice was open between the produce of the fields and orchards, and the increase of the flocks and herds. What decision was most likely to be taken by untutored worshippers? Guided by the principle that the offerings were acceptable to the deity in proportion to their value, they naturally gave the preference to animal sacrifices; and they were confirmed in this view, when in the process of time, the blood was invested with the power of expiation.[3]

Accordingly, the bloody classes of sacrifice are found, nearly everywhere, to have been in special honour. Their superiority was repeatedly and distinctly proclaimed. The emperor Julian said, "the animal sacrifice is more pleasing to the living god than the vegetable and cereal oblations"[4]; and the acceptance of Abel's and the rejection of Cain's sacrifice have been thus accounted for.[5] The history of antiquity records but few deviations. Some religious systems, chiefly in middle and western Asia, in Babylonia, Syria, and Phoenicia, encouraged the vegetable offerings. They favoured especially the burning of frankincense.[6] The Syrian goddess, at Hierapolis, was, in the spring, honoured by trees burnt in the court of her temple. The Hebrew sect of the Essenes rejected bloody sacrifices.[7] Before the Erechtheum in Athens, there stood an altar of Jupiter,[8] and at Delos one of Apollo Genetivus (Γενήτωρ), on which no victim was killed; solemn prayers alone were offered; that of Delos was hence called "the altar of the pious"; and there only Pythagoras is related to have worshipped as on an unstained spot.[9] The altar of Venus at Paphos, and that of Mylitta or Beeltis in Babylon, were not permitted to be sprinkled with blood; they were honoured "by supplications alone and the pure flame."[10] It was deemed inappropriate to bring blood upon the altar of the goddess of Peace, because she abhorred slaughter,[11] or upon that of *Terminus*, because he was the guardian of concord and the witness of justice, and should, therefore, remain clean from murder.[12] It is supposed that, at first, the anniversary of

---

[3] See Sect. IX. 7.

[4] *Cyrill.* Contr. Julian. 10.

[5] *Ἐπειδὴ ... τιμιώτερα τῶν ἀψύχων ἐστὶ τὰ ἔμψυχα τῷ ζῶντι καὶ ζωῆς αἰτίῳ θεῷ ..., καθὸ καὶ ζωῆς μετείληφεν, καὶ ψυχῆς οἰκειότερα· διὰ τοῦτο τῷ τελείαν προςαγόντι* (sc. Abel) *θυσίαν ἐπηυφράνθη.*

[6] See Sect. VII.

[7] *Philo*, Opp. II. 458.

[8] Comp. *Pausan.* I. 26; VIII. 2.

[9] *Porphyr.* De Abstin. II. 28; *Macrob.* Saturn. III. 6; *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 12 (13); *Clem. Alex.* Strom. VII. 448; *Sponheim* and *Grăcius* on Callimach. Del. 283; *Creuzer*, Symbol. II. 537, 538.

[10] *Tacit.* Ann. II. 3; *Plin.* Hist. Nat. II. 96; comp. *Münter*, Relig. der Babylonier, pp. 22, 25; Der Tempel d. himmlischen Göttin zu Paphos, p. 20 *sqq.*

[11] *Aristoph.* Pax, 1019, 1020.

[12] *Plut.* Num. 16.

Rome's foundation was celebrated by vegetable offerings, because it was deemed right to keep that festival pure, and unpolluted by bloodshed.[1] Most of the offerings ordained by Numa were bloodless, consisting of flour, wine, and other simple gifts.[2] The Syrians in early times (τὸ παλαιόν), the Pythagoraeans, some castes of the Hindoos, and a few tribes of southern Asia, that abstained from all animal food,[3] considered vegetables alone as pious offerings.[4] Asclepiades held animal offerings to be unnatural, and regarded, therefore, an express prohibition superfluous.[5] Eusebius[6] contended that the early Greeks offered vegetables only, because they did not regard the "soul" or "life" (ψυχή) of animals as essentially different from that of men, and hence viewed the killing of beasts in the light of carnage. It was an old Attic custom, to accuse all those of murder who had taken part in an animal sacrifice, those who had fetched the water, sharpened the knife, and performed the slaughtering; till at last the instrument was declared guilty of the crime and thrown into the sea.[7] A similar rite was observed in Athens at a sacrifice in honour of Zeus Polieus, the protector of the city: the priest who had killed the victim was obliged to flee, while the axe which he had used was brought to judgment and condemned.[8]

However, all these instances are isolated exceptions. Nations which presented vegetable offerings exclusively to some deities, devoted animal sacrifices to others. So Bel, the god of the sun and of fire and of all animal life, received in his temple in Babylon, on two altars, old and young animals. The Hindoo sect of the Shivaites, in almost implacable opposition to the Vishnuites, offered only animal sacrifices; for they looked upon Shiva as the principle of fire and of animal existence and generation.[9] Among the Hindoos, therefore, both classes were evidently of equal antiquity: the "horse sacrifice" or Asvamedha was their chief and noblest offering;[10] and the Vedas contain distinct precepts with regard to animal sacrifices. It is stated that though the

---

1 *Plut.* Rom. 12, καθαρὰν καὶ ἀναίμακτον ᾤοντο δεῖν τῇ πατρίδι τὴν ἐπώνυμον τῆς γενέσεως τὴν ἑορτὴν φυλάττειν.

2 *Plut.* Num. 8; *Plin.* Hist. Nat. XVIII. 2.

3 *Porphyr.* Abstin. IV. 15; II. 36; comp. *Plato*, Legg. VI. 22, p. 782. *Horat.* Ars Poet. 391—393 (Silvestres homines sacer interpresque deorum Caedibus et victu foedo deterruit Orpheus, Dictus ab hoc lenire tigres rabidosque leones).

4 Ἁγνὰ θύματα.

5 *Porphyr.* De Abst. IV. 15.

6 Demonstr. Evang. I. 10.

7 *Porphyr.* De Abstin. II. 30; *Aelian.* Var. Hist. VIII. 3. The day on which this took place, was called *Διιπόλεια* and *Βουφόνια*; comp. *Aristoph.* Nubes 984.

8 *Pausan.* I. 24; *Ael.* H. A. XII. 34.

9 Comp. *Stahr*, Die Religionssysteme des Orients, pp. 103—108.

10 See Sect. VII.

Pythagoraeans abstained from animal food, yet, if they offered an animal for themselves,[11] they partook of its flesh:[12] it is, therefore, manifest that they did offer, at least occasionally, animal sacrifices. The observation of Eusebius, evidently too vague to be correct, is unsupported by conclusive evidence; and the frequency of animal offerings among the Greeks requires no proof. The tradition that animals were first killed for sacrifices on the behest of an oracle, when their vast increase began to be dangerous to the fruits and fields,[13] is utterly untrustworthy: for men offered to the gods not what they wished to destroy, but what they prized most. Porphyry[14] indeed collects elaborate arguments against all bloody sacrifices, which he would permit exclusively for appeasing the *demons*, whether good or bad;[15] and he contends that the gods accept more readily frank-incense, cakes, flour, and especially the firstfruits, than the most splendid animal sacrifice,[16] especially as for this purpose not the noxious, but just the most harmless and most useful animals are killed.[17] But the testimony of Porphyry must be received with extreme caution, since, as a strict Pythagoraean, he deemed the killing of animals criminal, and was biassed by his uncompromising advocacy of an absolute abstinence from animal food, which he regarded as injurious to the body and hostile to the elevation of the soul.

It seems, therefore, safest to conclude that vegetable and animal offerings were nearly coeval in origin; that both were presented promiscuously; that agriculturists naturally offered more frequently the former, breeders of cattle more especially the latter; while the poor of either class were of course compelled to limit themselves to the former alone. The narrative in Genesis regarding the first offerings may with equal propriety be used in support of this view, since Cain and Abel are represented as *brothers*.

But the worshippers knew a sacrifice more precious still than animals, that of their fellow-men or of themselves. Hence we find human sacrifices of every form and variety practised among nearly all ancient nations.[18] Their origin is evidently of a comparatively later date. They seem to imply a development of religious feeling carried to an enthusiastic excess, and hence to belong to a period, when the principle of sacrifice, natural, if not laudable, from certain points of view, became pernicious and detestable by its blind and irrational exaggeration. It has indeed been supposed that the first bloody sacrifices consisted of

---

[11] *Ὅτε δὲ εἰς ἀπαρχήν τι τῶν ζώων ἀνθ' ἑαυτῶν μερίσειαν τοῖς θεοῖς.*

[12] *Porphyr.* De Abstin. II. 28.

[13] *Plut.* Sympos. VIII. viii. 3.

[14] De Abstin. II. 12—14.

[15] *L. c.* c. 36.

[16] *L. c.* cc. 15, 16; comp. cc. 12, 59.

[17] *L. c.* c. 22.

[18] See Sect. XXI.

human beings for whom animals were in later time substituted:[1] but this view seems to involve a bound contrary to the nature of the human mind and its laws of advancement.

It will be clear from the preceding remarks that all efforts made to point out successive stages in the materials used for vegetable oblations, must be artificial. They are legitimate on the supposition only that sacrifices were nearly contemporaneous with the existence of men on earth. But this supposition has been proved to be erroneous; the first vegetable offering must, therefore, have been composed of the best and most valuable products of the earth that could be procured, the more so as even these were commonly considered as a poor substitute for the more acceptable, because more costly, sacrifice of animals. Yet it may be interesting to consider the gradations conjecturally adopted by a thoughtful ancient writer. According to Porphyry,[2] the vegetable oblations consisted successively of herbs burnt with their leaves and roots, and often with their stalks; the fruits of trees, especially acorns presented with the leaves of the oak; of cereals, chiefly barley (κριθαί), coarsely ground and sprinkled over the altar,[3] of dishes prepared from ground barley, and burnt on the altar, or of wheat and cakes baked from wheaten flour; of the firstlings of other productions, especially flowers, consumed on the altar, whether singly or tied in wreaths; of other objects distinguished for beauty or fragrance; of wine, honey, and oil: and then only, after a long interval, and as a proof of horrid degeneracy, animals were sacrificed, killed at first from ignorance, then from wild bloodthirstiness or cowardly fear; whence men received and deserved the epithets of "godless, evil-minded, and irreligious."[4] It is manifest that these and similar views[5] are poetical rather than historical. They are evidently based on the legendary traditions of a golden age when men subsisted on vegetable food alone, and the whole animal creation lived in harmony and peace.[6]

An order or succession with regard to the origin of sacrifices can only be proved in reference to their internal significance and tendency; and the proof has been attempted in the preceding Section.

## III. HISTORY OF SACRIFICES AMONG THE HEBREWS.

It is needless to observe that the Hebrews, from very early times, offered sacrifices to their gods or God. Indeed, almost as far as their

---

[1] So Theophrastus, in *Porphyr.* Abst. II. 20, 27.

[2] De Abst. II. 9, 29, 60; comp. also III. 5, 6; VII. 27. [3] Οὐλοχυτεῖσθαι.

[4] Ἄθεοι, κακόφρενες, κακόθεοι.

[5] Comp. *Ovid* Fast. I. 337—362; *Plut.* Symp. VIII. viii. 3.

[6] See Comm. on Genes. pp. 91 and 79, and the ancient writers there quoted.

annals reach into the past, they record pious offerings designed to express either submission or thankfulness. We need not go the length of Talmudists and Rabbins, who contend that even Adam presented offerings;[7] for they suppose the skins of which God made garments for the first couple[8] to have been those of sacrificial animals: an opinion as trustworthy as the statement of the same authorities that these animals were oxen with one horn on the forehead.[9] But the Bible represents the first brothers as the first sacrificers, and attributes to them the two chief classes of oblations, the animal and vegetable.[10] The patriarchs are stated to have offered sacrifices on every suitable opportunity. When Noah had escaped the dangers of the Deluge, he evinced his gratitude by a magnificent offering consisting of "every clean beast and every clean fowl."[11] Not only did Abraham, Isaak, and Jacob build altars on various occasions when they "invoked the name of the Lord";[12] but Jacob sacrificed when he had effected a reconciliation with Laban, his incensed pursuer;[13] and again when he finally left Canaan to settle with his family in Egypt.[14] In fact, sacrifices were considered to have been so firmly established, even in those remote generations, that a command given to Abraham for offering up his own son, was deemed possible.[15] The patriarchal oblations comprised not only the bloodless kind,[16] but also holocausts[17] and animal thank-offerings.[18] They did not, however, include the expiatory sacrifices[19] — a significant fact which has been accounted for elsewhere.[20] Moreover, sacrifices accompanied by appropriate and symbolical rites, seem from primitive times, to have been employed for the conclusion of treaties and the confirmation of solemn promises or vows.[21] It has been conjectured that the Book of Genesis intends to convey a distinct gradation and climax in the successive sacrifices of Cain and Abel, of Noah, and of Abraham; that it desires to represent Abel simply as the pure-minded offerer, Noah as the type of the human race conscious of its sinfulness and frailty, and Abraham as the self-sacrificing man con-

---

[7] *Talm.* Sabb. 28 *b*; Abod. Sar. 8*a*; Chull. 60*a*; comp. ידי משה ad Midr. R. Beresh. cap. 20.

[8] Gen. III. 21.

[9] Talm. ll. cc.

[10] Gen. IV. 3, 4; see pp. 10, 13.

[11] Gen. VIII. 20.

[12] קרא בשם יהוה; comp. Gen. XII. 7, 8; XIII. 4, 18; XXI. 33; XXVI. 25; XXXIII. 20; XXXV. 7. On prayer in connection with sacrifice see Sect. X. 4.

[13] Gen. XXXI. 54.

[14] XLVI. 1. [15] XXII. 1—19.

[16] מִנְחָה, Gen. IV. 3.

[17] עֹלָה, VIII. 20; XXII. 13.

[18] זֶבַח, XXXI. 54; XLVI. 1.

[19] חַטָּאת and אָשָׁם.

[20] See Sect. I, p. 3.

[21] See p. 10; Comm. on Gen. p. 366, 367, 440; *Plato*, Critias, c. 11 (pp. 119, 120); comp. Deut. XXVII. 2—8; Josh. VIII. 30—35; Ps. L. 5.

quering his natural affections by the strength of faith.[1] But such system of sacrifices cannot be supposed in a composition which entirely omits the sin-offerings, while it passes far beyond them in the sacrifice of Abraham.[2] Nor is it feasible organically to connect the sacrifices of Genesis and Exodus with those of Leviticus, and thereby to explain the later mention of the expiatory offerings.[3] For according to the narrative of the Pentateuch, the relation between God and Israel had not changed since the time of Abraham, through whom a Divine covenant was concluded with his descendants for ever;[4] indeed, the compact of mercy that was to exist between the deity and man had been finally fixed in the time of Noah, after the Deluge.[5]

The patriarchal sacrifices were offered on temporary altars which, as a rule, were constructed "of earth",[6] that is, of the fresh, green turf,[7] or frequently of simple, unhewn stones "unpolluted" by the application of iron tools.[8] For it seems that the ancients avoided the destructive metals as much as possible in connection with sanctuaries. Thus, whenever it was necessary, in the holy groves of Rome, to use iron instruments for digging the ground within their precints or the adjoining field, or if merely an iron instrument was carried through them, a *piaculum* was required to be made by the sacrifice of a swine. A similar expiation was indispensable in the temple dedicated to the Arval brothers, in the grove of their goddess Dia, whenever the stylus was employed for engraving on the marble tablets there kept for the records of the sanctuary.[9] The altars were not restricted to particular localities; it may be, that if a choice was left, hills or shady trees or groves were preferred. Among the Greeks and Romans, the altars of the upper gods (*Ολύμπιοι*) were higher structures (*βωμοί, altaria*), those of the lower gods (*Χθόνιοι* and *ἐπιχθόνιοι*) only grates (*ἐσχάραι*) not of stone, or originally holes dug in the ground and covered with wicker-work; because the sacrifices of the former deities were mostly performed on heights, those of the latter in caverns.[10] Such distinction was of course

---

1 Comp. *F. D. Maurice*, Doctrine of Sacrifice, Serm. I to III.

2 See Sect. XXV. vi. 1.

3 *Keil*, Comm. on Lev. p. 9.

4 Gen. XII. 2, 3; XXII. 18.

5 Gen. IX. 8—17; see Comm. on Gen. pp. 222 *sqq*.

6 Exod. XX. 24.

7 Comp. *Hor*. Od. III. viii. 3, 4; *Ovid*, Trist. V. v. 9; Metam. IV. 753; *Lucan*, Phars. IX. 988; etc.

8 Exod. XX. 25; Deut. XXVII. 5; see Comm. on Exod. p. 379; comp. *Ovid*, Fast. II. 537, where the sacrifices for the manes of the departed are described (*Tegula* porrectis satis est velata coronis).

9 Comp. *Cato*, De Re Rust. c. 140; *Plato*, Critias, c. 11 (p. 119); *Marini*, Atti Dei Fratr. Arv. pp. 218, 309, 339, 363; *Döllinger*, Gentile and Jew, II. 88; see Sect. X. 5.

10 *Saubert*, De Sacrif. p. 297; *Creuzer*, Symbolik, III. 764, 765.

impossible among the Hebrews. The place where the opportunity for the offering arose, was unhesitatingly chosen for its performance.[11] God is distinctly represented to have proclaimed the principle, "In all places where I shall let My name be mentioned, I will come to thee, and I will bless thee;"[12] a principle worthy of being coupled with the noble utterance, "Thus says the Lord, The heaven is My throne, and the earth My footstool: where is the house that you can build to Me? and where is the place of My rest?"[13] The prophets describe the happy time when all nations of whatever clime will worship God in any place. "In that day", says Isaiah, "there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border of it to the Lord; ... and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day and shall offer sacrifices and oblations, and shall make vows to the Lord and perform them."[14] Nor was this conception foreign to other ancient nations. The Hindoos presented their chief offering of the juice of the *soma*[15] in their dwellings, in a chamber appropriated to the purpose, in which a perpetual light was maintained; in fact, "there is no mention of any temple, or any reference to a public place of worship, and it is clear that the worship was entirely domestic."[16] The Greeks sometimes simply laid out in the streets or hung up before their houses the firstfruits, or other fruits, or pots with dressed vegetables intended as offerings to the gods.[17] The old Teutons did not consider it compatible with the majesty of the gods to enclose them in the walls of temples, and hence worshipped them freely in groves,[18] as was especially the case with the goddess Hertha or Tanfana.[19] The Scythians were not accustomed to erect images, altars, and temples, except to Mars.[20] The Syrians in Hierapolis permitted no images of the Sun and the Moon; since those deities were manifest to every one by their

---

[11] Gen. VIII. 20; XXXI. 54; XLVI. 1; Exod. XXIV. 4; comp. Gen. XXVIII. 18, 19.

[12] Exod. XX. 24. The opinion that these words imply the selection of *one* holy place at a time, and therefore enjoin the *unity* of public worship (*Riehm*, Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab, pp. 25, 26), is against the spirit of the context. The remarks of Geiger on this passage (Zeitschr. der deutsch-morgenl. Gesellsch. XIX. 1865, pp. 603—608), though ingenious, are based on the well-known principles of his „Urschrift"; he considers תזכיר as the correct reading, not אזכיר, which he regards as opposed to the genius of the Hebrew language. Be this as it may, the general result is the same.

[13] Isai. LXVI. 1; comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 27; 2 Chr. II. 4, 5; VI. 18.

[14] Isai. XIX. 19, 21; comp. vers. 22—25; Zeph. II. 11; Mal. I. 11; Zech. XIV. 20, 21; 1 Tim. II. 8; see, however, Isai. II. 2, 3; Ps. LI. 18, 21.

[15] See Sect. VII. B.

[16] *Wilson*, Rig-Veda I. pp. XXIII. XXIV.

[17] Comp. *Döllinger*, Gentile and Jew, I. 230.

[18] *Tacit.* Germ. c. 9.

[19] *Tacit.* Germ. c. 40; Ann. I. 51.

[20] *Herod.* IV. 59.

splendour in the skies, and required no visible representation.[1] The Persians sanctioned no statues and altars whatever, but "considering the heaven as Jupiter, sacrificed on a high place";[2] they looked upon such erections even as folly (μωρίην), because "they did not believe the gods to have the same nature with man",[3] as the Greeks did.[4] If it is, besides, remembered that, in the history of the Hebrew patriarchs, no peculiar or fixed ritual of sacrifices is prescribed; that evidently the mode of offering was left to custom or individual option; that every Hebrew was permitted to perform the rites, though these sacred functions were commonly entrusted to the most authoritative members, as the chiefs of the family or the firstborn of the house;[5] and that even the Midianite priest Jethro is related to have offered to Jehovah holocausts and eucharistic sacrifices, in which Moses, Aaron, and the elders of Israel participated, because he had learnt to revere the power of the Deliverer of Israel:[6] it will be admitted that the allusions contained in the earlier portions of the Pentateuch with reference to primitive sacrifices, imply nothing that needs to be contested; they refer to a state of simplicity in religious worship, which bears the stamp of probability and truth.[7] They exhibit, indeed, one very important distinction from the usages of the rest of the ancient world. The sacrifices are invariably stated to have been presented to Jehovah, the only God of heaven and earth;[8] whereas it is indisputable that the belief in Jehovah wavered among the Hebrews for many centuries;[9] that idols were made and

---

1 *Lucian,* Dea Syr. c. 34; comp. c. 2.

2 *Strabo,* XV. iii. 13 (p. 732).

3 *Herod.* I. 131, Οὐκ ἀνθρωποφυέας ἐνόμισαν εἶναι.

4 Comp. *Herod.* III. 29, 37, where he describes the contempt of Cambyses for all images of the gods.

5 See the Treatise on Priesthood before chapt. VIII; Sect. V.

6 Exod. XVIII. 12; see Comm. on Exod. p. 319.

7 It is indeed remarkable that all the instances of patriarchal sacrifices above quoted, with one single exception which refers to Jacob, the latest of the great patriarchs (Gen. XLVI. 1; comp. XXXV. 14), either occur in sections written by the later Jehovist (Gen. IV. 3, 4; XXXI. 54), or were interpolated by him in Elohistic portions (Gen. VIII. 20; XXII. 13; comp. Comm. on Genes. ll. cc.). It appears, therefore, that sacrifices were, at the earlier date of the Elohist, not yet so predominant and frequent, and that they were not invested with such paramount importance. This fact may also tend to show that he desired to describe *Moses* as the true originator of sacrifices among the Israelites; but it cannot prove that sacrifices were unknown or unusual in his time, which is against the historical records of the Hebrews. The Jehovist may, therefore, be considered to have aptly inserted the sacrifices in the narrative of Genesis, although the distinction between clean and unclean animals (VIII. 20.) is, perhaps, inappropriate, and plainly enough betrays his school, system, and age.

8 Comp. also Genes. XIV. 18—20.

9 Hos. IX. 1, 4, 5; X. 9; Am. II. 4; Zeph. I. 4, 5; Isai. XLVIII. 8; Jer. II. 4—9; etc.

adored even by men of pure and pious intentions;[10] that images and religious symbols of pagan gods were placed in the very Temple of Jehovah, an act of detestable pollution;[11] that their inveterate propensity to idolatrous iniquities was prevalent up to the time of the Babylonian captivity,[12] when it was a well-founded complaint, "The people of Israel, with their kings, their princes, their priests, and their prophets, say to the block, Thou art my father, and to the stone, Thou hast brought me forth";[13] and when they were reproached with surpassing in every crime and perversity even the ill-famed people of Sodom;[14] that the fearful rites of Moloch which had contaminated the land throughout all previous periods of their history,[15] were hardly abandoned at the termination of their national life, so that Ezekiel still was compelled to exclaim, "Thus says the Lord God, How? do you pollute yourselves after the manner of your fathers? and fornicate after their abominations? For when you offer your gifts, when you make your children pass through the fire, you pollute yourselves with all your idols, *even to this day*." [16] But the authors of the Book of Genesis intended to delineate the patriarchs as the special favourites of God, whom He deemed worthy of His familiar communion, guided in His truth, and shielded from the common errors of their time and people. Duly balancing this fundamental peculiarity of the narrative, we shall be bound to admit that, in its references to sacrificial acts, it judiciously abstains from introducing features not in harmony with the practice of primitive generations.

But the case is totally altered when we enter on the Biblical records of subsequent periods. The Books of Exodus and Leviticus are replete with statements which defy the laws of national development, imply a bound in religious progress destructive of all regular continuity, and strikingly contrast with the impartial testimony of history.

1. All sacrifices were thenceforth to be offered at one place exclusively, first "at the door of the Tabernacle before the Lord", where the altar of burnt-offerings stood (Exod. XL. 6), and God was expected

[10] Judg. VIII. 27; XVIII. 14, 17—19, 24; comp. Exod. XXXII. 1—6.

[11] Jer. VII. 30; XXXII. 34; Ezek. V. 11; XXIII. 38; 2 Ki. XXI. 4, 5, 7; XXIII. 4, 7, 11, 12; 2 Chr. XXXIV. 33; comp. Jer. VII. 9, 10; Zeph. I. 5 ("they swear by the Lord and swear also by their idol"); Ezek. VIII. 6, 10—12; 2 Ki. XVII. 33, 40; 2 Chr. XXXVI. 14.

[12] Ezek. II. 3; V. 6, 7; XXIII. 35; Isai. LXV. 1—7.

[13] Jer. II. 26—28; comp. IX. 13; XVI. 11; XIX. 13; XXIII. 25—27, 30 *sqq.*; XXXII. 32; Ps. CVI. 36.

[14] Ezek. XVI. 47, 48.

[15] 1 Ki. XI. 5, 7; 2 Ki. XXIII. 10; Jer. III. 24; VII. 30, 31; XXXII. 35; Ps. CVI. 37, 38.

[16] Ezek. XX. 30, 31; comp. XVI. 20, 21; XXIII. 37, 39; and in general 2 Ki. XVII. 7—23; XXIII. 4—20, 24; especially Sect. XXII.

to "meet" the people;[1] and afterwards in the Temple to be erected in Jerusalem.[2] Contravention of this command was considered a heinous crime. It was certain to bring down upon the offender the severest vengeance of God. Nay, later, when the Levitical system was developed in its full rigour, the injunction was extended even to animals destined for food: he who killed a beast for this purpose, whether within or without the camp, was guilty of a deed of iniquity; "Blood shall be imputed to that man; he has shed blood; and that man shall by cut off from among his people."[3] It is, then, evident that the law in question was deemed of the utmost consequence. It was indeed regarded as one of the most effectual safeguards against heathen abuses.[4] It placed the sacrifices under the direction and supervision of the appointed priests. It was designed to cement the unity and mutual good-will of the people, since all met for the holiest ends.[5] But it is equally manifest that the precept involved insuperable obstacles which rendered its strict observance impossible.

It may be doubted whether it could be fully obeyed even during the wanderings in the desert, when the Tabernacle formed the centre of the Hebrew hosts. We have the distinct authority of the Book of Deuteronomy that such was not the case; for after commanding that no offerings should be presented at any other place but the common Sanctuary, it continues, "You shall not do after all the things which we do here this day, every man whatever is right in his own eyes."[6] But the ordinance was absolutely impracticable after the conquest of Canaan, when the people were scattered over the length and breadth of the country, both in the east and west of the Jordan. Was it possible to carry out even the comparatively limited command that bid every male Israelite to appear, with his offerings, three times annually at the national Temple?[7] Could one town accommodate and support such vast numbers of pilgrims? For though the males only are mentioned as the sacrificers and the offerers of festive gifts, *the whole nation* was supposed to congregate at that hallowed spot, "And thou shalt rejoice before the

---

[1] Exod. XXIX. 42; Lev. I. 3; IV. 4; XII. 6; XV. 14, 29; XVI. 7; XVII. 2—6; XIX. 21; or simply "before the Lord" (לפני יהוה), as Lev. III. 1, 7, 12; IX. 2, 4, 5.

[2] Deut. XII. 5—7, 11, 12.

[3] Lev. XVII. 3—5; comp., however, Deut. XII. 15; see *infra* and Introduction.

[4] Comp. Lev. XVII. 7, in connection with the preceding verses; see also *Spencer*, De Legg. Ritt. I. viii. sect. I.

[5] Comp. *Joseph.* Antiqq. IV. viii. 7 (*ὅπως συνιόντες ἀλλήλοις καὶ συνευωχούμενοι προσφιλεῖς ὦσι*). It is utterly untenable to suppose, with Abarbanel (Introd. to Levit. c. IV), that the law was designed to effect a gradual *diminution* of sacrifices by the difficulties that attended their performance (see Sect. IV).

[6] Deut. XII. 8; see *infra* p. 23.

[7] Exod. XXIII. 17; Deut. XVI. 16, 17.

Lord thy God, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant, and the Levite who is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the orphan, and the widow, that are among you, in the place which the Lord thy God has chosen to let His name dwell there."[8] This explicit statement is made with regard to Pentecost and the Feast of Tabernacles; it naturally applies to Passover also; for this was emphatically a domestic festival; the peculiar commands regarding the paschal lamb had the one object of symbolically impressing the *unity* of the families and of the entire people;[9] it was to be sacrificed in no other place but at the national altar;[10] therefore not the males alone, but entire families were obliged to attend: this is so clearly involved in the spirit of the law that it might have appeared superfluous expressly to state it. It is not easy to understand how those who lived in distant parts of the country could perform the journey from Jerusalem home, and thence again to the capital, within the short interval of the six weeks intervening between the conclusion of Passover and the Feast of Pentecost. It is incredible that they should have left their homes just within the period of the harvest and at the most pressing season of agricultural labours and duties. Could the commonwealth exist if all the citizens, abandoning their avocations and leaving their abodes, gave themselves up to periodical festivities, twice every year protracted during seven days?[11]

But the difficulty increases if we consider that sacrifices were ordered for many special occasions in the life of individuals. Every woman who had given birth to a child, whether male or female;[12] whoever was healed of leprous diseases;[13] whoever had lived in a house infested by leprous impurities;[14] whoever had suffered from certain "running issues out of his flesh";[15] was ordered to offer particular sacrifices regulated by the Law, in the Tabernacle or Temple. Can it be seriously entertained that in all these cases the injunction was literally complied with? Who can imagine the inconvenience and trouble that militated against it in the first named emergencies alone?

Again, if a man felt an internal impulse to do homage to God as the Ruler of his destinies and the Judge of his deeds, he had to travel to Jerusalem to offer a holocaust.[16] If he wished to evince his gratitude

---

[8] Deut. XVI. 11; comp. vers. 14, 15; and I Sam. I. 21 ("And the man Elkanah and all his house went up to offer to the Lord the yearly sacrifice and his vow").

[9] Exod. XII. 3—10, 46; Deut. XVI. 4—7; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 178, 179, 182.

[10] Deut. XVI. 5—7.

[11] Deut. XVI. 8, 15.

[12] Lev. XII. 1—8.

[13] XIV. 1—32.

[14] XIV. 33—57.

[15] XV. 1—15, 25—30.

[16] Lev. I.

for Divine blessings and benefits, he could not perform his devotion by a eucharistic sacrifice at home, but was obliged to delay it till he was able to undertake the journey, whether near or distant.[1] If, oppressed by sin in its thousandfold forms, he was anxious to make atonement before God and to restore his peace of mind, he was forbidden, unless happening to live in the capital, to satisfy at once his spiritual craving.[2] Hebrew tradition maintains that persons who lived in the provinces, offered all private sacrifices on the first great festival following the vow or obligation;[3] but more than four months elapsed between Pentecost and Tabernacles, and nearly six months between the conclusion of Tabernacles and Passover: therefore, granted even that this arrangement is in accordance with the spirit of the law (as in many instances it certainly is not), must not the sacrifices have lost much of their beneficent influence, when after such intervals the pious frame of mind which at first prompted the sacred acts, was weakened or changed? Would not, therefore, the ordinances in question have checked, rather than promoted, the growth of religious life? Were they not calculated almost to compel the people to the erection of altars in greater proximity to their abodes, or to make them join the worship of the heathens by whom they were surrounded?[4] The compilers of the Levitical laws cannot have been blind to this danger. If they yet insisted on their statutes with unmitigated severity, they evidently considered the effects of a scattered worship, beyond the controlling power of the priests, as even more fatal. They preferred the possibility of a less active sacrificial service to the certainty of idolatrous degeneracy. They would rather lessen the ardour, than imperil the purity of public devotion.

But to arrive at this view, and to act accordingly, they required the guidance of long and varied experience. They saw that the Hebrews, despising the reproof and admonition of occasional teachers, were constantly leaning towards every pagan rite. They found this propensity prevailing not only during the time of the conquest and during the period of the Judges, but even after the completion of Solomon's Temple. They perceived with sorrow, that scarcely any of the lofty expectations

---

1 Lev. III.

2 Lev. IV. V.

3 Comp. *Maimonides*, Pref. to Yad Chazak. להביא כל הקרבנות שיש על האדם בחוב או בנדר ברגל ראשון שפגע בו.

4 Even Winer who, on the whole, praises the Levitical institutions of the Pentateuch, sees in the exclusiveness of the central sanctuary "a defect of the Mosaic worship" (Real-Wörterb. I. 442; comp. *Raumer*, Vorlesungen, I. 125), and expresses his conviction (I. 508), that "an untutored people whose faith so much depended on their form of worship, could not have fully satisfied their religious feelings, unless they were permitted to offer sacrifices at other places besides Jerusalem."

that had been attached to that national centre, were realised. The religious and moral elevation of the people, as a whole, had not advanced. The political animosities of the tribes did not abate. On the contrary, almost immediately afterwards, an event happened — the secession of the Ten Tribes, with their adoption of the Apis-worship — which perpetuated both the political and religious rupture of the nation. The Levitical reformers were of opinion that too great laxity had up to their time been tolerated in religious matters. They were no doubt aware that the unsettled condition of the preceding epochs had not permitted severer measures. But they believed that the influence of the priests supported by the power of theocratic kings, allowed, in their age, a more peremptory course. They clung to the opinion that the *idea* of a national Sanctuary was radically sound and even imperative; and they indulged in the hope, that by a rigorous injunction of its exclusive sanctity, they might at last secure those religious and political benefits which had, at the outset, been anticipated. Hence the Deuteronomist repeatedly and distinctly enforced the command, "Take heed that thou offer not thy burnt-offerings in every place that thou seest;"[5] "thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithe of thy corn . . . or the firstlings of thy herds or of thy flocks" etc.;[6] and he extended the injunction to all vows and free-will gifts, and to the celebration of the great festivals.[7] But he significantly added, "You shall not do after all the things which we do here this day, every man whatever is right in his own eyes."[8] To what period in the history of the Israelites does this remark refer? If we consider the natural context of the narrative, it would relate to the time of the Hebrew wanderings in the desert;[9] for the chief contents of the Book of Deuteronomy profess to have been pronounced by Moses, in the east of the Jordan, in the land of Moab, before the entrance of the people into Canaan.[10] But that is impossible. How could the author suppose that sacrifices were offered at all places promiscuously, while Moses, the ostensible proclaimer of the Levitical laws, the zealous and inflexible champion of the new faith, watched and directed the people, and while the Tabernacle formed the very heart and life of the Hebrew journeys and encampments? Therefore, although not denying to that statement a certain historical value with regard to the period prior to the conquest of Palestine,[11] we must regard it to point chiefly to the time of the Deuteronomist himself, that

[5] Deut. XII. 13. [6] Ibid. ver. 17.

[7] Comp. Deut. XII. 11, 14, 26, 27; XIV. 22—27; XV. 19, 20; XVI. 2, 5—7, 11, 15, 16; XXVI. 2; see also XVII. 8.

[8] Deut. XII. 8.

[9] Vers. 1, 9, 10.

[10] Deut. I. 1, 5; XXXI. 1 *sqq.*; see *infra* p. 49.

[11] See *supra* p. 20.

is, to a very late phase in the history of the Hebrew commonwealth. It almost seems to imply that the idea of one common Temple for the whole nation was, at his time, a recent and unpopular proposal which it was deemed necessary to enforce with firmness.[1] It is an incidental admission, on his part, that priestly authority had, not even in the long interval between the age of Moses and his own, succeeded in establishing that unity of Hebrew worship which he considered the strongest support of a pure religion of Jehovah.[2] Therefore, the final author of Leviticus, tenaciously pursuing the same idea and discarding the leniency of the Deuteronomist, interdicted sacrifices at all other places except the common Sanctuary under the awful penalty of excision;[3] and living in an era of a complete hierarchical organisation, he could venture, from that point of view, to frame his sacrificial laws with uncompromising stringency.[4]

The history of sacrificial offerings among the Hebrews, from the time of Moses to the destruction of the first Temple, may, therefore, be sketched as follows. Whether the Hebrews performed any sacrifices in Egypt, and if so, whether they observed the traditional rites of their race, or adopted the deviating practices of the Egyptians, we have no means of ascertaining. For the Hebrew records pass over the long period of four hundred years with a few rapid outlines, while the statements of heathen writers are fanciful, contradictory, and mostly fabulous.[5] However, according to national traditions, the Hebrews were, in Egypt, addicted to idolatry.[6] If they offered sacrifices at all, they probably, in the progress of time, imitated more and more those of the people among whom

[1] The passage hardly proves that the Deuteronomist did not suppose a Tabernacle to have existed in the time of Moses (see XXXI. 14, 15; comp. *George*, Jüd. Feste, pp. 43, 44). Riehm (Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab, p. 30) says justly, "The Deuteronomist puts into the mouth of Moses what he could say of his own contemporaries, that they sacrificed, at their option, in any place they liked"; and he adds, "This appears to me certain that Moses himself, if he be the main author of Levitic. XVII. 1—9, and of other sacrificial laws, could not possibly have used words like those of Deut. XII. 8"; or in other terms, the corresponding precept in Leviticus cannot have existed when the passage of Deuteronomy under discussion was written (see Introduction).

[2] Honest critics who start from the supposition of a more recent origin of the fifth Book of the Pentateuch, have, from that passage, involuntarily concluded that the Deuteronomist was unacquinted with the law in Leviticus, or did not attribute it to the time of Moses; so De Wette (Opusc. Theol. p. 165): "Videtur noster (sc. the Deuteronomist) eam legem vel ignorasse vel certe ad Mosaica tempora non retulisse."

[3] כָּרֵת, Lev. XVII. 16.

[4] Comp. p. 20 and *infra* p. 43.

[5] See Comm. on Exod. pp. XXIII. *sqq.*

[6] Josh. XXIV. 14 ("Put away the gods which your fathers served on the

they lived. Indeed the author of the Book of Exodus considered others as dangerous and unfeasible.[7] Hence the only sacrifice attributed in the Pentateuch to the Israelites in Egypt, that of the paschal lamb, is intrinsically improbable. Not only would it pre-suppose, on the part of the Hebrews, a degree of religious culture not warranted by their abject condition; but it could not possibly have been carried out in one night and before the eyes of the Egyptians. The author of the Book of Exodus introduced it as the prototype of the paschal sacrifice common in his days, which he desired to invest with sanctity and importance, and he adroitly blended it with the main thread of his narrative.[8]

It is possible that, during their migrations in the desert, the Hebrews were more accustomed to the rites of sacrifice.[9] The zeal of Moses and his brother Aaron contributed to enforce the observance of religious ceremonials. The construction of a portable Tent, in which sacrifices were performed, as a part of the regular service, may have exercised an influence in the same direction. But it would be hazardous to conclude from these circumstances too much. The accounts of the Pentateuch prior to the occupation of Canaan, are derived from vague traditions: they require extraneous confirmation to be received as historically reliable. But this confirmation is nowhere supplied; on the contrary, everything points strongly to opposite inferences. The Pentateuch sets down the duration of the wanderings at forty years, but it barely relates the events of two. The hosts of the Israelites which, according to the Bible, amounted to upwards of two millions of souls, could not be supported, for any length of time, in a small peninsula, mostly composed of barren tracts, and ordinarily affording scanty subsistence to no more than a limited fraction of that number: the ingenuity incessantly lavished in attempts to prove such a possibility, has yet been unable to produce convincing arguments. How, then, could the multitude of beasts required by the ordinances of the Pentateuch, have been obtained and spared for the manifold classes of sacrifice? Would not the regular and daily offerings alone have absorbed more cattle than the pasturage of the district of Sinai was able to feed? At the consecration of the Tabernacle, the chiefs of the tribes are said to have offered, besides costly vessels of silver and gold, 252 animals.[10] The

---

other side of the stream, and in Egypt" — ובמצרים); Ezek. XX. 7, 8; XXIII. 3, 8; comp. Exod. XXXII. 4; Lev. XVII. 7; Deut. XII. 8. Considering, therefore, the variety of passages in support of this view, it avails little to regard, as some have done, ובמצרים in Josh. XXIV. 14, as a spurious interpolation.

7 Exod. VIII. 21—24; comp. V. 1—3; VIII. 4.

8 See Sect. XVII.

9 Comp. Exod. XVIII. 12; XXIV. 5; etc.

10 Num. VII. 12—88.

*public* burnt-offerings amounted to no less than 1245 victims annually.[1] The paschal festival as described to have been celebrated in the second year after the exodus, would, on a very moderate computation, have demanded between 50,000 and 60,000 lambs.[2] How could animals be procured for the various other offerings above enumerated? Indeed the prophet Amos,[3] generally measured and moderate in his expressions, lets God distinctly say, "Have you offered to Me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, o house of Israel?[4] But you have borne the tabernacle of your king (idol)[5] and the statues of your images,[6] the star of your god which you made to yourselves." He thus corroborates by a clear and comprehensive testimony what spontaneously offers itself on a simple examination of the facts, namely, that in the desert, the Hebrews so far from offering the sacrifices later known as Mosaic, abandoned themselves to every form of Sabaean idolatry.[7]

From the conquest of Canaan to the building of the Temple by Solomon, all sacred functions are supposed to have been performed at the Tabernacle, whether this was the magnificent and complex structure described in the Book of Exodus, or simply a portable shrine sufficient for the requirements of wandering tribes.[8] Now, the Book of Joshua relates not only that the Tabernacle, which contained the Ark with the Cherubim and the two tablets of the Law,[9] and in which a sacred light[10] burnt from evening to morning,[11] was by that leader brought to Shiloh and kept there;[12] but that it was considered the only legitimate sanctuary for the performance of sacrifices: the erection of an altar at any other place was deemed revolt against Jehovah and hostile treachery against His people; the mere suspicion roused against the east-jordanic tribes, almost plunged the nation into a civil war.[13] But these statements of the Book of Joshua must be subjected to very essential modifications. It is true, that at Shiloh stood a time-honoured

[1] See Sect. XIII.

[2] Num. IX. 1—14.

[3] V. 25, 26.

[4] It matters little for our purpose whether we lay stress upon לִי or not; comp. *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. Lib. III. Diss. II. ch. 1; see also *Ebn Ezra* on Lev. VII. 36.

[5] Perhaps Moloch, so Acts VII. 43.

[6] Understood to mean the images of Saturn (כיון צלמיכם), to whom offerings were presented by the old Arabians on the seventh day, and who was conciliated by human sacrifices also; comp. *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. II. 15—17; *Gesen.* Comm. üb. Jesai. II. 343; *Vatke*, Bibl. Theol. I. 190—193; *Gramberg*, Kritische Geschichte der Religionsideen des Alten Testaments, I. 473.

[7] Comp. also Isai. XLIII. 23, 24. On Ezek. XX. 25, 26 see Sect. XXI.

[8] See Exod. XXXIII. 7; comp. *Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. 12, 13.

[9] 1 Sam. IV. 3, 4; 1 Ki. VIII. 9.

[10] נֵר אֱלֹהִים.

[11] 1 Sam. III. 3.

[12] Josh. XVIII. 1; XIX. 51; XXII. 9.

[13] Josh. XXII. 16, 19, 22, 23, 26—29.

Tent or Tabernacle of the Hebrews.[14] It was, for protracted periods, probably during the whole time of the Judges up to Samuel, the chief centre of public worship.[15] There, at regularly recurring seasons of the year, religious festivals were celebrated; thither the Hebrews repaired with their families, but generally not more than once a year, to perform sacrifices and vows; and there the people or their delegates assembled for national deliberations.[16] But on the other hand, it is indisputable that, during the whole of this epoch, not only were public convocations held in many towns except Shiloh; but sacrifices were frequently performed at other places where the Tent did not then stand, whether these localities were believed to have been hallowed by the presence of the patriarchs, or had long been sacred spots among the Canaanites, or simply happened to offer themselves opportunely for the occasions. For we are informed that the people met also in Shechem,[17] where even a "Sanctuary of the Lord" is mentioned,[18] certainly distinct from the Tabernacle which was then in Shiloh.[19] They assembled at Mizpah in Gilead,[20] where Jephthah addressed his adherents "before the Lord",[21] and at Mizpah in Benjamin,[22] where the whole people came together "to the Lord;"[23] at Gilgal[24] and at Hebron.[25] They habitually went to Bethel, Gilgal, and Beer-sheba to obtain oracles or to offer sacrifices.[26] In some of the towns there were no doubt ancient temples or houses of worship, as is certain with respect to Bethel, Hebron, and Mizpah in Benjamin.[27] The Israelites are expressly mentioned to have there met "before the Lord"; but this term does not permit us to identify those places with Shiloh, by explaining them as appellative nouns; for though this expedient has a semblance of

[14] משכן or אהל, Ps. LXXVIII. 60; comp. 2 Sam. VII. 6; it is also called by the distinctive names אהל מועד (Josh. XVIII. 1; XIX. 51; 1 Sam. II. 22); or בית יהוה (1 Sam. I. 7, 24) and בית האלהים (Judg. XVIII. 31), or היכל יהוה (1 Sam. I. 9; III. 3).

[15] Judg. XVIII. 31; 1 Sam. III. 3; XIV. 3; especially Jer. VII. 12.

[16] Judg. XXI. 12, 19; 1 Sam. I. 3, 21; II. 19; comp. XX. 6; see Comm. on Genes. p. 741; comp. *C. H. Graf*, De Templo Silonensi, pp. 25 *sqq.* It cannot be concluded from 1 Ki. IX. 25 and 2 Chr. VIII. 13, that every Israelite journeyed thither *three* times annually.

[17] Josh. XXIV. 1.

[18] מקדש יהוה, ver. 26.

[19] XVIII. 1; XXII. 9.

[20] Judg. XI. 11.

[21] לפני יהוה.

[22] Judg. XX. 1.

[23] אל יהוה, comp. XXI. 1, 5, 8; 1 Sam. VII. 5, 6; X. 17; 2 Ki. XXV. 23, 25; 1 Macc. III. 46. Bertheau (on Judg. XX. 1) argues "the wandering sanctuary was brought to the various places of national assembly" (so also *Öhler* in Herz. X. 51): with how little justice, is evident from the facts here discussed.

[24] 1 Sam XI. 15; XIII. 8; XV. 21.

[25] 2 Sam. V. 3.

[26] Am. IV. 4; V. 5; VIII. 14; comp. Gen. XXI. 33; XXVI. 25; XLVI. 1.

[27] Comp. Judg. XX. 18; 2 Sam. XV. 7—9; 1 Macc. III. 46.

probability with regard to Mizpah and Bethel,[1] it is inapplicable to Gilgal and Hebron. Nor does it justify us in supposing the assemblies to have taken place round an *image* of Jehovah;[2] for though this is, in some cases, not improbable,[3] it is not likely in all: the altar erected for the sacrifices which usually accompanied public meetings, was dedicated to Jehovah; and before Him, therefore, the proceedings could well be said to have taken place.[4] Again it is recorded that the people *sacrificed* at Bochim[5] and Bethel.[6] Individual households offered, in their homes, regularly private sacrifices,[7] as the family of Jesse in Bethlehem[8] or that of Ahithophel at Giloh in Judah;[9] though the assistance of Levites seems from comparatively early periods to have been deemed desirable.[10] Gideon the Manassite presented an offering at Ophrah;[11] Manoah the Danite at Zorah;[12] Samuel, whether an Ephraimite or Levite, did the like at Mizpah, Ramah, Gilgal, and Bethlehem;[13] Saul at Gilgal[14] and during his pursuit of the Philistines;[15] David in Jerusalem and on the threshing-floor of Araunah;[16] Absalom, with David's sanction, in Hebron;[17] Adoniah, the son of David, near En-rogel;[18] Solomon and the people, before the completion of the Temple, "in high places."[19] Elisha did not remonstrate at Naaman's avowed intention of sacrificing to Jehovah in his Syrian home;[20] and later prophets, as Isaiah, Zephaniah, and even Malachi hopefully predicted the time when sacrifices would be performed at all places.[21] Moreover, we find, after the age of Eli, the principal Tabernacle, with a regular service, at Nob, in the

---

1 Comp. *Joseph.* Ant. V. ii. 9; *Michael.* Orient. Bibl. V. 241—243; *Vitringa*, De Synag. Vet. p. 323 *sqq.*

2 See Sect. XII.

3 Judg. XI. 11; XX. 1.

4 Comp. 1 Sam. VII. 5, 6, 17; XI. 15; XIII. 8, 9; XV. 21.

5 Judg. III. 5.

6 XXI. 4.

7 In the manner of the sacra gentilicia of the Romans; Liv. V. 52; *Cic.* Legg. II. 9, 19; Offic. I. 17; see *Hartung*, Relig. d. Röm. I. 226 *sqq.*

8 1 Sam. XX. 6.

9 2 Sam. XV. 12; comp. Job I. 5; XLII. 8.

10 Judg. XVII. 4—13.

11 Judg. VI. 11—20, 26 *sqq.*

12 XIII. 16, 19, 20.

13 1 Sam. VII. 9, 10, 17; IX. 12, 13; X. 8; XI. 15; XVI. 2, 5.

14 1 Sam. XIII. 9 *sqq.*

15 XIV. 32—35; although at this time the *Ark* of the Covenant was with him in the camp; see ver. 18.

16 2 Sam. VI. 17 (comp. ver. 13); XXIV. 25; comp. XV. 32.

17 2 Sam. XV. 7—9.

18 1 Ki. I. 9.

19 1 Ki. III. 2, 3. See Comment. on Gen. pp. 737—740. These instances also prove sufficiently the precarious nature of the opinion that "prophets" or "pious men" were permitted to sacrifice at any place, because they were free from the temptations of idolatrous abuse, or because they actually chose the place in the name of God (*Michael.* Mos. R. §. 188; *Hengstenb.* Authent. d. Pent. II. 40, 41, 58, 59; *Öhler*, l. c. pp. 619, 650, 651).

20 2 Ki. V. 17, 19.

21 See *supra*, p. 17.

territory of Benjamin;[22] and after the bloodshed there committed by the direction of Saul,[23] we meet it again, in David's and Solomon's reign, at Gibeon, where it was erected on "the great height."[24] But during these periods, sacrifices were freely performed at other places also, without any derogation from the piety of the offerer or the acceptableness of his gift. By command of "the angel of the Lord", David himself built, on the threshing-floor of Araunah or Arnon the Jebuzite, an altar where he "offered burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, and invoked the Lord, and He answered him from heaven by fire upon the altar of burnt-offering."[25] But even if sacrifices had then been exclusively performed at Nob and Gibeon, they would not have possessed the sanctity with which they were invested by the laws of the Pentateuch: for during the whole of this period, comprising the time of Samuel's leadership, of Saul's and David's, and partly of Solomon's reign, the Tabernacle was deprived of its most essential part, the Ark of the Covenant, containing not only the tablets of the Law, or the "testimony" of a supernatural revelation, but also the mysterious figures of the Cherubim, the emblems of God's watchful presence, and the holy mercy-seat, the pledge of His grace and forgiveness: indeed, without the Ark, the Tabernacle, like a body without a soul, lost its significance as the chosen abode of Jehovah; it was virtually not more hallowed than any ordinary place of worship.[26] Now, the Ark was, in the time of Eli, taken by the Philistines,[27] and brought to Ashdod, where they placed it in the temple of Dagon.[28] Seven months later,[29] they removed it to the territory of the Israelites, to the bonudaries of Beth-shemesh.[30] Shortly afterwards, it was by the inhabitants of this town sent to Kirjath-jearim, where it was received into the house of Abinadab, and guarded by his son Eleazar.[31] There it remained "a long time",[32] considerably more than "twenty years";[33] and from thence Saul took it occasionally to

---

[22] 1 Sam. XXI. 1—10; XXII. 10.

[23] XXII. 16—19.

[24] 1 Ki. III. 4; 1 Chron. XVI. 39; XXI. 29; comp. Comm. on Exod. pp. 620, 621. According to the Talmud (Zevach. 118b), the Tabernacle was in Shiloh 369 years, in Nob and Gibeon 57, and in Gilgal 14 years—which are purely conjectural figures.

[25] 1 Chr. XXI. 18, 26; 2 Sam. XXIV. 18, 25.

[26] Comp. 1 Sam. IV. 3—22; V. 6, 7; VI. 20; etc. See Comm. on Exod. pp. 479, 480, 494. A better right, therefore, had the people of Beth-shemesh to sacrifice in their town, when in possession of the Ark, though not of the Tabernacle (1 Sam. VI. 15).

[27] 1 Sam. IV. 11.

[28] V. 1, 2. [29] VI. 1.

[30] VI. 12—20. [31] VII. 1.

[32] וירבו הימים.

[33] VII. 2. The Hebrew historian, evidently uncertain as to the exact duration, ventured to fix it at 20 years; but as the Ark was brought into the house of Abinadab about 8 months after the death of Eli, and taken again

accompany him on his war-expeditions, to serve him as a Divine oracle, and to enhance the sanctity of his altars and his sacrifices.[1] Then David, surrounded by a large concourse of people, fetched it from the house of Abinadab,[2] to remove it to Jerusalem; but terrified by a fearful accident, he left it, on the way, in the house of Obed-Edom, where it was preserved for three months;[3] then, however, David carrying out his resolve, transported it to Jerusalem,[4] where it thenceforward remained.[5] And when in the eleventh year of Solomon's reign, after the completion of the Temple, the Tabernacle with its vessels was brought from Gibeon to Jerusalem, the Ark was deposited, in its due place, in the Holy of Holies of the new Sanctuary.[6] Therefore, from

---

from thence by David long after the death of Saul, and after the subjugation of all the hostile tribes around (comp. 2 Sam. VI. 2, 3, and VII. 1), it must have been kept there more than half a century; for the reign of Saul alone comprised at least 20 years (*Joseph.* Antiq. VI. xiv. 9; *Clem. Alex.* Strom. I. 140), or according to other traditions 40 years (Acts XIII. 21; *Joseph.* l. c. in conformity with the usual text, *'Εβασίλευσε — ὁ Σάουλος — Σαμουήλου ζῶντος ἔτη ὀκτὼ πρὸς τοῖς δέκα, τελευτήσαντος δὲ δύο καὶ εἴκοσι*; whereas another reading confirmed by the statement of Clemens Alexandrinus *l. c.*, has *τελευτήσαντος δὲ δύο*); to which must be added the whole time of Samuel's public activity up to Saul's coronation, and about 8 years of David's reign (2 Sam. V. 5).

1 1 Sam. XIV. 18, 34, 35; comp. XV. 34. It appears, indeed, to have been no unusual practice for military leaders to take with them the Ark as the most powerful protection of the army; comp. 1 Sam. IV. 3 *sqq.*; 2 Sam. XV. 24, 25; and so probably Judg. XX. 26—28 (comp. vers. 18, 23; XXI. 2), where we find the Ark in Bethel, while the Tabernacle was evidently elsewhere, since the Israelites had to erect an altar for the performance of sacrifices, Judg. XXI. 4. A similar custom prevailed among other nations (comp. 2 Sam. V. 21).

2 Abinadab is, in 2 Sam. VI. 2, stated to have lived in בעלי יהודה, which, however, is no doubt identical with קרית יערים (1 Sam. VII. 1), as this is also called קרית־בעל (Josh. XV. 60); comp. *Gramberg*, Relig. Ideen, I. p. 29.

3 2 Sam. VI. 2—11.

4 Vers. 12—17; comp. 1 Chr. XV. 28.

5 2 Sam. XV. 24, 25, 29. It does not concern us here to enquire whether the Ark mentioned in the passages just quoted from the historical Books, was the Ark, or one like that described in Exodus, and whether it contained the Tablets of the Law, and had the Mercy-seat and the Cherubim: though the fact of its long absence from the "Tent of Meeting", to which, according to the Pentateuch, it inseparably belonged, and the careless placing of it in the houses of private individuals, render the existence of the sacred implements, which the Book of Exodus attributes to the time of Moses, more than doubtful.

6 1 Ki. VIII. 1—6. We may thus briefly complete the history of the Ark. In the time of the divided empire, it was taken away, probably by some idolatrous monarch, though it is unknown by whom, and on what occasion; it was ultimately restored to its place by the pious king Josiah (2 Chr. XXXV. 3), and probably destroyed or lost at the demolition of the Temple

the time of Eli, the Tabernacle was incomplete, and could not, according to the injunctions of the Pentateuch, be considered a true "Tent of Meeting."[7] It cannot, therefore, be surprising to find, during this period, holy acts performed and sacrifices offered, in places neither sanctified by the presence of the Ark nor of the Tabernacle, as the instances above referred to abundantly prove.[8] It is true, that the Books of Chronicles furnish different accounts in nearly all the points just discussed; and as they are frequently adduced in support of the current views, it is advisable briefly to characterise their nature and tendency. The alterations are the more striking by their systematic consistency; they breathe throughout a Levitical and theocratic spirit; and to this spirit facts and events are unscrupulously rendered subordinate. Thus the Chronist introduces Levites when the Ark was brought to Zion by David,[9] on which occasion he makes them sing a hymn of praise manifestly borrowed from various Psalms of the period of the exile.[10] He represents Solomon acquainted with the "Mosaic" Tabernacle,[11] the regulations of the Book of Numbers with respect to its transport,[12] and the sacrificial ritual of the Pentateuch,[13] familiar also to Abijah, the son of Rehoboam.[14] He describes the Book of the Law "found" in Josiah's time distinctly as the work of Moses.[15] He reports the slaughter of an enormous number of sacrifices, contrary to all

---

by Nebuchadnezzar; but according to an old tradition, Jeremiah, at the command of God, took it, together with the Tabernacle, to Mount Pisgah, and concealed it in a cavern, which he closed and fastened, and which will not be discovered before the appointed time of Israel's restoration (2 Macc. II. 4—8): therefore, the Holy of Holies of the later Temples was empty (*Joseph.* Bell. Jud. V. v. 5, ἔκειτο δὲ οὐδὲν ὅλως ἐν αὐτῷ; *Tacit.* Hist. V. 9), or, as Jewish authorities state, had instead of the Ark an altar-stone (שתיה) raised three digits above the ground, and used, on the Day of Atonement, by the High-priest, to put the censer upon (*Mishn.* Yom. V. 2; Bartenur. in loc. explains שתיה by יסוד *foundation*, sc. of the world).

[7] The tent (אהל) mentioned in 2 Sam. VI. 17 and 1 Chr. XVI. 1, is not the old Tabernacle, but one specially erected by David to receive the Ark of the Covenant; it was probably constructed on the model of the latter, with curtains, though in a very simple form (2 Sam. VII. 2; XI. 11); comp. 1 Chr. XVI. 39, where the משכן יהוה is mentioned in contradistinction to that אהל; though the Chronist, in a later passage (XXI. 29), makes both identical; see *infra* p. 32.

[8] Comp. 1 Sam. VII. 5, 6, 9, 10, 17; IX. 12, 13; X. 17; XI. 15; XIII. 9 *sqq.*; XX. 6; 2 Sam. XXIV. 25; 1 Ki. I. 9; III. 2, 3.

[9] 1 Chr. XV. 26; comp. 2 Sam. VI. 13.

[10] 1 Chr. XXVI. 8—36; comp. Ps. CV. 1—15; XCVI. 1—13; CVI. 1, 47, 48.

[11] 2 Chr. I. 2—6; comp. 1 Ki. III. 2—4.

[12] 1 Chr. XXIII. 26; comp. Num. III. IV. VII.; but see also 2 Chr. XXXV. 3.

[13] 2 Chr. II. 3; comp. 1 Ki. V. 15 *sqq.*

[14] 2 Chr. XIII. 11; comp. 1 Ki. XV. 1—8.

[15] ביד משה, 2 Chr. XXXIV. 14; comp. 2 Ki. XXII. 8.

probability,[1] to which may be added his statement that king Jehoshaphat levied in Judea alone an army of 1,160,000 men,[2] which was probably more than the entire population of the province: indeed he does not seem always to have realised to his mind the figures he mentions; for he contends that David had laid aside for the building of the Temple "100,000 talents of gold, and 1000,000 talents of silver", besides brass and iron "beyond weight";[3] and again that his body guard consisted of 288,000 men, while in the older account it is stated at 600 men.[4] He amply adorns his narrative with miracles,[5] and with additions, alterations, and expansions in the Levitical sense to such a degree that the very spirit of his sources is perverted, which, in the main, were probably an enlarged and augmented edition of the canonical Books of Samuel and Kings.[6] He refers the institutions mentioned in the middle Books of the Pentateuch, or in Ezekiel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, to the earlier times, especially those of David and Solomon. He describes the service of the Tabernacle, with store-houses, treasuries, and an organised system of officials, in a manner evidently betraying the combined features of various later epochs.[7] He connects genealogically celebrated men of subsequent times, as Samuel, Heman, and Asaph, with the patriarchs, especially Levi;[8] in fact, he considers the whole caste of the Levites as holy, and continually represents them as exercising decisive influence on the course of history. As a rule, he is anxious to vindicate the kings of Judah, in opposition to the statements of earlier historians.[9] But he fictitiously attributes every variety of idolatry to king Joram,[10]

---

[1] 2 Chr. XV. 11; XXIX. 32, 33; etc.; see p. 6. [2] 2 Chr. XVII. 14—18.

[3] 1 Chr. XXII. 14; comp. also XXIV. 4—7.

[4] 2 Sam. XV. 18; comp. 2 Chr. XIII. 3, 7; XIV. 8, 9; XXV. 5; XXVI. 13; etc.; see the lists in *Kuenen*, Histoire critique des livres de l'ancien Testament, I. pp. 484, 485; comp. on the other hand, 1 Ki. IX. 14; 2 Ki. XVIII. 15.

[5] 1 Chr. XXI. 26, 28; XXVIII. 1—19 (where it is related that David received "in writing by the hand of God" — בכתב מיד יהוה — the model of the Temple with all its accessory buildings and utensils; comp. Exod. XXV. 9); 2 Chr. VII. 1—3; XXVI. 16—21.

[6] Comp. *Kuenen*, l. c. pp. 466—477; see 1 Chr. XV. 12, 13 (comp. 2 Sam. VI. 6, 7); 1 Chr. XXI. 29, 30; 2 Chr. I. 3—5 (comp. 1 Ki. III. 4); 1 Chr. XXII. 2—5 (comp. 1 Ki. V. 20, 23); XXII. 8 (comp. 1 Ki. V. 17); XXIX. 17, 18; 2 Chr. III. 4 (comp. 1 Ki. VI. 3); VIII. 11 (comp. 1 Ki. VII. 8); IX. 14 (comp. 1 Ki. X. 5; 2 Ki. XVI. 18); XV. 10—15 (comp. 1 Ki. XV. 12, 13); XXIV. 13, 14 (comp. 2 Ki. XII. 13, 14); XXIX. 7 *sqq.* (comp. 2 Ki. XVI. 10 *sqq.*); XXXI. 3—11; XXXIII. 4, 5, 11—13 (comp. 2 Ki. XXI. 4, 5); XXXVI. 6, 7 (comp. 2 Ki. XXIV. 1, 2).

[7] 1 Chr. IX. 1—34.

[8] 1 Chr. VI. 1—15, 18—32.

[9] Comp. 2 Chr. XII. 1 and 1 Ki. XIV. 22—24; 2 Chr. XIII. 2 and 1 Ki. XV. 2—5; 2 Chr. XIV. 2, 4; XVII. 6 and 1 Ki. XV. 14; XXII. 44; 2 Chr. XXIV. 2 *sqq.* and 2 Ki. XII. 3 *sqq.*; 2 Chr. XXV. 2 and 2 Ki. XIV. 3, 4; etc.

[10] 2 Chr. XXI. 11.

evidently because his wife was the daughter of Ahab, king of *Israel.*[11] For untheocratic kings, as Joash and Ahaz, he invents punishment and misfortune.[12] On the other hand, he omits injuring traits in the history of his favourites. He is silent about David's unlawful use of the ephod,[13] his concubines,[14] and his crimes against Bathsheba and Uriah;[15] he suppresses all mention of his cruelty against the Ammonites,[16] and of his infamous surrender of five of Saul's descendants to the Gibeonites to be "hung up before the Lord";[17] he passes over the fearful and unnatural confusion in David's family;[18] and makes no allusion to the foreign wives and idolatry of Solomon.[19] The result of all this may be thus summed up. The Books of Chronicles are the work of *one* author; for they disclose throughout the same systematic re-arrangement of history. They were written at a time when the eloquence of the prophets had been succeeded by the direction of the priests. The author, a Levite, anxious to glorify his tribe and to secure its material prosperity, may, in modifying the earlier records, have undertaken a task congenial and acceptable to his contemporaries, who had themselves undergone a signal change; yet his work is a grave offence against the spirit of truth and honesty.[20] He shows neither the ability nor the desire for writing an impartial and faithful history. Recognising no higher, scarcely knowing another, interest than that of Levitical priesthood, he is betrayed into the most obvious and invidious prejudices against all other classes and intellectual pursuits. He, therefore, deserves no authority

---

11 2 Ki. VIII. 18.

12 2 Chr. XXIV. 23—25, comp. 2 Ki. XII. 18; 2 Chr. XXVIII. 20—24, comp. 2 Ki. XVI. 8 *sqq.*

13 See Sect. XXII. init.

14 פילגשים, 1 Chr. XIV. 3; comp. 2 Sam. V. 13. 15 2 Sam. XI. 2—XII. 26.

16 2 Sam. XII. 31.

17 2 Sam. XXI. 1—9.

18 2 Sam. XIII—XX.

19 Further details may be found in *De Wette,* Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Band 1; and Einleitung §§ 190, 191; *Gramberg,* Die Chronik nach ihrem geschichtlichen Character und ihrer Glaubwürdigkeit, etc.; and Religions-Ideen I. 81—93; 162—168; 248—261; *Davidson,* Introduction to the Old Testament, II. 81—85; *Kuenen,* l. c. p. 464, 465, 485—493; *Graf,* Geschicht. Büch. d. A. T. pp. 114—247.

20 It is neither possible nor desirable to attempt a defence of the Chronist by some vague remarks like these, "Faudrait-il conclure que l'auteur des Chroniques eut été de mauvaise foi? N'oublions pas qu'il a écrit sous l'empire de principes dont personne de son temps ne songeait à contester la valeur" (*Kuenen,* l. c. p. 493); especially if every single damaging detail is admitted, and the alleged difference between "l'ancienne école rationaliste", which is censured in its representative De Wette, and "la bonne méthode historique" (ibid. p. 494), amounts to nothing else but that the latter is more veiled and guarded in its phraseology: but we are inclined to believe that the ends of Biblical science are better served by a distinct and unequivocal expression of results.

whatever as a source of history, at least on points connected with public worship; and disavowing his statements, we resume our sketch.

It may naturally be expected that the building of Solomon's Temple materially augmented the splendour of the sacrificial service. Large numbers of worshippers were no doubt attracted by the fame of the king's wealth, power, and wisdom. The magnificence of the sacred edifice, exaggerated by report, contributed to allure visitors not always prompted by the purest motives of devotion, and often utterly estranged from a religious life.[1] But the Temple was by no means the only and exclusive place of worship. Solomon himself set the example of defying all hierarchical institutions. He not only himself, though no Levite, offered three times every year burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, and incense, upon the holy altars;[2] but he built "a high place for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, on the hill that is before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon": he adopted, in fact, the religious rites of all his foreign wives.[3] It may be, that the exclusion of non-Levites from priestly functions in the Temple, could gradually be enforced, as the power of the Levites became, in the course of time, more commanding, and their spirit more rigorous.[4] But it was certainly impossible to insist upon the absolute unity of worship, and to compel the Hebrews to sacrifice in Jerusalem alone. From Solomon's immediate successors to the very termination both of the empire of Ephraim and of Judah, we find kings and people, and often prophets and priests, inveterately addicted to all pagan rites, which they performed at whatever place they chose, as will be proved by the unreserved admissions of the Hebrew writers themselves.[5] Additions and modifications in the service of the Temple were unscrupulously introduced not by priests alone but by worldly rulers, evidently unfettered by the existence of binding laws. Solomon occasionally offered the sacrifices, not on the brazen altar, but in the Court of the Temple generally.[6] When king Ahaz (B.C. 743—728), zealously intent upon the improvement of religious institutions, had seen, at Damascus, a new altar, he sent an exact model of it to the priest Uriah, who without hesitation reproduced the heathen fabric, placed it in the Court of the Temple, for which purpose he removed the old brazen altar to another position: the king himself sacrificed on the new structure, ordered Uriah to use it thenceforth for all offerings and libations, and

---

[1] Comp. Isai. I. 11—13; XXIX. 13; etc.; see Sect. IV.

[2] 1 Ki. IX. 25; see the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. V.

[3] 1 Ki. XI. 7, 8.

[4] Comp. 2 Chr. XXVI. 16—21.

[5] See Sect. XXII; comp. p. 19.

[6] 1 Ki. VIII. 64.

reserved to himself the decision with regard to the old altar: a Mosaic ordinance on the subject seems to have been entirely unknown.[7] Nay, the heights (בָּמוֹת), used for sacrifices throughout the land, were left untouched even by some of those pious kings who sincerely desired to establish a pure worship in harmony with the views of the best and most enlightened teachers, by the kings Joash, Asa, and Jehoshaphat, Amaziah, Azariah, and Jotham.[8] This significant fact irresistibly suggests the conclusion, that, in the age of those kings, either the prohibition of worship on heights formed no part of the Law, or the Law was so imperfectly diffused that its ordinances were little known even to theocratic kings. How completely institutions supposed to have originated in the time of Moses, and to have been enjoined by him in writing, were neglected for centuries, is manifest from that remarkable occurrence in the reign of Josiah, when "the Book of the Law"[9] or "the Book of the Covenant"[10] was "found" in the Temple, when the king learnt, with mingled surprise and consternation, the curse-laden illegality of idolatrous worship,[11] and when he ordered a celebration of the Feast of Passover, such as had not been kept "from the days of the Judges who judged Israel, and all the days of the kings of Israel and of the kings of Judah."[12] Finally, the regular pilgrimages to Jerusalem supposed to have been undertaken three times annually, were never, and in fact could never be, carried out in the manner ordained by the Pentateuch. The extraordinary sacrifices commanded by the same code could, in most cases, not be offered up in Jerusalem. Hence, there remained, for the service in the Temple, besides occasional visits of the pious from near and far, chiefly the celebration of the festivals[13] and the performance of the daily sacrifices by the appointed priests.

2. We can, therefore, hardly be surprised at various minor discrepancies between the sacrificial ordinances of the Pentateuch and the practice of pious leaders in later times. The Law prescribes *male* victims for burnt-offerings;[14] yet on an occasion of peculiar solemnity and importance,

---

[7] 2 Ki. XVI. 10—16: the Chronist takes care not to mention the new altar (2 Chr. XXVIII. 20—24).

[8] 1 Ki. XV. 14; XXII. 44; 2 Ki. XII. 4; XIV. 4; XV. 4, 35; comp. 1 Ki. III. 2, 3; 2 Chr. XV. 17; XX. 33; XXXIII. 17. On the discrepancy between 1 Ki. XV. 14 and 2 Chr. XIV. 2, 4; between 1 Ki. XXII. 44 and 2 Chr. XVII. 6, see Sect. XXII; on the alterations of the Books of Chronicles, *supra*.

[9] 2 Ki. XXII. 8, ספר התורה.

[10] XXIII. 2, 21, ספר הברית.

[11] XXII. 11, 13; XXIII. 4—20, 24.

[12] XXIII. 21. Nehemiah (VIII. 17) mentions a similar neglect of the Feast of Tabernacles from the time of Joshua down to his own. These points, together with the momentous inferences they involve, will later be examined with greater minuteness. Comp. *George*, Jüd. Feste, pp. 13 *sqq.*

[13] Comp. 1 Sam. I. 3, 21; IX. 25; etc.

[14] Lev. I. 3, 10; see Sect. VIII. 2.

the people assisted by the Levites sacrificed *cows* as holocausts.[1] Samuel killed a sucking lamb[2] for a burnt-offering,[3] although the lawful age was above one year old.[4] According to the Pentateuch, a holocaust accompanied by a bloodless offering was to be presented both morning and evening;[5] but in the time of Elijah, one chief daily sacrifice seems to have been performed at noon, while the morning sacrifice was not necessarily an animal, but simply a bloodless oblation;[6] even in the reign of Ahaz it was probably the practice to present a holocaust in the morning and a bloodless offering in the evening.[7] Libations consisted, in earlier times, not only of wine, but also of oil or water.[8] It seems to have been customary that the priests received their due portions of meat *boiled*, and not *raw;* but in the former case, they could not so easily choose the pieces at their pleasure; therefore the sons of Eli demanded the raw flesh,[9] as is alone lawful according to the Pentateuch.[10]

But in some instances, the very nature of the sacrifices is different in the Pentateuch and in history. The thank-offerings (שְׁלָמִים) are in the Law distinctly characterised as "offerings of safety" or as "praise-offerings"; and their specific features cannot possibly be mistaken.[11] But in earlier times, they were, like the holocausts, employed for the confirmation of compacts and treaties, of mutual vows and solemn pledges. Thus, when the Israelites at Mizpah promised by an oath never to intermarry with the tribe of Benjamin, because it was convicted of detestable immorality, "they built there an altar, and offered up burnt-offerings and שְׁלָמִים":[12] the repast connected with the latter and forming their distinctive peculiarity, was deemed a bond of union and brotherhood.[13] A similar meaning must no doubt be assigned to the שְׁלָמִים which, not long before the same date, the Israelites offered at Bethel: repeatedly defeated by the Benjamites, and oppressed with bitter grief, they resolved to persevere in the just warfare, and concluding an alliance of determined and unyielding resistance, they presented "holocausts and שְׁלָמִים".[14] Again, in earlier periods, שְׁלָמִים or "safety-

---

[1] 1 Sam. IV. 14, 15. The reason that the cows were consecrated to God because they had drawn the holy Ark (*Winer*, Real-Wört. I. 192; *Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. 113) is insufficient to account for a manifest contravention of the Law.

[2] טלה חלב. [3] 1 Sam. VII. 9.

[4] See Sect. VIII. 3. [5] See Sect. XIII.

[6] 1 Ki. XVIII. 29; 2 Ki. III. 20.

[7] 2 Ki. XVI. 15. [8] See Sect. XII.

[9] 1 Sam. II. 15—17; comp. also Judg. VI. 18, 19.

[10] The remarks of Michaelis (Mos. R. IV. § 206) and of Hengstenberg (Auth. des Pent. II. 87, 88) are not to the purpose. [11] See Sect. XIV.

[12] Judg. XXI. 4. [13] Comp. ver. 5.

[14] Comp. Judg. XX. 26. It is artificial to explain in this passage the שלמים as identical with עולת, since they were likewise burnt entirely (שלם); and it is arbitrary to take the שלמים merely as an accessory to the עולות, and to deny them a direct relation

offerings" seem to have been customary when help or rescue was *prayed for.*[15] Saul, terrified at an expected attack of the Philistines, offered שְׁלָמִים, besides holocausts;[16] and so David when a pestilence raged.[17] Later, however, they were confined to occasions when deliverance *had been obtained* and was *thanked for;*[18] and thus exclusively they appear in the Levitical Law.

Again, the expiatory offerings, themselves of later adoption, obtained the development exhibited in the Pentateuch, only by gradual stages: at first, trespass-offerings (אָשָׁם), generally including pecuniary restitution, were introduced, chiefly for offences connected with the rights of property; then the sin-offerings (חַטָּאת), for all transgressions inadvertently committed; but for some periods they were accompanied by a proportionate fine paid to the priests; till at last they were offered alone, and rendered more impressive by the solemnity of their ritual.[19]

The question, then, arises: Did Moses lay down any distinct laws with regard to religious worship? and if so, are the precepts embodied in the three middle Books of the Pentateuch traceable to his authority? If it is difficult to reply categorically to the first point, history gives an unequivocal denial to the second. It proves that, for many centuries after Moses, the Levitical ordinances were neither practised nor known; that primitive notions and institutions prevailed for protracted periods; that a long and severe struggle was fought between monotheism and pagan idolatry; till gradually and late, theocratic views conquered, and revolutionized the religious life of the nation. It is true that sacrifices were offered at all times with some fixed though simple ceremonies;[20] they were regarded as acts of piety and virtue; and while their neglect was denounced as wickedness and revolt,[21] their compulsory suspension appeared as a dire curse and visitation;[22] they always formed a prominent feature in the picture of perfect and godly excellence,[23] and

---

to the sad event. Comp. also Exod. XXIV. 5.

[15] Called by the Rabbins תפלה על העתיד. [16] 1 Sam. XIII. 9.

[17] 2 Sam. XXIV. 25.

[18] Termed הודאה על העבר.

[19] See Sect. XV.

[20] Compare Judg. II. 5; VI. 18—21, 25—27; XIII. 16, 19; XX. 26; XXI. 4; 1 Sam. I. 3, 21; II. 13—17, 28; III. 14; VI. 14, 15; VII. 6, 9; IX. 13; X. 8; XI. 15; XIII. 9; XV. 15, 22; XVI. 3—5; XX. 6; XXI. 5—7; 2 Sam. VI. 13, 17, 18; XV. 12; XXIV. 25; 1 Ki. I. 9, 25; III. 4; VIII. 5, 63; IX. 25; X. 5; XII. 32; XIII. 1 *sqq.*; XVIII. 29; 2 Ki. III. 20; esp. 2 Ki. XVI. 13—15; Hos. V. 6; VI. 6; Ps. XX. 4; XXVII. 6; L. 8, 9; LXVI. 15; CX. 3; CXVI. 17; CXLI. 2; 1 Chr. XXIII. 31; Ezra III. 4; Sir. XXXVIII. 11; Matth. VIII. 4; Acts XXI. 26. [21] Eccl. IX. 2; Isai. XLIII. 23, 24; comp. Matth. XXIII. 18.

[22] Comp. Hos. III. 4; Joel. I. 9, 13, 14; II. 14, 17.

[23] Comp. Jer. XVII. 26; XXXIII. 18, 22.

were hence expected to be most abundant in the days approaching the Messianic age.[1] The prophet Joel, who lived about B. C. 800, lamented that, at the time of the locust plague, "bloodless offerings and drink-offerings[2] were cut off from the house of the Lord, and the priests, the Lord's ministers, mourned";[3] and with greater vehemence still, he exclaimed, "Gird yourselves and moan, ye priests; wail, ye ministers of the altar; come, be all night in sackcloth, ye ministers of my God: for the bloodless offering and the drink-offering is withheld from the house of your God"[4] — which offerings, as a rule, formed the accompaniments of animal sacrifices. But it is equally certain, that even the regular sacrificial service was neglected at all times. The king Hezekiah (B. C. 728—699) commanded the priests and Levites, "Hear me, ye Levites, sanctify now yourselves, and sanctify the house of the Lord God of your fathers, and carry forth the filthiness out of the holy place: for our fathers have trespassed . . . and have turned away their faces from the habitation of the Lord . . .; also they have shut up the doors of the porch, and put out the lamps, and have not burnt incense nor offered burnt-offerings in the holy place to the God of Israel."[5] Even Malachi, in the time of Nehemiah, who so zealously laboured for the practical introduction of the institutions of the Pentateuch, severely complained of the general neglect of the chief sacrificial laws.[6] The pious and gifted teachers who occasionally arose in the nation, never ceased to inveigh against the equal and simultaneous corruption of people, priest, and prophet,[7] which would have heen impossible, had the priests occupied the position and been charged with the functions assigned to them in the Pentateuch.

Therefore, what is natural and probable in itself, is clearly confirmed by the recorded events. The Levitical system of sacrifices is not the work of one generation, but the result of succeeding ages. Its beginnings may reach back to very early times, possibly to those of Moses; but its progress and development were slow and gradual. It could not, from its nature and end, be built up by one man, however able and energetic. It rooted in the life of the people, and was the sum of the national experience. It gathered in one focus the scattered ideas and customs that had imperceptibly spread. It converted vague aspirations into distinct notions; it proposed a principle and created a unity. This is the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from the discrepancies pointed out between the Pentateuch and the historical

---

[1] Jer. XXXIII. 17, 18; Isai. XIX. 21; LVI. 7; LX. 7; see Sect. IV.

[2] מנחה ונסך.

[3] Joel I. 9.

[4] Joel I. 13.

[5] 2 Chr. XXIX. 5, 7.

[6] Mal. I. 7, 8, 14; comp. III. 8—10.

[7] See the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. II.

Books: but that conclusion derives additional force from the *fluctuations discoverable in the Pentateuch itself.* The laws which it propounds are by no means all finally and irrevocably fixed; they betray a part of that motion and spiritual growth, of which they are the result; they are in some respects indefinite, in others contradictory.

Various arrangements, as the share of the priests in the thank-offerings and in the firstborn animals, and the law of the tithes, are totally different in Deuteronomy and the three preceding Books of the Pentateuch; and they exhibit a steady extension of the privileges of the tribe of Levi, as has been specified elsewhere.[8]

Deuteronomy prohibits the killing merely of *sacrifices* at any place but the central Sanctuary, but permits the killing of animals for *food* in all abodes; while Leviticus includes the latter also in the same prohibition.[9] But the former demands the celebration of the festivals, and the offering of the tithes, firstfruits, and firstborn animals, in Jerusalem,[10] which it supposes to be the chief seat of priestly jurisdiction:[11] this centralisation, if not abandoned, is not so expressly urged in Leviticus.[12]

In Deuteronomy, it is merely commanded to "pour out upon the earth like water" the blood of the animals slaughtered at home for private use;[13] while the Book of Leviticus regards blood with a religious awe so strong, that it orders even the blood of animals killed in the chase to be covered with earth.[14]

For a very long time, the blood of animals alone was prohibited, and not the fat.[15] But when the latter was, in the course of time, regarded, similarly to the blood, as a seat or principle of animal life, it was likewise deemed too holy for human consumption. However, the interdiction, involving so considerable a loss for an agricultural people, and arising as it did from the laws of public worship, was limited to the sacrificial animals, the ox, the sheep, and the goat;[16] and as at the time when it was made, all the clean animals were to be killed at the Sanctuary, and thus marked as offerings, its operation was practically restricted to the place of common worship: but finally it

[8] See the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. IV.

[9] Comp. Lev. XVII. 3, 4; Deut. XII. 13—15. The expedient by which it has been attempted to reconcile this discrepancy, namely that the law in Leviticus treats of the period of the wanderings in the desert, that in Deuteronomy of the time of the settlement in Canaan, is untenable; for the injunction in Leviticus concludes with the words, "this shall be a statute for ever to them throughout their generations" (ver. 7).

[10] Deut. XIV. 23—26; XV. 20; XVI. 5—7, 11, 15; XXVI. 2.

[11] XVII. 8 *sqq.*

[12] Comp. *George,* Jüd. Feste, pp. 38—40.

[13] Deut. XII. 16, 29; XV. 23.

[14] Lev. XVII. 13; see Sect. IX. 10.

[15] Comp. Deut. XII. 15, 16, 23—25.

[16] Lev. VII. 23—25.

was extended, like the interdiction of the blood, to "all habitations" and "all generations."[1]

The thank-offerings[2] were originally *one* class, and their flesh was uniformly allowed to be eaten both on the day of the sacrifice and the following day.[3] But subsequently, they were divided into praise-offerings[4] and vow- and voluntary offerings,[5] and then the consumption was, for the former or holier class, limited to the day of the sacrifice itself, while, for the latter, the original period was preserved.[6]

In the later legislation, the minimum of fine flour required for a cereal offering is fixed at one tenth part of an ephah, which was demanded even from the very poorest.[7] But it appears that originally a smaller measure was accepted; for we find that each offering of the High-priest on the day of his initiation was only half that quantity;[8] if at the time when the simple ritual for that solemn occasion was written,[9] the law or custom which demanded one tenth of an ephah, had already been established, it would certainly have been applied on an occasion of the highest importance both for the religious and social life of the nation.

It will be expected that the expiatory sacrifices, themselves revealing traces of several successive stages, exhibit fluctuation in a more than ordinary degree. We shall specify a few instances.

In one passage, simply *a young bullock*[10] is prescribed for expiating a transgression of the whole people;[11] in another, *a kid of the goats*,[12] to be accompanied by a burnt-offering.[13] How is this double divergence to be accounted for? So decided a difference in one of the most important of all theocratic commands cannot be slightly estimated. The historical principle offers again the only clue for solving the difficulty. It appears that, at first, the goat was the animal peculiarly reserved for expiatory sacrifices. For, at the time of their introduction, the principal species of clean domestic animals had, by long usage, been appropriated for the other and older sacrifices, the burnt- and thank-offerings; and yet it appeared desirable to fix a special victim for sacrifices so distinct as those of expiation. Possibly, at first, a less comely animal may even have appeared particularly appropriate for the stern and serious offerings associated with the sublimest attributes of the deity. Therefore, the earliest sin-offerings consisted of goats or sheep, both male and female,[14] and those killed on the Hebrew festi-

[1] Lev. III. 17; see Sect. IX. 10.
[2] זבח שלמים.
[3] Lev. XIX. 5—8.
[4] זבח תודה.
[5] נדר או נדבה.
[6] Lev. VII. 15—18; see Sect. XIV.
[7] Lev. V. 11; comp. Sect. XI.
[8] Lev. VI. 13.
[9] VI. 12—16.
[10] פר בן־בקר.
[11] Lev. IV. 13, 21.
[12] שעיר עזים.
[13] Num. XV. 22—26.
[14] Lev. V. 6, 15, 18, 25; IX. 3.

vals, of kids of the goat:[15] when king Hezekiah, after the purification of the Temple, presented a sin-offering, comprising bullocks, rams, lambs, and goats, the latter alone were distinguished by the significant ceremony of imposition of the hand, and were hence chiefly regarded as having effected the expiation.[16] However, the idea of atonement had long been associated with the oldest class of offerings, the holocausts; it is, therefore, intelligible that the latter were at first not discarded as a means of expiation, even after a new kind of offering had been exclusively set apart for that purpose; and hence we cannot be surprised to find burnt-offerings and sin-offerings presented jointly for remission of sins; such was the case in the second passage above referred to,[17] and on the principal festivals.[18] But later, it naturally occurred to the Levitical mind that the noblest animal was due to the noblest sacrifice; and then it was ordained that the sin-offering of the whole congregation and of its representative, the High-priest, should be a young bullock:[19] this arrangement recommended itself the more strongly when the theocratic system had been so far worked out as to establish a clear gradation between the whole people, the High-priest, the rulers, and the common Israelite, and when, therefore, the less valuable animals, as goats and sheep, were required as sin-offerings for the two latter sections of the community. On this principle of gradation alone we can explain the law, that, on the Day of Atonement, a goat was offered for the whole people, but a bullock for the High-priest, who required even a higher degree of purity than the people itself.[20]

In one passage, sin-offerings (חטאת) are prescribed for all and every case of Levitical impurity. "If a soul touch any unclean thing, whether it be a carcase of an unclean beast, or a carcase of unclean cattle, or the carcase of unclean reptiles, . . . or if he touch the uncleanness of man, whatever uncleanness it may be wherewith a man

---

15 Num. XXVIII. 15, 22, 30; XXIX. 5, 11, 16.

16 2 Chr. XXIX. 20—24. It is not impossible that, for some time, goats one year old were offered (עז בת שנתה, Num. XV. 27; comp. VI. 14), because they are more valuable; but that later, when it was particularly desired to bring the expiatory sacrifices within the means of the humblest, an older or cheaper goat (שעירת עזים) was admitted (Lev. IV. 28): but this surmise rests on the nice discrimination between the terms עֵז and שְׂעִיר עִזִּים alone (comp. Sect. VII); we cannot therefore speak with decision. But it is certainly gratuitous to explain this difference as well as the greater one above pointed out with regard to bullock and goat, by an assumed distinction between sins of commission and sins of omission (see notes on Lev. IV. 22—35; comp. also *Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. 134).

17 Num. XV. 22—26.

18 Comp. Sect. XIII.

19 Lev. IV. 3—21.

20 See notes on XVI. 5 *sqq.*

defiles himself . . . then he shall bring a female from the flock . . . for a sin-offering."[1] The command cannot be more comprehensive or more general. Yet, in the later legislation, the cases of impurity to be atoned by sin-offerings are very limited, and singly specified,[2] while for all the rest washing or bathing with water was sufficient to restore cleanness.[3] Evidently, then, when first sin-offerings were introduced, it was thought advisable and possible to order them for every emergency of defilement; but when this was found impracticable, the sacrifice was restricted to the principal cases; while a more convenient emblem of purification was ordained for the rest. This is a rare and remarkable kind of vacilation in the Levitical law — the abandonment of a general principle, which had been adopted in the enthousiasm of a new idea, in favour of expediency and feasibility.

At first, the blood of the expiatory sacrifices, whether sin- or trespass-offerings, was, like the blood of the holocausts, simply sprinkled "round about upon the altar."[4] Later, however, when the sacredness of those sacrifices, and chiefly of the sin-offerings, was enhanced, because they were considered more specially the sacrifices of the theocratic community or the theocratic citizens, a part of the blood, the proper means of atonement, was put upon the *horns* of the altar, which more prominently symbolised the presence of the deity; and in some solemn cases, not on the horns of the brazen altar in the Court, but of the golden altar in the Holy itself, and on other still more significant parts of the Sanctuary.[5]

In fact, the laws of the Pentateuch with regard to the sin-offerings, involve the strongest proof of their later origin; for they are so pure, so elevated, so free from worldly alloy, that they cannot possibly be placed before the barbarous and lawless times of the Judges, when even human sacrifices were performed and deemed meritorious. They presuppose so long and so earnest a religious education, that they form the termination, and not the beginning, of a spiritual career. They exhibit so immeasurable a contrast to the views and practices of the heathens, that they could only be conceived after a complete triumph over pagan theology.

One additional circumstance will complete the basis for our conclusions and inferences. It is surprising that the whole of Deuteronomy, which purports to be a recapitulation of the Law,[6] and inculcates anew nearly all the precepts of the preceding Books, does not mention any

[1] Lev. V. 2, 3.

[2] See Sect. XV.

[3] Lev. VI. 20, 21; XI. 24—28, 31—33, 40; XVII. 15, 16; etc.

[4] על המזבח סביב, Lev. VII. 2, 7; comp. I. 5, 11.

[5] See Sect. X. 7, and Comm. on VI. 17—VII. 6.

[6] מִשְׁנֵה הַתּוֹרָה, Deut. XVII. 18.

portion of the sacrificial rituals of Leviticus, nor even indirectly refer to it. In fact, it contains nothing beyond general allusions to holocausts, thank-offerings, and free-will gifts, in the manner of Genesis and Exodus;[7] it has a few fundamental provisions, regarding faultlessness of the victims,[8] the duty of exclusively sacrificing at the central sanctuary, the dedication and offering of the firstfruits and tithes, and the prohibition of blood.[9] But it is silent about the Tabernacle and its service, about the daily sacrifices and the shew-bread,[10] and various offerings of purification.[11] It does not make a single mention either of sin-offerings or trespass-offerings, those specifically Hebrew sacrifices;[12] nor does it name any festival sacrifice, except the Pesach, although it describes the festivals themselves with fulness and with its usual eloquence.[13]

From all these premises we are irresistibly forced to the conclusion that the minute and complicated sacrificial legislation of Leviticus originated at a considerably later time than that of Deuteronomy; and as the Book of Deuteronomy can, from internal evidence, not have been written earlier than the seventh century before the present era, and is probably the "Book of the Law" or the "Book of the Covenant" found in the Temple during the reign of Josiah,[14] the sacrificial laws of Leviticus were not compiled before the Babylonian period, and came into operation in the second Temple only, after the return of the Jews from captivity.

On account of the great historical importance of this result, we shall briefly recapitulate the reasons from which it is derived.

1. The Levitical ordinances were neither known nor carried out before the exile: they were unknown in the time of the Judges, when Jephthah offered his daughter as a burnt-sacrifice with the knowledge of the whole people, and when prominent and pious leaders of the nation publicly performed priestly functions in places not hallowed by the presence of the Ark; nor in the time of David and Solomon, who, descended from Judah, on many occasions assumed the prerogatives of the Levites; nor in the time of the later kings; for Josiah (B. C. 642—611) was seized with astonishment and despair when he heard

[7] Comp. Deut. XVII. 6; XXVII. 6, 7.

[8] Deut. XV. 21; XVII. 1.

[9] Deut. XII. 5—27; XV. 19—23; XXVI. 1 *sqq.* [10] Exod. XXV—XXVIII.

[11] Comp. Num. XIX.

[12] The word חטאת, even in the sense of *sin*, occurs in the whole of Deuteronomy but four times (IX. 18, 21, 27; XIX. 15), אשם in the meaning of *guilt* not at all.

[13] Deut. XVI. 9—17; XII. 26, 27; comp. Num. XXVIII. 11—31.

[14] See p. 35; though Gramberg (l. c. pp. 306—308) believes that it was the Book of Exodus or a part of it (comp. ibid. pp. 504, 522); and Hartmann (Pentat. pp. 568 *sqq.*) a code of laws compiled from the three middle Books. The sneers of Oehler (in Herz. XII. 227) do little credit to his critical tact.

"the words of the Book of the Law," the contents of which were entirely new to him;[1] which would have been impossible, had the precept of Deuteronomy regarding the septennial and public recital of the Law existed.[2]

2. The execution of those ordinances argues a degree of religious education utterly at variance with the multifarious forms of perverse idolatry to which the Hebrews were addicted up to the sixth century.

3. The priests whom history proves to have long been powerless and needy, appear in the Levitical law as men of influence and wealth; indeed even the Book of Deuteronomy represents their position as so little secured that it never ceases to make the most pathetic appeals on their behalf, and recommends their helplessness to the benevolence and charity of the other tribes.[3] Their ascendency was gradual, but steady; it is impossible to believe that they would have renounced any of the privileges once obtained; it is against all evidence to assume that the Deuteronomist lowered the priestly demands "in order to adapt them to real or possible circumstances"; or that he "abandoned some of them because they were never carried out", and because he saw the necessity of greater moderation:[4] those demands were the ideal emanations of a theory, and they inevitably grew with the growth of the Levitical system.

4. The Deuteronomist is more lenient and less authoritative in some of the Levitical injunctions.

5. The Book of Leviticus manifests a decided progress in the depth and purity of religious notions and in the spiritual character of public worship, especially with regard to the expiatory offerings not even mentioned in Deuteronomy: it bespeaks a very matured stage in the internal history of the nation.[5]

6. The minuteness of the sacrificial ritual laid down in Leviticus, accords perfectly with the spirit of post-Babylonian times, and finds a faithful reflex in the thoroughly Levitical Books of Chronicles.

7. The Book of Leviticus, as a whole, cannot be placed before the sixth century, from various intrinsic reasons, among which are the exact description of the Babylonian exile and the allusion to the return of the captives.[6]

It must, therefore, be supposed that the sacrificial laws were

---

[1] 2 Ki. XXII. 11 *sqq.*

[2] Deut. XXXI. 9—13.

[3] Deuter. XVIII. 1 *sqq.*; etc.

[4] *Gramberg,* Rel. Id. I. 153, 155; comp. pp. 229, 394.

[5] Hence the opinion that Deuteronomy exhibits a more advanced or purer theology (*Riehm,* Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab, pp. 16—22) is untenable, or requires at least material modifications.

[6] See the Introduction.

gradually framed on the practice customary among the Hebrews from early times and steadily modified and improved, till they assumed, in the seventh century, the form which they bear in Deuteronomy, and were ultimately, on the basis of the latter, developed into the elaborate system laid down in Leviticus.[7] The subject has indeed been similarly viewed by some of the acutest and most consistent critics.[8] The opposite opinion, which claims a higher antiquity for the middle Books, overlooks or disregards the irrefragable arguments derived from the development of the Hebrew hierarchy.[9] Jeremiah wrote, "Thus saith the Lord of hosts... I spoke not to your fathers nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices":[10] he could not possibly have used such language had he known the Books of Leviticus and Numbers, and considered them as Mosaic;[11] but the terms are quite compatible with the existence and diffusion of Deuteronomy; they seem to lead to the inference that, in Jeremiah's time, the complicated Levitical laws of sacrifice began to be compiled and to be forced upon the people as Divine, and that the prophet opposed them as injurious innovations calculated to impair the heart by the burden of an external service.[12] He indeed mentions "the Law" (התורה) and its interpreters:[13] but his allusions refer to Deuteronomy,[14] and not to other Books of the Pentateuch. Yet some portions of Leviticus are most probably of earlier origin.[15] For it must be admitted that the author of Deuteronomy had before him, and occasionally referred to, at least the full outlines of the narrative and legislation of the three middle Books,[16] which manifestly formed the groundwork of his own composition.[17] He clearly distinguishes the

---

7 How such expansion was possible, is clear from the instance Deuter. XXIV. 8, 9, which verses contain nothing but the general injunction to consult the priests in cases of leprosy, but which, in Leviticus, are worked out into a complex system of religious and sanitary supervision.

8 As Vatke, Bohlen, George, Reuss (in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclop. 2 Sect. XXIII. pp. 186, 187), a. o.

9 So De Wette (Dissertatio qua Deuteronomium ... recentioris cujusdam auctoris opus esse monstratur; Stud. und Kritik. 1837, Heft 4, pp. 933, 969; comp. *George,* Jüd. Feste, pp. 7 *sqq.*), Bleek (Stud. 1831, Heft 3, p. 506), Bähr (Symb. II. 8), Gramberg (Rel. Id. I. 153, *sqq.*, 307), who, however, did not fail to discover in Levit. and Num. traces of the post-Babylonian time, a. o.

10 Jer. VII. 21, 22; comp. *Gramberg,* Rel. Id. I. 140, 143.

11 It is scarcely probable that they indeed existed, but were rejected by him as unauthoritative compositions of priests (so *De Wette,* Beiträge, I. 185).

12 Comp. Jer. VII. 23.

13 Jer. II. 8; VIII. 8; XVIII. 18; comp. XI. 3, 4; XXXI. 32, 33; XXXIV. 13, 18.

14 Comp. Jer. XXXIV. 19 and Deut. XV. 12.

15 See the Introduction.

16 Comp. Deut. IV. 5; V. 12, 16; VI. 1, 17; XX. 17; XXIV. 8, 9.

17 "Priores libros noster (auctor Deuteronomii) non solum novisse et legisse,

covenant concluded at mount Horeb from that sanctioned, through Moses, in the land of Moab;[1] for he considers the former to have been broken by the disobedience of the Israelites in the desert, and to have therefore required a renewal and fresh confirmation, for re-constituting the Hebrews as the people of God.[2] It is, therefore, impossible to allow that "Deuteronomy — except some few later additions — is a work of reformation and occasionally even of opposition written in Judea in antagonism to the older and Ephraimitic portions of the four earlier Books,"[3] the promised proofs of which opinion cannot possibly overthrow the obvious relation of the fifth and the three middle Books of the Pentateuch.

For the sake of completeness, we subjoin a brief review of the objections that have been, or that might be, raised against the opinion just advocated.

It has been urged that the plan of Deuteronomy is to prescribe laws, not to the learned priests and Levites, but to the unlearned people;[4] and that thus the omission of the sacrificial precepts in Deuteronomy may be accounted for. However, the people were deeply concerned in being accurately informed of the times, the classes, and the modes of their offerings; above all, they had a vital interest in the ordinances of holocausts and the private expiatory offerings, which were designed to preserve the theocratic sanctity of the nation: and hence the sacrificial laws are, in Leviticus, distinctly addressed to all the Israelites,[5] except the enactments applying to the priests, which are aptly enjoined on them alone.[6]

Again, it is contended that, in the middle Books, Moses is predominantly legislator, in Deuteronomy prophet. But Deuteronomy abounds in laws, many of which cannot be compared, in importance, with the laws of sacrifices.[7]

Critics who assign to the compilation of the Levitical code an

---

sed in sinu gestasse, memoria comprehendisse, et in hoc libro scribendo tamquam exemplar sibi proposuisse videtur. Deuteronomium enim prioribus libris tamquam fundamento niti quaevis pagina docet" (*De Wette*, Opuscul. Theol. p. 160). "Est Deuteronomium *epitome* seu *summarium* priorum librorum in popularem, uti videtur, usum concinnatum simulque adhortationibus exornatum" (ibid. p. 167).

[1] Deut. XXVIII. 69; XXIX. 9—14; comp. V. 2—5, 23—31; IV. 14.

[2] Comp. Deut. XXVII. 9; XXVI. 16—19.

[3] *Geiger*, in the Zeitschr. d. deutsch-morgenländ. Gesellsch. XIX. 1865, p. 604.

[4] *Riehm*, Gesetzgeb. Mosis im Lande Moab, p. 11.

[5] Comp. Lev. I. 2; IV. 2; VII. 29; etc.

[6] Comp. Lev. VI. 2, 17; etc.

[7] Compare, moreover, the prophetic portions Exod. XXIII. 20—23; Lev. XXVI. etc.

early date, are constantly tempted to interpret the Hebrew sacrifices in a more or less grossly anthropopathic sense, so as to harmonise with the notions of primitive ages; they take them as meals placed before God; they explain the shew-bread and the daily burnt-offerings as the regular food, and the festival sacrifices as the exceptional and more splendid repasts of the Deity; while they see in the incense-offering an imitation of the eastern custom of honouring distinguished guests by fumigations.[8] They are therefore necessarily vague in their estimate of the Levitical system, the spirit of which they are hardly able to seize and to appreciate.[9]

It is true that the first author, or the Elohist, mentions Moses as the framer of the sacrificial service; but this view of the Elohist deserves no greater weight than it is intrinsically worth: he was naturally anxious to secure authority for most important ordinances; and he connected them, therefore, with an honoured name of the distant and glorified past. As it is admitted that Moses fixed in writing no sacrificial laws,[10] the historical records of the Hebrew commonwealth can alone assist us in tracing their origin and growth; and these records prove indisputably that there existed no settled or uniform rules of private and public worship; that all was uncertain and arbitrary; that the Levitical code was not fixed without long and doubtful combats; and that even after it had been worked out, it struggled through many generations for popular favour and acceptance. It is, therefore, too much to assert, that "on the Mosaic foundation, a sacrificial practice was formed in the course of the succeeding centuries,"[11] or that "it is based on an older law of sacrifices."[12] For during protracted periods, there was no definite foundation whatever, except the general and patriarchal usage,[13] which long after Moses, as the tribe of Levi gradually gained predominance, began to assume a specific or Levitical tendency. The Elohist insists upon the performance of sacrifices at the central sanctuary and by the Aaronites exclusively; hence he could not, in compiling his laws, have been guided by the practice of the Tabernacle, which admitted sacrificial acts at any place and by any Israelite of whatever tribe. Had even the slightest basis or regulation existed, or

8 See pp. 7—9.

9 This applies, for instance, to Knobel's remarks (Levit. p. 347): "Gewiss hat wenigstens der gebildete Hebräer im Opfer keine Speisung Jehovah's und in den Festopfern keine Festmähler für Jehovah gefunden, sondern nur gedacht, dass man Jehovah allezeit and an den Festen gesteigert zu verehren und dabei der allgemein üblichen und herkömmlichen Weise zu folgen habe."

10 Comp. *Knobel*, l. c. p. 348.

11 *Knobel*, l. c.

12 Ibid. p. 350.

13 For the passages Lev. XX. 24—26; XXII. 28; XXIV. 5; contain nothing that goes beyond that sphere.

had any reliable tradition assigned the precepts to a man so revered as Moses is represented to have been, the perpetual fluctuations in nearly every point of the sacrificial service would have been impossible.

Nor is it at all necessary to suppose that because the author of the Levitical laws *attributed* them to Moses, he believed them, at least partially, to be traceable to him. Literary fictions of this kind were frequent throughout antiquity, and occur repeatedly even in the preserved fragments of Hebrew literature: almost the whole of Deuteronomy was written in the name of Moses, the Book of Daniel in that of Daniel, long after the age of these men; and the Book of Enoch boldly professes to be the work of Enoch, in the seventh generation after Adam. "The writers had absolutely no taste for genuine history and no notion of criticism; they deemed history important not for the sake of its truthfulness, but for its underlying significance; they did not, therefore, scruple to modify it for the furtherance of their objects, or to enrich it with additions."[1] The Levitical laws can, in no essential point, be Mosaic, because they were, in no essential point, observed centuries after Moses. Yet the composition, on the whole, carefully and skilfully upholds the historical situation. God directs the Israelites through Moses, from the Tabernacle, on Mount Sinai, or in the fields of Moab.[2] The offerings are invariably performed at the "Tent of Meeting.[3] Moses is to make estimates or valuations which were later given by the High-priest or the priests.[4] Some animals or parts of animals are to be burnt "without the camp".[5] The ashes of the altar of burnt-offering are to be taken "without the camp".[6] Persons affected with certain kinds of uncleanness are to stay "without the camp."[7] Several specified perquisites are to be allowed to "Aaron and his sons,"[8] who form the objects of other ordinances also.[9] Some laws, evidently recommended as examples for imitation in the practice of the Temple, are expressly adapted to the period of the migrations and encampment in the desert;[10] while others are enacted for the time of the occupation of Canaan.[11] The law includes detailed commands respecting the transport of the Tabernacle and its utensils,[12] commands which, from the time of

---

[1] *De Wette*, Beiträge, II. 405.

[2] Lev. I. 1; VII. 38; XXV. 1; XXVI. 46; XXVII. 34; Num. I. 1; XII. 5; XXXVI. 13.

[3] אהל מועד, I. 3; III. 8, 13; IV. 7, 14; VI. 9, 23; etc.

[4] Lev. V. 15, 18, 25; XXVII. 2 *sqq.*, 12, 14, 16, 23, 27; etc.

[5] Lev. IV. 12, 21; XVI. 26, 27.

[6] IV. 12; VI. 4; etc.

[7] XIII. 46; XIV. 3, 8; comp. vers. 34 *sqq.*

[8] II. 3, 10; VI. 9; VII. 39; etc.

[9] I. 7, 8, 11; II. 3; III. 13; VI. 2, 7, 9, 13, 18; VIII. 9; XIII. 7, 39; etc.

[10] Lev. XVII. 1—6.

[11] XIV. 34 *sqq.*; XXV. 2 *sqq.*

[12] Num. III. IV.

David, entirely ceased to be applicable: because they are meant to reflect the relative position and religious character of the tribes in the author's time. The local colouring is maintained, with peculiar fidelity, in Deuteronomy. The speeches are represented to have been delivered in the east of the Jordan (בעבר הירדן), and are particularised by the most accurate statements of time and place.[13] The people are on the point of crossing the river.[14] The possession of Canaan is made dependent on the faithful observance of the Law.[15] The Israelites are charged, after the conquest of the land, to pronounce the blessing on mount Gerizim, and the curse on mount Ebal,[16] to erect large stones and to write the Law upon them;[17] and in fact, the Book is throughout so composed that minds unprepared by historical research can hardly detect the fiction. But this proves nothing more than that the revisor thoughtfully designed the form and consistently carried out the disposition of the work, as might justly be expected from a man of his superior and manifest ability. Those who insist upon this circumstance as a proof of authenticity[18] might with equal propriety urge the general coherence in the narrative of the Iliad as an indisputable indication of its historical truth; and it is well known that the composition and tendencies of the Homeric books offer more than one analogy to those of the Pentateuch. We refrain, in this place, from entering into the question whether the author's expedient of assigning to Moses his own laws or those of his time, and of thus claiming for them an exceptional sanction, can be justified before the tribunal of a pure morality; it suffices to know that he pursued a lofty aim with unwavering earnestness, and that he hoped to attain it more easily by a literary artifice, which was then not uncommon.

A few remarks will complete the history of the Jewish sacrifices. As their lawful performance was, by the Pentateuch, made dependent on the existence of the Temple, they were interrupted at its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar and during the Babylonian exile. After the return of the Jews and the completion of the second Temple, they were continued with greater regularity and scrupulousness; they were even, at times, encouraged and supported by heathen kings, as Antiochus the Great, who granted to the Jews an annual sum for sacrificial animals, besides a liberal allowance of flour, wheat, and

[13] Deut. I. 1—5; comp. III. 20, 24; XI. 30.

[14] I. 7, 8; IV. 14, 22, 26; VI. 1; IX. 1; etc.

[15] IV. 1; VI. 18; VIII. 1; etc.; comp. however, IX. 4—7.

[16] XI. 29.

[17] XXVII. 2—4; comp. *Riehm*, Gesetzgebung Mos. im Lande Moab, pp. 106—116.

[18] *Hävernick*, Einl. in das A. T. I. 2. pp. 409, 410; 472 *sqq.*; 575 *sqq.* (2nd edit.); *König*, Alttestamentliche Stud. II. 147—165; etc.

salt.[1] But some Syrian kings exacted a tribute for every sacrifice offered to Jehovah, till Demetrius Nicator repealed the tax.[2] In the time of the Maccabees, during the supremacy of the Syrian invaders, the Temple service was entirely suppressed, but restored after the defeat of Antiochus Epiphanes, to be finally discontinued when the war under Titus had ended with the destruction of the national Sanctuary. A vestige of the old sacrificial worship has been preserved among the small sect of the Samaritans alone, who at Nablous, the ancient Shechem, still offer the annual paschal sacrifice.[3]

## IV. PURER NOTIONS ON SACRIFICES.

In a higher degree, perhaps, than other ceremonial observances, the rites of sacrifice were liable to be severed from motives of true morality, and thus to lose their beneficient influence. The elements of edification were encumbered and almost oppressed by outward acts and even coarse manipulations. Prayer or spontaneous confession, even if it accompanied the imposition of the hand,[4] could obtain neither prominence nor weight.[5] Sacrifices, therefore, easily became ineffectual for religious elevation; they deteriorated into a lifeless *opus operatum;* they were apt to engender that hollow and pharasaical hypocrisy which, under the studied appearance of righteousness, conceals iniquity and corruption. The Israelites were pre-eminently subject to such debasement. Irresistibly attracted by the numerous forms of superstition which surrounded them, and but rarely induced by some powerful mind to adopt the worship of Jehovah, soon again to relapse into their usual and more congenial creeds, they showed little readiness to understand the deeper import of the sacrifices: they failed to employ them either as manifestations of pious submission and gratitude, or as aids for recovering the peace and purity of their hearts. The danger of an unintelligent and mechanical service was naturally greatest in the earlier periods when the authority of public-spirited advisers was the principal and the precarious source of national instruction, because no written Law existed or was diffused to guide and to enlighten. Yet the admonitions and warnings of such noble teachers were equally incessant and impressive; and they contained the germs of a universal religion. "I desire mercy", says Hosea, "and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of

[1] *Jos.* Ant. XII. iii. 3; see Sect. VIII. 5.

[2] *Jos.* Antiq. XIII. iv. 9.

[3] See Comm. on Gen. pp. 332, 333; *Stanley,* Jewish Church, I. 513–520; *Jos. Mills,* Three months in Nablus, 1865.

[4] See Sect. X. 4.

[5] Comp. the description in *Stanley,* Jewish Church, II. 410.

God more than burnt-offerings."[6] Amos, indignantly denouncing a false service devoid of rectitude, writes, "I hate — says God — I despise your feast-days, and I take no delight in your solemn assemblies: for if you offer Me burnt-offerings, and your bloodless offerings, I will not accept them; nor will I regard the thank-offerings of your fat beasts... but let justice flow like water, and righteousness like a never-failing stream."[7] More emphatically still Isaiah inveighs against the profitless and sinful worship ungraced by piety. He predicts the most awful calamities "because the people honour God with their lips while their hearts are far from Him, and their fear of the Lord is a precept taught by men."[8] He proclaims with rising vehemence, "Of what avail is the multitude of your sacrifices? says the Lord: I am satiated with burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fattened beasts; and for the blood of bullocks, and of lambs, and of he-goats I have no desire . . . Bring Me no more oblations of falsehood; incense is an abomination to Me, the new-moons, and sabbaths, and convocation of festive meetings; I cannot bear iniquity and solemn assembly . . . And when you spread forth your hands, I hide My eyes from you: even when you multiply prayer, I do not listen: your hands are full of blood. Wash yourselves, make yourselves clean, remove your wicked deeds from My eyes, cease to do evil, learn to do good, seek justice, restrain the insolent, procure justice to the orphan, plead for the widow."[9] It is a maxim in Proverbs, "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination; how much more when he offers it with a deceitful mind!"[10]

But these and similar exhortations, however powerful, remained long unavailing; they required renewed injunction even during the latest periods of the commonwealth. In the prophecies of Jeremiah, God asks with stern reproof, "To what purpose does incense come for Me from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a distant land? your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, and your sacrifices are not pleasing to Me"; and he adds the reason, "Because you have not hearkened to My words, and have rejected My Law."[11] And considerably more than a century later, Malachi finds cause for bitter complaint: the sacrifices were not presented in the true spirit; avaricious priests polluted the altars by offering maimed and sick, yea even stolen animals; and God, offended and revolted, proclaims, "Who among you would close the doors, that you might not kindle fire on My altar in vain? I have no

---

[6] VI. 6; comp. VIII. 13; IX. 3, 4; XIV. 3.

[7] V. 21—24; comp. IV. 4, 5.

[8] Isai. XXIX. 13, 14; comp. Eccl. V. 1; Matth. XV. 7—9.

[9] I. 11—17.

[10] Prov. XXI. 27; comp. XV. 8; XXVIII. 9; Eccl. IV. 17.

[11] Jer. VI. 19, 20; comp. XXXI. 31—33.

pleasure in you, says the Lord of hosts, and I will accept no offering at your hand."[1]

In the mean time, however, the notions of the deity and the true requirements of religion advanced in depth and refinement. Thoughtful men began to look upon sacrifices, as upon other ceremonials, as less and less essential; while, in the same proportion, they attached greater significance to inward piety and to a life of truth and duty. In a Psalm attributed to Asaph, God declares, "I do not reprove thee on account of thy sacrifices, for thy burnt-offerings are continually before Me; I will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he-goats out of thy folds; for every beast of the forest is Mine, and the cattle on a thousand hills . . . If I were hungry, I would not tell thee: for the world is Mine and the fulness thereof. Do I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats? Offer to God thanksgiving, and pay thy vows to the most High: and call upon Me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify Me."[2] Another Psalm expresses more briefly the same sentiment, "I will praise the name of God with song, and will extol Him with thanksgiving: this will please the Lord better than ox or bullock with horns and hoofs;"[3] and similarly, "To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice;"[4] or "Has the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."[5] In the account of the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, the chief stress is evidently laid on the frame of mind of the offerers, not on the nature of their gifts.[6]

Some passages go even beyond this point. "Sacrifice and offering", says a Psalmist, "Thou dost not desire, this didst Thou reveal to me; burnt-offering and sin-offering Thou dost not require. Then said I, Behold, I come with the scroll of the Book written in my heart; to do Thy will, my God, is my delight, and Thy Law is within my mind."[7] And again, "O Lord, open Thou my lips, and let my mouth relate Thy praise. For Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it; Thou

---

[1] I. 10; comp. vers. 7, 8, 13, 14. It is, therefore, extremely unsafe to contend, "the better feeling of consecration, and of self-dedication by way of symbol, or contrition expressed by offering, entered into the rite from at least Abraham's time, probably before" (*Rowl. Williams,* The Hebrew Prophets, I. p. 234), an opinion rendered more doubtful still by a comparison with the results stated in the preceding section.

[2] Ps. L. 8—15; comp. Isai. XL. 16; see also *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 13, 14, 16.

[3] Ps. LXIX. 31, 32.

[4] Prov. XXI. 3.

[5] 1 Sam. XV. 22.

[6] See Comm. on Genes. p. 136; comp. Ps. XV. 1—5; XXIV. 3—6; L. 5—23; also *F. D. Maurice,* The Doctrine of Sacrifice, Serm. I.

[7] Ps. XL. 7—9.

delightest not in burnt-offering: the sacrifices of God are a humble spirit; a humble and contrite heart, o God, Thou dost not despise."[8] Or, "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before God the exalted? shall I come before Him with burnt-offerings, with yearling calves? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He has declared to thee, o man, what is good: and what does the Lord require of thee, but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?"[9] Terms like these seem almost to imply an absolute rejection of the sacrificial service, and to insist upon an internal approach to God's holiness alone. But such conclusion would be wholly unwarranted. The beautiful penitential Psalm from which we have quoted, concludes with a prayer for the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple, "then shalt Thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt-offering and entire holocausts; then will they offer bullocks upon Thy altar."[10] Joel, interpreting a terrible locust plague as the Divine retribution for wickedness, indeed beautifully exhorted the people, "Rend your heart, and not your garments"; but he exhorted them also to turn to God "with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning."[11] Jeremiah, wrath at the intolerable callousness engendered by a false formalism, exclaimed, "Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Put your burnt-offerings to your sacrifices, and eat flesh; for I spoke not to your fathers, nor commanded them at the time when I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices. But this I commanded them, saying, Obey My voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be My people; and walk you in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well to you."[12] But does this prove that Jeremiah entirely repudiated the sacrificial service? Nothing would be more erroneous. He elsewhere declared, "Thus says the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel; neither shall the priests, the Levites, want a man before Me to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle bloodless offerings, and to perform sacrifice continually."[13] Or does

---

[8] Ps. LI. 17—19. [9] Mic. VI. 6—8.

[10] Ps. LI. 20, 21. Some have attempted to prove that these verses are a later addition; but without success: the correct exposition is given by *De Wette*, Psalmen, p. 345; comp. also *Hitzig*, Ps. I. 277, 291; *Hupfeld*, Ps. III. 29; *Delitzsch*, Ps. I. 407, 408.

[11] Joel II. 12, 13.

[12] VII. 21—23; comp. vers. 3—10; III. 16, where the prophet speaks of the time when public worship will no longer be bound to the Ark of the Covenant.

[13] Jer. XXXIII. 17, 18; comp. XVII. 26; XXXI. 14; XXXIII. 11.

that passage at least, as has been contended,[1] testify to the merely *optional* character of the offerings set forth in the Levitical law? This is antecedently impossible from the simple fact that Jeremiah could not have referred to the contents of Leviticus at all, as has above been proved.[2] But it is also overthrown by the slightest comparison with the Levitical legislation. Optional were indeed the sacrifices and oblations voluntary from their nature, as the private holocausts, and the private thank-offerings; and herewith of course corresponds the wording of the text:[3] but the law of the *public* holocausts to be offered daily and on festivals, is plainly categorical;[4] the expiatory sacrifices are distinctly and positively commanded as indispensable instruments for restoring purity of mind or body.[5] The case is similar with respect to Deutero-Isaiah, the gifted and noble-minded author of the last portion of the Book of Isaiah.[6] In one passage, he seems to rise to the highest and most spiritual form of worship. He first addresses the pious, "Thus says the Lord, the heaven is My throne, and the earth is My footstool: where is the house which you could build to Me? and where is the place for My rest? For all these things has My hand made, and all these things were called into existence, speaks the Lord: but upon him will I look who is humble and lowly in mind, and who trembles at My word." Then abruptly turning to the wicked, and describing their sacrifices as abominations, because performed in iniquity, he adds, "He who kills an ox, slays a man;[7] he who sacrifices a lamb, strangles a dog; he who offers an oblation, offers swine's blood; he that burns incense, worships an idol."[8] He declares, therefore, even the lawful sacrifices presented to Jehovah really like deeds of murder and idolatry, unless proceeding from an honest and unstained mind. Yet he is far from disparaging sacrifices in general. Drawing an enthusiastic picture of the happy time when justice, and uprightness, and charity, will reign triumphant, he promises that then God will bring even strangers to His holy mountain; for, says He, "I will make them rejoice in My house of prayer; their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted on My altar; for My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations."[9] The compulsory suspension of sacrifices,

---

[1] See *Rashi* on *Talm.* Chul. 5*a*, s. v. מכם; *D. Kimchi* on Lev. I. 2 and Jer. VII. 23; *Maimon.* Mor. Neb. III. 46 (see *infra*); a. o. [2] See p. 45.

[3] Lev. I. 2, 3, 14; II. 1; III. 1; etc.

[4] Lev. VI. 1—6; XXIII. 12, 13, 18, 19, etc. [5] Lev. IV. 2, 3, 13, 14, etc.; V. 1 *sqq.*, 14 *sqq.*, 17 *sqq.*, 20 *sqq.*; etc.

[6] Chapt. XL. to LXVI.

[7] That is, acts as if he slew a man.

[8] LXVI. 1—3; comp. XLIII. 23, 24.

[9] Isai. LVI. 7; comp. LVIII. 2—10, where the uselessness of fasting without works of kindness is described with equal force and beauty; LXVI. 20; see *Gesenius* Comm. ll. cc.

whether occasioned by drought and famine, or hostile invasion and oppression, was always lamented as a national disaster.[10] In fact, sacrifices were never omitted in descriptions of the Messianic age, when distant nations are expected to accumulate offerings to Jehovah,[11] and when kings will present their choicest treasures and the fatlings of their herds.[12] In this respect, legislators, priests, and prophets, shared the views of the bulk of the people; offerings satisfied the religious aspirations of all alike. This is admitted even by many of those who differ from our views on the relation between the Pentateuch and the ante-Babylonian prophets, and derive therefrom very heterogeneous inferences.[13] It may be that priests encouraged the people, from selfishness, to multiply sacrifices;[14] but they can least be supposed to have been, on principle, averse to ritualism, or to have outgrown it. It is, therefore, too much to say, "The whole sacrificial system to which the priests administered awakened, in the highest spirits of the Jewish Church itself, a feeling almost amounting to aversion;" and less exact still is the remark, "The contempt, the irony, the disgust expressed by the prophets at the very thought of the slaughtered victims, has a strength which must be of universal significance, and which could hardly be exceeded by the disdainful language of western philosophy or modern Puritanism."[15]

Yet the Levitical sacrifices have frequently been classed among the institutions permitted merely on account of the people's "hardness of heart."[16] They were so regarded by most of the Fathers of the Church, by Justin the Martyr, Origen, and Tertullian, by Jerome, Epiphany, and Chrysostom, by Cyrill and Theodoret,[17] and by several later writers,[18] especially the catholic theologians.[19] This opinion was advocated chiefly on dogmatic grounds; it was deemed inappropriate that the people

[10] Hos. III. 4; Joel I. 9, 13 *sqq.*; etc. comp. also Dan. VIII. 11, 12; IX. 27; XI. 31; XII. 11. [11] Isai. XIX. 21.

[12] Isai. LX. 7; comp. Ezek. XL—XLVIII; espec. XL. 39; XLII. 13; XLIV. 29; XLV. 18—25; XLVI. 20; Zeph. III. 10; Zech. XIV. 20, 21; Mal. I. 11; III. 3, 4.

[13] So *Öhler*, in Herzog's Real-Encycl. XII. 228; *Delitzsch* in Drechsler's Comm. on Isai. III. 384, 385; *Philippson*, Israelitische Religionslehre, II. 193.

[14] *Talm.* Berach. 23; Pesach. 17.

[15] *Stanley*, Jewish Church, II. 424. 425. — Hengstenberg (Authent. des Pentat. II. 627) calls a similar view not unjustly, though perhaps too harshly, "an absurd assertion"; comp. also *Drechsler*, die Unwissenschaftlichkeit im Geb. der alttest. Crit. p. 170 *sqq.*; *Küper*, Jeremias librorum sacr. interpres atque vindex, p. 49 *sqq.* — See some good remarks on the subject in *Palfrey's* Academical Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities (Boston 1838), I. p. 240.

[16] Matth. XIX. 8.

[17] Comp. *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. Lib. III. Diss. II. ch. 1; see also *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 85—98, 102, 103.

[18] As Petavius, Grotius, and others.

[19] As Bellarminus, Pecerius, Gregorius de Valencia, etc.

enlightened by revelation should have forms of public worship in common with heathens; many, therefore, depreciated the value and origin of the sacrifices, which others, looking chiefly to the Pentateuch, were inclined to represent as Divine.[1] But no one has more elaborately defended the view in question than Maimonides. He asserted[2] that Moses did not introduce, but was reluctantly compelled to retain, the sacrifices, to which the Hebrews, like all other nations, were accustomed from early ages, and which it would have been as impossible then to abolish or to prohibit, as if in his own (Maimonides') time some prophet declared, "God forbids you to pray to Him, and to fast, and to implore His help in time of need; but your worship shall wholly consist of meditation unaccompanied by any ritual" — a doctrine which no doubt all would reject, because so entirely in antagonism to their habits: although, therefore, Moses would fain have preferred leading the Israelites to religious truth by supplication, study, and discerning knowledge, he was prudently induced to use the sacrificial service as an auxiliary to enjoin the cardinal truths of the existence and unity of God, to whom alone, as the Lord of Creation, homage was due; which end he hoped materially to promote by opposing, as strikingly as possible, his ritual to that of pagan nations,[3] and especially by ordaining the slaughtering of animals held sacred by the Egyptians, Hindoos and others.[4] But nothing can be more directly opposed both to the letter and the spirit of the sacrificial code. The arguments of Maimonides, like those usually offered by him, are a perplexing combination of logical phraseology and traditional conservatism; they spin a deceptive web round the unguarded reader; they lull him, for a time, into the illusion of rational deduction; but they cannot long hide from him the conviction that the matter has not been advanced a single step; and that, at best, old errors have been classified or reduced to a specious system: they may be admired and extolled by men who consider it a gain to array prejudices in a philosophical garb, but they cannot deceive or win critical minds. Thus Maimonides refers to the principle frequently urged by him with great emphasis, that "the miracles consist in a change of the nature of existing *objects;* but that God never by a miracle changes the nature

[1] As Deyling (Obs. Sacr. II. 4); Buddaeus (Hist. Eccl. V. T. p. 143—145); Ernesti (Vindic. arbitr. div., Opusc. theol. p. 245); comp. also *Saubert*, De Sacrif. I. 1; *Carpzov*, Appar. Crit. pp. 699—705; *Oehler*, in Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie, X. pp. 616, 617; *Nägelsbach*, der Gottmensch, I. 335 *sqq.*

[2] Moreh Neboch. III. 32.

[3] Comp. Lev. XVII. 5—7.

[4] Comp. *Vayikrah rabbah* on Lev. XVII. 3; *Michaelis*, Mos. R. § 189; *Spencer*, De Legg. Hebr. Ritt. Lib. III. Diss. 2. cap. 3; also *Hochstädter*, Religionsphilosophische Erläuterungen zur biblisch-reinen Glaubens- und Pflichtenlehre (fasc. 2), 1864, pp. 45 *sqq.*

of *man*"; and he continues with a long chain of syllogisms insinuating indeed by apparent analogies, but totally irrelevant to the subject. The advance from the multifarious forms of gross idolatry to the spiritualistic doctrine of one incorporeal God, is infinitely more decided than from the performance of sacrifices to their suppression: a legislator who interdicted idolatry under punishment of death and excision, would not have hesitated to disclaim sacrifices, had he deemed them objectionable; nor would he have surrounded them with sacred solemnity, had he deemed them unessential. Hence we may understand and excuse the vehemence of Nachmanides in denouncing the opinion of Maimonides as a sinful profanation of Divine behests. Yet Abarbanel[5] not only adopted and developed the theory of Maimonides, but, pursuing an incidental remark of the latter, he strenuously laboured to prove that several Mosaic enactments — for instance, the exclusiveness of the Temple as the place, and of the Aaronites as the ministering agents of the sacrifices — exhibit the legislator's desire to *restrict*, as much as he could venture, the custom of offerings. His observations in support of Maimonides, and in refutation of Nachmanides, however honourable to his liberality of thought, are not derived from statements of the Pentateuch, but from extraneous sources, and from his personal bias which he strives to justify by every effort of his peculiar ingenuity.[6]

The sacrifices form unquestionably an indispensable part, nay a main pillar of the Mosaic theology. They may indeed, in a certain sense, not incorrectly be described as a means both of religious discipline and of religious education; but the compilers of the Pentateuch thus employed them as a παιδαγωγός because they were convinced of their intrinsic value as instruments of grace; they would not have used them for the highest ends, had they considered them a despicable heirloom of heathen falsehood, which they would have shrunk from countenancing by injunctions meant to be of unchangeable and eternal application.

We may admit that the ceremonial law of the Pentateuch, and more especially the sacrificial system, is symbolical in its character, and that the writers, evidently men of high cultivation and of considerable power of thought, and conscious of this symbolical form which they occasionally explained, attached importance not so much to the act of offering nor to the value of the oblation, as to the piety of

---

[5] Introd. to Levit. c. IV.

[6] Especially unfortunate is his interpretation of 2 Chr. XXIX. 5—7, in which he does not recognise a lament of King Hezekiah at the long neglect of the sacrificial service, but simply a complaint at the prevalence of idolatry; see p. 38.

heart thereby revealed:[1] but it would be erroneous to assert that they were themselves fully accustomed to abstract religious notions, which they clothed in symbols merely in accommodation to the untrained understanding of the people. We may also admit that the ceremonial law of the Pentateuch, and the emblems which it employs, are, on the whole, simple and intelligible, worthy of a monotheistic religion, not compromising its primary principles, and free from hair-splitting casuistry, as is more evident if compared with its later Talmudical development: yet it grew out of, and was fitted for, some of the earlier — though not the earliest — phases of intellectual culture; it is adapted, it may be thoughtfully and efficiently, to a modest degree of national education only; and when it claims to be final and unalterable — when it declares, "You shall neither add to it, nor take away from it"[2] — it becomes injurious and objectionable in the extreme. It was doubtless, for many ages, beneficial in its operation; it constantly fostered the feeling of dependance on God and His will; it helped to separate the Jews from the heathens and their customs;[3] it usefully occupied the senses of an untutored people; it admitted at least the possibility of disclosing to their minds the deeper ideas of religion.[4] But ceremonials practised after that stage, when the symbol has ceased to be one with its meaning, unable to move the soul and heart, or to occupy the intellect, are not only unjustifiable, but become a dangerous obstacle to religious worship in spirit and in truth.

It appears, therefore, that the Jewish mind possessed no aptitude to free itself from the bonds of ritualism, and to conceive a purely internal faith. Though capable of the loftiest abstractions of monotheistic doctrines, it required and seized the aid of ceremonials. So far from gradually rising above them, the Jews developed them, in the post-Biblical times, into a system unexampled in intricate minuteness, and rendered innocuous almost solely by the power of the fundamental truths of Mosaism. Occasionally, the necessity of sacrifices was disclaimed by some independent sect, excelling in simple virtue and righteousness, as the Essenes or Ebionites;[5] or by a class of men, who Jews by descent and education, rose to an ideal conception

---

[1] Comp., on the one hand, *O. Müller*, Proleg. pp. 110, 119, 257, 332; *Stuhr*, Die Religionssysteme des Orients, pp. 41 *sqq.*; *Bauer*, Die Religion des A. T. I. pp. 246, 255, 314; on the other hand, *Creuzer*, Symbol. *passim*; *Hengstenb.* Auth. des Pent. II. 617—623; *Bähr*, Symbol. I. 8 *sqq.*; *Kurtz*, Opferc. p. 35; *Öhler* in Herzog's Real-Encycl. X. 620.

[2] Deut. IV. 2.

[3] Comp. Ephes. II. 14.

[4] Comp. *Bauer*, Gottesdienstl. Verfass. I. 104—106.

[5] *Joseph.* Ant. XVIII. 1. 5; comp. *Philo*, Quod omnis probus liber, c. 12 (Opp. II. 458, comp. p. 633).

of the ritual commands. Thus Philo declared,[6] "The mind (*νοῦς*), when without blemish and properly purified by perfect virtues, is itself the most holy sacrifice,[7] being entirely and in all respects pleasing to God." Jesus Sirach[8] taught: "He that keeps the Law, brings offerings enough;... he that requites a good turn offers fine flour, and he that gives alms sacrifices praise ... The offering of the righteous makes the altar fat, and the sweet savour thereof is before the Most High ... Do not think to bribe (God) with gifts, for such He will not receive; and trust not to unrighteous sacrifices; for the Lord is Judge, and with Him is no respect of person." And the apostle Paul[9] enjoined, „Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable, unto God, which is your reasonable service."[10] But such examples and doctrines either remained without abiding influence on the progress of thought among the Jews, and like a delicate branch soon withered off from the main stem; and either they helped to form other religious communities, and to impart to them vigour and vitality; or they were blended with fantastical alloy, which virtually rendered them profitless and unavailing. So the Kabbalists held, that after the advent of the true Messiah no animal sacrifice would be required, since he would himself effect all that can be hoped for by sacrifices; "the Messiah will deliver up his soul and pour it out unto death, and his blood will atone the people of the Lord."[11] Even in the New Testament, the ceremonial law, though rendered subordinate to piety and love, is by no means declared superfluous, much less abrogated. Jesus said, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the Law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought you to have done, and not to leave the other undone."[12] "The curse of the Law"[13] or its "yoke of bondage"[14] is not the scrupulous adherence to rituals, but the neglect of moral duties. "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother has ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way: first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."[15] Indeed Christ acknowledged the sacrifices as binding. After having healed the leper, he bid him to present the offering prescribed in the Pentateuch for

---

[6] De Victim. c. 5.

[7] *ἡ εὐαγιστάτη θυσία.*

[8] XXXV. 1—15; comp. VII. 9.

[9] Rom. XII. 1.

[10] *Τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν*; comp. Hebr. XIII. 16; 1 Petr. II. 5.

[11] Comp. Isai. LIII. 12; Sheloh — שני לוחות הברית — fol. 242*a*; see also *Sommer*, Theol. Sohar. p. 94.

[12] *Ταῦτα δὲ ἔδει ποιῆσαι, κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφεῖναι*, Matth. XXIII. 23; Luke XI. 42.

[13] Galat. III. 13, *κατάρα τοῦ νόμου.*

[14] *Ζυγὸν δουλείας*, Galat. V. 1; Acts XV. 10.

[15] Matth. V. 23, 24.

such occasions,[1] and he himself took part in the ceremonies of the paschal sacrifice.[2] It has indeed been supposed that he was averse to offerings:[3] but this can neither be proved by his clearing the Temple from buyers and sellers and money-changers,[4] nor from his remark, "I am able to destroy the Temple of God, and to build it in three days,"[5] which is hardly a figure of speech to indicate the abolition of the ceremonial service and the immediate introduction of a spiritual worship; while his alledged declaration quoted from the gospel of Matthew of the Ebionites, "I am come to repeal the sacrifices, and unless you desist from sacrificing, the wrath of God will not desist from you,"[6] are of very questionable authority. Animal and vegetable oblations were indeed discarded by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and he declared that "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins."[7] Yet he was far from renouncing the idea of offering itself; he centred his creed in the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice; he merely urged that an internal and moral relation is necessary between the guilty and the victim; that such connection does not exist between man who is responsible and the animal which is no free agent; that, therefore, the sin of the former cannot be atoned by the blood of the latter; that it can only be propitiated by the death of a being at once human and, like God, guiltless.[8] This may be the "spiritualisation of sacrifice;"[9] but even in this conception, the idea of sacrifice reveals its fundamental and irremediable defects: it belongs to an elementary stage of religious life; it flows from illusory and imperfect views of the attributes of the deity; it converts into a transcendental operation what must be a spontaneous emotion of the human heart. Nor ought it to be palliated by vague metaphors: it may be true that the notion of sacrifice is so bound up with our nature that it always manifests itself in some form; and that "no theory, religious or philosophical, dispossesses the heart of it";[10] but the sacrifice of self-denial and of self-conquest is different from the sacrifice offered to the Deity to secure His favour or His pardon; the former is the offspring of a true and active faith leading to ennoblement and to moral vigour; the latter, theoretically unjustifiable, may practically engender spiritual torpor and contemptible pietism. It

---

1 Matth. VIII. 4; Mark. I. 44; Luke V. 14; comp. Acts XXI. 20, 26; XXIV. 17, 18; see Lev. XIV. 10 *sqq.*

2 Matth. XXVI. 17—20; Luke XXII. 7—15; comp. Mark. XIV. 22.

3 *Strauss,* Das Leben Jesu, p. 214.

4 Matth. XXI. 12, 13; Mark. XI. 15—17; etc.

5 Matth. XXVI. 61.

6 *Epiphan.* Haeres. XXX. 16.

7 Hebr. X. 4.

8 Comp. *Hengstenb.* Opfer, pp. 16, 17.

9 Die Verklärung des Opfers, *Hengstenb.* l. c. p. 48; comp. 1 Petr. II. 5.

10 *F. D. Maurice,* Doctrine of Sacrifice, pp. 45, 61, *et passim*; *F. P. Cobbe,* Religious Duty, pp. 318—323.

is, therefore, historically incorrect to say, that "sacrifices are the incarnation of prayer";[11] it would be more proper to define prayer as the idealisation of sacrifice. The religious sentiments may be identical in both, since every true sacrifice requires the frame of mind demanded or created by prayer, and every true prayer must involve some inward or external sacrifice; but those sentiment were naturally first embodied in a material and then in a more spiritual form.[12] It would, however, be superfluous to recount the arguments which reason and experience suggest against sacrifices, even if they had not been put forth by others with equal spirit and learning.[13]

Now Talmudical and Rabbinical writings contain indeed maxims highly creditable to their authors and the times in which they lived. "The humble-minded is by God considered to have offered all the sacrifices; for it is said, The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit."[14] "Sacrifices, whether great or small, are equally acceptable, provided the heart is turned to God."[15] "Acts of justice are more meritorious than all the sacrifices."[16] Or more strongly, "Unless the mind be purified, the sacrifice is useless; it may be thrown to the dogs."[17] "He who engages in the study of the Law, requires neither holocaust nor bloodless offering."[18] The words, "A day in Thy courts is better than a thousand",[19] were explained to mean, "God said to David, I prefer thy sitting and studying before Me to the thousands of burnt-offerings which thy son Solomon will offer on the altar."[20] When, after the destruction of the Temple, sacrifices became unlawful, the value of *prayer* and of absorbed devotion was more and more acknowledged and appreciated.[21] It was a maxim, "He who prays is considered as pious as if he built an altar and offered sacrifices upon it;"[22] or "prayer is deemed sacrificial

---

[11] *Hengstenb. l. c.* p. 19, evidently after Outram, "preces utique sacrificia spiritualia, et sacrificia symbolicae preces"; comp. De Sacrif. pp. 108, 228, 229; *Keil*, Archäol. I. 192; *Oehler*, l.c.; *Kurtz*, Opferc., p. 37.

[12] Comp. Sect. X. 4.

[13] See, for instance, *Arnobius*, Advers. Nat. VII. 1—34.

[14] *Talm*. Sotah 5*b*; comp. Ps. LI. 19.

[15] *Talm*. Menach. 110: אחד המרבה ואחד הממעיט ובלבד שיכוין לבו לשמים; comp. *Talm*. Erubin 65 ("Prayer without devotion is like the body without a soul"); Berach. 2, 3, 28, 31, 34; Taan. 2; Aboth II. 18; *Maimon*. Hilch. Teph. IV. 15; *Orach chay*. 38, 98.

[16] *Talm*. Succ. 49*b* (העושה צדקה יותר מכל הקרבנות); comp. Sanh. 43; *Talm*. *Jerus*. Rosh Hash. c. I.

[17] אי לא אתכר האי רוחא קרבנא לא כלום לכלבא אתמסר; Sohar.

[18] *Talm*. Menach. 110.

[19] טוב יום בחצריך מאלף, Ps. LXXXIV. 11.

[20] *Talm*. Macc. II. *init*.; comp. also *Shemoth Rabbah* sect. ואתה תצוה; *Schöttgen*, Hor. Hebr. p. 1007.

[21] Comp. תוצאות חיים on Levit. I. 1.

[22] *Talm*. Berach. 15; comp. also 6, 10, 17; 32; Succah 45; Taanith 26; *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan*, c. 4; see also *Outram*, De Sacrificiis, pp. 234, 239, 240; *M. Duschack*, Der bibl. Opfercultus, in Hilberg's Illustrirte Monatshefte I. 462.

service";[1] or "he who *reads* the laws of sacrifice, will be pardoned as if he had performed the offerings;[2] or "as the altar wrought atonement during the time of the Temple, so after its destruction the table."[3] However, all these and similar sentiments are merely echoes of the utterances of ancient prophets, and imply no more than these. The discontinuance of the sacrifices was, as in the Biblical times, mournfully deplored as a dire calamity and a punishment for heinous sins. The words of Hosea, "We will offer the sacrifices of our lips",[4] were interpreted to mean, "we will pay the offerings with our lips:"[5] prayer was regarded as a poor and unworthy substitute for sacrifice, once the most precious privilege, but then alas! no longer permitted. Offerings were declared to guarantee the preservation of heaven and earth.[6] Nor are they in the whole range of Talmudical literature, pronounced to be unnecessary, much less objectionable, at the Messianic time, though they would then be limited to thank-offerings: the restoration of the Temple and the restoration of the sacrificial service were deemed inseparable.[7] And as the Samaritans of Nablus still regularly offer the paschal lamb,[8] so the Jewish prayerbook abounds with fervent supplications for the advent of the time when the blood of sacrifices will again be sprinkled on the sides of the holy altar, and the priests will be reinstated in their functions. Not even the most distinguished of the Jewish scholars and philosophers of the Middle Ages, had the intellectual energy and penetration properly to estimate the value of sacrifices. Ebn Ezra[9] repeated, the Divine glory would indignantly have withdrawn from the earth, had the Israelites neglected the precepts of the burnt-offerings. Maimonides, though professing to consider the sacrificial ordinances of the Pentateuch merely as an expedient accommodation to deeply rooted usages,[10] laid it down as the first and most important rule, that the offerer must firmly believe in the force and efficacy of sacrifices;[11] and he bestowed the minutest care upon collecting, classifying, and expounding the endless host of

---

[1] התפלה נקראת עבודה; see *Vitringa*, De Synagog. Vetere, pp. 40, 41.

[2] *Talm*. Megill. 31*b*; comp. *Yalkut chadash* 179*a*; של"ה on Lev. I. 2.

[3] *Talm*. Berach. 55*a*; Chagig. 27*a*.

[4] XIV. 3, נְשַׁלְּמָה פָרִים שְׂפָתֵינוּ.

[5] Comp. Ps. CXLI. 2, תכון תפלתי קטרת לפניך; Hebr. XIII. 15, *ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*; see *supra*; *Talm*. Berach 26*b*; comp. also Prov. XV. 8; *Bähr*, Symbol. I. 476. Heliodorus (III. 18) mentions that a person embarrassed by his dreams, offered to Apollo "the sacrifice of a hymn" (*ὕμνον ἀποθύειν τῷ θεῷ*).

[6] לנטוע שמים וליסוד ארץ זו קרבנות, *Talm*. *Jer*. Shekal. fin.

[7] Comp. *S. Braun*, in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1857, p. 254.

[8] See p. 50. [9] Comm. on Lev. I. 1. [10] See p. 56. [11] De Noxiis, c. III. § 10; comp. ibid. c. IX. § 3.

Talmudical regulations with regard to the various kinds of offerings.[12] Jehudah Halevi, in his elaborate work, the Book of Cusari, attempted to prove the Divine origin, and hence the eternal obligation of the oral law with its numberless expansions of the ceremonial ordinances.[13] Baruch Spinoza alone, trained by the philosophy of Descartes, stimulated by the astounding discoveries in astronomy and other natural sciences, and above all guided by the divine impulse of genius, penetrated to the root of religious and metaphysical questions. He boldly rose above tradition; renouncing the Rabbinical teachings of his youth, he worked out, with uncompromising consistency, a system happily combining metaphysical speculation with practical ethics. But this manful independence of thought brought him into hostile collision with his coreligionists; he was, by excommunication, repudiated as a member of their community; he exercised no influence on the development of the Synagogue, whose spirit was utterly foreign to his own. The formula of excommunication, written in Spanish, and recently re-discovered, is instructive.[14] It bears date the 6th day of Ab 5416 (i.e. 1656); after denouncing Spinoza's "wicked views and works", his "evil ways", his "learned heresies" and "abominable deeds", it concludes thus: "By the sentence of the angels, by the decree of the saints, we anathematise, cut off, curse, and execrate Baruch d'Espinoza . . . with the anathema wherewith Joshua anathematised Jericho . . . , and with all the curses set forth in the Law. Cursed be he by day, and cursed by night; cursed when he lies down, and cursed when he rises up; cursed when he goes out and cursed when he comes in; the Lord pardon him never; the wrath and fury of the Lord burn upon this man, and persecute him with all the maledictions of the Law. The Lord blot out his name under heaven, and separate him to his misfortune from all the tribes of Israel. And you who are faithful shall be blessed, if you take heed that no man shall speak to him, no man write to him, no man show him any kindness, no man stay under the same roof with him, no man come nigh him within four yards, no man read a book written by him." The wish of the fanatic Rabbis who composed this document — re-discovered to perpetuate their shame — has to this day been gratified within the pale of orthodox Judaism:

---

[12] Comp. *R. Mos. Majemonidae* De Sacrificiis Liber, convertit in sermon. Latin. L. de Compiegne de Veil, Lond. 1683.

[13] Comp. p. 7, note 23.

[14] It has been published, at Amsterdam, by Van Vloten, in a supplementary volume to Spinoza's works, p. 290 *sqq.* See also allgem. Zeit. des Judenthums, 1862, p. 623; *J. Wiesner*, Der Bann in seiner geschichtlichen Entwickelung auf dem Boden des Judenthums, Leipz. 1864, p. 82; *M. Arnold*, Essays in Criticism, p. 253.

Spinoza "is separated from all the tribes of Israel"; if perchance he is mentioned, pious lips involuntarily whisper, "may his name be blotted out" (ימח שמו); no one "reads a book written by him"; or if it be read, it is done in no spirit of sympathy, nor even of fairness; not alone is his philosophy distorted, execrated, and reviled with a warped dogmatism for which we are prepared, but impotent attempts are made to defame his moral character — a character of such matchless beauty and purity, that it is in itself a glory to mankind second only to the immortal philosopher's intellectual greatness.[1] How different is the language used by Schleiermacher, the distinguished Protestant divine! his words may, as a contrast, here find a place. "Dedicate with me in reverence a lock of hair to the manes of Spinoza, the holy, the rejected. He was pervaded by the august spirit of the universe; the infinite was his beginning and his end; the universe his only and eternal love. In holy innocence and deep humility, he mirrored his own image in the imperishable world, and saw how he himself was its most loveable reflection. He was full of religion and full of the holy spirit; therefore he stands alone and unapproached, master in his teachings, but sublime above the profane school, without disciple and without privileges ... When philosophers will be religious like Spinoza, and artists pious like Novalis, then the great resurrection will be solemnised in the worlds of either."[2] Indeed, the Jewish mind so tenaciously preserved its traditionary character and peculiarity, that even Moses Mendelssohn, though in his philosophical writings as liberal as might be expected from the contemporary of Kant and the friend of Lessing, exhibited in doctrinal matters no perceptible progress, as is manifest from his Hebrew Commentary on parts of the Old Testament; he felt it as his greatest grief and affliction to see his friend suspected of Spinozistic views; and if this suspicion did not, as his biographers say, accelerate his death, it certainly embittered the last days of his life. One of the greatest Jewish authorities of our time, the learned S. D. Luzzatto, who may well be considered the representative of his class, thus writes in one of his latest works.[3] "Far be it from me to

1 As a proof of this we may quote a treatise of *J. B. Lehmans*, Spinoza, sein Lebensbild und seine Philosophie, Würzburg, 1864 — a compilation written in the disparaging spirit above indicated.

2 *Schleiermacher*, Sämmtl. Werke, vol. I. p. 190 (comp. *Strauss*, Charakterist. und Krit. p. 167 *sqq.*); and similar opinions have been expressed by Jacobi, Herder, Novalis, Orelli, Gfrörer, Schelling, Van Vloten, Kuno Fischer (Baruch Spinoza, Leben und Charakter, Mannh. 1865, and in the recent volume of his History of Philosophy), and many others.

3 Lezioni di Teologia Morale israelitica, Padova, 1862 (translated into German by L. E. Igel, Czernowitz 1864), §§ 27—29.

think that the ceremonial laws are not obligatory in our age. All of them that have no connection with the Temple or the holy land, must be sacred to us at every time and in every place; that which has been commanded by God, cannot be abrogated by men: neither could such attempts be ventured without undermining public morality; for if the Law of God is, in any of its provisions, modified by human arbitrariness, it would no longer be regarded as absolutely and unchangeably binding. Nor can the ceremonial laws, which make man virtuous in more than one respect, at any time lose their salutary influence." Another contemporary Rabbi, Dr. L. Philippson, the mouthpiece of a large and more liberal section of the Jews acknowledging the absolute force of the written, but not of the oral Law, expresses himself in a similar sense. "Man is never and at no stage able to dispense with ceremonies entirely." "No religion can exist without them." "By their neglect the religion of the heart is easily forfeited, or loses immeasurably in efficacy, coherence, and power, and runs the danger of decay."[4] The Hebrew prophets and the Jewish doctors were able to perceive the insufficiency,[5] but not the superfluousness or obnoxious tendency of ceremonial worship. They discovered many fatal errors in heathen religions, and adhered with fervour to their purer convictions; but a lack of independence, the sad inheritance of their eastern origin, prevented the adoption of a rational religion, the result of matured intelligence, and solely reliable as a guide in the intricacies of life. However, the modern Jews, especially those scattered among the Teutonic nations to which they appear to have a peculiar affinity, fairly promise to pass beyond the narrow boundaries of their ancestors, and by blending the eastern and western character, to produce a new type superior to either and not unlikely to realise, though in a different manner, the proud hopes which live in their race. Spinozism counts among them not a few admirers[6] and even adherents.[7] In the prayer-books of some recent reform-sects, as that of Hamburgh and Berlin, the passages relating to sacrifices have been modified or sup-

---

[4] Religionslehre, I. 157, 158; comp. pp. 213—219; II. 192, 193; III. 111; Entwickelung der relig. Idee, Vorles. VI. and X.

[5] Comp. *Jellinek*, Einleitung in die Thora, p. 29: „Though you build seven times seven altars, and sacrifice thereon seven times seven bullocks, but violate the law of love ... your God is an idol, an evil demon, a cruel king of darkness"; see also *Philippson*, ll. cc.; a. o.

[6] Comp. *L. Philippson*, Baruch Spinoza, re-printed in the Jahrbuch für die Geschichte der Juden und des Judenthums, vol. II. pp. 195—242.

[7] See, for instance, Berthold Auerbach's translation of Spinoza's works, and the life prefixed to it; his tale "Spinoza"; etc.

pressed; and when this subject was discussed in the German conferences of Rabbis, one of the members, distinctly declared, that the prayer for the return to Jerusalem and the restoration of the sacrifices, is a hollow falsehood; and he thereby expressed not only the sense of the assembly, but of the vast majority of his educated co-religionists.

We have above quoted some advanced opinions on sacrifices from the writings of the Hebrews. But let it not be supposed, that heathen literature is less rich in utterances of a similar import. Indeed a full comparison shows the balance of superiority to be on the side of the latter. It must not be urged that refined notions were not found among the multitude, but in the limited class of the wise and the enlightened. In this respect, the case was not different among the pagans and the Israelites. Moreover, occasional instances or exceptions suffice to show that such improvement lay within the intellectual range of the nations, and might, therefore, be gradually diffused. Nor did the philosophers withhold their instruction and counsel within the limits of the civil laws. They ridiculed the mercenary and selfish spirit in which sacrifices were frequently performed.[1] They described it as iniquity, rather than piety, to present valueless and contemptible offerings. They pronounced it disgraceful to say to the gods, "If you remember the gifts I have bestowed upon you, and love me accordingly, I shall honour you again with increased presents; for I offer them for the sake of expected favours."[2] They derided the frivolity so often exhibited at sacrifices, festivals, and solemn assemblies. "If a sensible person", says Lucian,[3] "witnesses the silliness with which the religious rites are conducted, and considers what notions most people form of the nature of the gods, and what they pray for, he must be very dejected indeed, if he is not disposed to laugh at their folly and childishness". The same writer, in an amusing and humorous description, strongly satirizes the whole of the sacrificial ritual — the wreathing of the victim, its heart-rending cries when killed, which are "the music of the solemn act", the blood-stained figure of the priest, though pure hands only are professedly admitted near the sacred implements, and the other ceremonies and incidents[4] —; and he concludes his treatise on sacrifices with the words, "It would be impossible for any one to stigmatise all the superstitions of the multitude, whether like Democritus he laughs at their ignorance, or like Heraclitus he weeps at their folly." In another work[5] he logically contends that as the Greek gods are unalterably subject to primeval decrees of Fate (*Εἱμαρμένη*) and the Parcae (*Μοῖραι*), they are them-

[1] *Lucian*, De Sacrif. 2; see p. 5.
[2] *Porphyr*. Abstin. II. 61.
[3] De Sacrif. c. 1.
[4] L. c. cc. 12, 13.
[5] Jupiter Confut. c. 5 *sqq*.

selves powerless to grant or to refuse any favour; it is, therefore, idle to pray or to sacrifice to them;[6] and he then makes Zeus say,[7] "He who offers to us sacrifices, does not wish to secure advantages, but merely to show his sense of obligation, and to repay in some manner the benefits he has received from us, or somtimes simply to do homage to us as to his superiors." Varro declared all sacrifices as superfluous; "the true gods", he said, "neither desire nor demand them, much less can those made of brass, clay, plaster, or marble care for them; hence no guilt is contracted by not offering sacrifices, and no favour gained by offering them."[8] Some remarks are indeed not unalloyed either by polytheistic elements, or by the pernicious distinction between an esoteric and an exoteric creed. Thus the Neo-Platonicians made the following division. The supreme god or the "soul of the world" (*ἡ τοῦ κόσμου ψυχή*), being incorporeal and indivisible, stands in need of no external thing, and to him, therefore, it is best not to offer any sacrifices at all; the other gods who, consisting of body and soul, are accessible to the senses, ought to be honoured with bloodless oblations only; while the invisible spirits comprised under the name of *demons* (*δαίμονες*) might be propitiated with offerings of any kind.[9] Porphyry himself considered all material offerings unnecessary for the philosopher, though he strongly recommended them for the people.[10] But it would be easy to collect from classical writers a large number of the most unexceptionable sentiments on the true value of sacrifices; we content ourselves with quoting a few. The best sacrifice is a pure mind and a passionless soul: the bad take fruitless trouble in worshipping the gods.[11] It is becoming to a good man alone to sacrifice to the gods and to appeal to them by prayer, offering, and worship: but to receive gifts from a defiled person neither behoves a good man nor a god.[12] Wicked persons fancy that they are able to appease Jupiter with gifts and sacrifice: they lose their labour and their money; for no petition of the perjured is acceptable to him.[13] The citizens must keep their souls free from every baseness, for the gods do not look with favour upon the sacrifices and costly donations of the wicked, but upon the just and excellent works of the virtuous.[14] Let men, in their offerings, ap-

6 Comp. *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 10, 23.

7 L. c. c. 7.

8 Comp. *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 1, "Quia, inquit (Varro), dii veri neque desiderant ea (sacrificia) neque deposcunt, etc.

9 *Porphyr.* De Abstin. II. 37; comp. 38—42, 58; *supra* p. 13; see also *Lucian*, De Sacrif. 1.

10 De Abst. II. 36.

11 *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 61; comp. *Plat.* Legg. IV. 8 (p. 717), *μάτην περὶ θεοὺς ὁ πολύς ἐστι πόνος τοῖς ἀνοσίοις*; *Cic.* Legg. II. 9, 16, impius ne audeto placare donis iram deorum.

12 *Plat.* l. c. p. 716.

13 *Plaut.* Rud. Prolog. 22—25.

14 So Zaleucus, according to *Diod. Sic.* XII. 20.

proach with piety, but remove luxury; he who acts differently will be punished by god himself.[1] The deity looks on the heart or disposition (ἦθος) of the sacrificer rather than on the number of the sacrifices.[2] The simplest gifts, as herbs, fruits, and flour, if presented in a humble spirit, are more acceptable than the most sumptuous hecatombs.[3] Honouring the gods does not consist in victims however choice and resplendent with gold, but in the good and upright intention of the worshipper; the right-minded are religious with barley and porridge, but the wicked do not escape their impiety, though profusely staining the altars with blood.[4] The little frank-incense which accompanies the offerings, is more essential and more prized by the gods than the victims.[5] The plainest and least expensive vessels are the most appropriate for sacrificial ceremonies.[6] Man ought to offer elevation of the soul, and calm reflection free from all disturbing emotions; for this is true worship and safety.[7] Piety renders even the smallest gift welcome.[8] God neither stands in need of presents, nor is it in our power to bestow upon him any.[9] The celestial divinities have no pleasure in slaughtered bulls, but in good faith to be kept honestly and even without controlling witness.[10] Sumptuous offerings accustom men to luxury, and lead to the delusion that the deity can by presents be bribed into remission of deserved punishment; whereas the knowledge that the gods have no desire for idle gifts, but for rectitude of life, would help to make the heedless just and pious.[11] Those who wish to sacrifice must do so in purity.[12] This purity does not merely reveal itself in a clean body and clean garments, but in "a soul purified from vices", since the soul is the divinest part of man, and most akin to the deity. The temple of Epidaurus bore the inscription, "He who enters the fragrant temple must be pure; but purity is to harbour holy thoughts."[13] Piety is a knowledge of the proper reverence

---

1 Pietatem adhibento, opes amovento; qui secus faxit, deus ipse vindex erit; *Cic.* Legg. II. 8.

2 *Porphyr.* l. c. II. 15.

3 *Ibid.* c. 16, 17.

4 *Senec.* De Benef. I. 6.

5 Comp. *Ovid*, Trist. II. i. 75, 76, Ut fuso taurorum sanguine centum, Sic capitur minimo turis honore deus.

6 *Porphyr.* l. c. c. 17, 18; comp. also *Heliod* X. 9.

7 *Porph.* l. c. II. 36; comp. 43, 60.

8 *Ovid*, Fast. II. 535, 536 (Parva petunt manes; pietas pro divite grata est Munere); *Hor.* Od. II. xvii. 32.

9 *Senec.* De Benef. IV. 9, nec ille collato eget, nec nos ei quicquam conferre possumus; *Min. Fel.* 32.

10 *Ovid*, Epist. XX. 181, 182, Non bove mactato caelestia numina gaudent, Sed quae praestanda est et sine teste fide.

11 *Porph.* l. c. c. 60.

12 *Porph. l. c.* c. 19: *δεῖ καθηραμένους τὸ ἦθος ἰέναι θύσοντας.*

13 *Ἁγνὸν χρὴ νηοῖο θυώδεος ἐντὸς ἰόντα Ἔμμεναι· ἁγνείη δ' ἐστι φρονεῖν*

due to the gods: the pious sacrifice to the gods and keep themselves pure; and the wise men are the only priests.[14]

The dialogue "Alcibiades the Second", whether the work of Plato or of some later philosopher, is an elaborate argument on the inutility of addressing to the gods special prayers, since man does not know whether, if granted, they would prove real boons. In the course of the discussion Socrates remarks, "The divine nature, I conceive, is not such as to be seduced by presents like a usurer . . . For it would be a dreadful thing indeed, if the gods looked to gifts and sacrifices, and not to the soul, if it be holy and just."[15] The same subject, and probably with reference to that dialogue, is treated by two of the greatest Roman satirists. The second satire of Persius, a noble rebuke of superstitious, sordid, and double-tongued prayer, contains the following lines:

"He sues for wealth: the labouring ox is slain,
"And frequent victims woo the god of gain!
"'O crown my hearth with plenty and with peace,
"'And give my flocks and herds a large increase!'
"Madman! how can he, when, from day to day,
"Steer after steer in offering melts away?
"Still he persists; and still new hopes arise,
"With harslet and with tripe to storm the skies:"[16]

and it concludes with a passage that has not unjustly been described as "not only the quintessence of sanctity, but of language:"

"No; let me bring the Immortals, what the race
"Of great Messala now depraved and base,
"On their huge charger, cannot; — bring a mind
"Where legal truth and moral sense are joined,
"And holy depths of thought exempt from stain,
"A bosom dyed in honour's noblest grain,
"Deep-dyed: with these let me approach the fane,
"And Heaven will hear the humble prayers I make,
"Though all my offering be a barley-cake.[17]"

In a composition equally famous for soundness of views and wealth of illustration, Juvenal also[18] sets forth the vanity of human wishes, whether the supplication be for riches, power, and glory, or for talents and accomplishments; he then proposes the following form of prayer, as rational as it is beautiful:

---

ὅσια; comp. also *Cic.* Legg. II. 8 and 10, ad divos adeunto caste: animo videlicet, in quo sunt omnia etc.

[14] *Μόνους τε ἱερέας τοὺς σοφούς*, *Diog. Laert.* VII. 64 (119).

[15] *Plato*, Alcib. II. 13 (p. 149); comp. *Hes.* Op. 334, 335; *Xen.* Mem. I. 3; *Paus.* IX. iii. 4; *Marc. Anton.* Medit. V. 6.

[16] Vers. 45—49, Gifford's translation (vers 77—84).

[17] Vers. 72—75: Compositum jus fasque animo, sanctosque recessus Mentis, et incoctum generosum pectus honesto. Haec cedo ut admoveam templis et farre litabo.

[18] In the tenth Satire.

"O Thou, who know'st the wants of human kind,
"Vouchsafe me health of body, health of mind,
"A soul prepared to meet the frowns of fate,
"And look undaunted on a future state;
"That reckons death a blessing, yet can bear
"Existence nobly, with its weight of care;
"That anger and desire alike restrains,
"And counts Alcides' toils and cruel pains
"Superior far to banquets, wanton nights,
"And all the Assyrian monarch's soft delights:"

and he concludes thus:

"Here bound, at length, thy wishes: I but teach
"What blessings man, by his own powers, may reach.
"The path to peace is virtue. We should see,'
"If wise, o Fortune, nought divine in thee:
"But we have deified a name alone,
"And fixed in heaven thy visionary throne!"[1]

The Persians considered the reading of the Law as an offering presented to the divine word (Honover), and as the daily food of the soul.[2] They consumed the whole of the sacrificial animal, convinced that "the deity requires only the soul of the victim, and nothing else".[3] But more decided than any eastern nation, the Hindoos passed occasionally within the domain of the purest spiritualism. As the principal of the five daily sacrifices obligatory on every master of the house, they regarded the study of the Vedas, the revealed wisdom of Bramah. Next in sacredness and importance stood the exercise of hospitality.[4] The worshipper was commanded to present a bloody sacrifice by slaying all his passions, as anger, covetousness, malice, and envy. He was to address the god thus, "All my works, good or evil, I present to thee, in the fire of thy favour, as a burnt-offering."[5] Unless he loves God, he cannot expect acceptance of his gifts. Voluntary sacrifices of gratitude and submission are alone desired. As God cannot become richer by the offering, he looks upon the intention, not upon the magnitude of the gift. He delights in the pigeon of the poor as much as in the thousand oxen of the rich. But he regards as the choicest sacrifice the conquest of man over his evil impulses and his worldly pleasures; for this he prizes as a self-sacrifice securing the crown of heaven and eternal bliss. Those who so hallow themselves, exchange worthless vanities for glorious and eternal treasures. In short, „the love of God, the child of pious wisdom, is the noblest gift, the purest offering."[6]

---

1 Vers. 356—366.

2 *Kleuker*, Zend-Avesta, I. 42, 36.

3 *Herod.* I. 132; *Strabo*, XV. iii. 13 (p. 732); comp. *Kleuker*, Anhang zu Zendavesta, II. 2.

4 *Manu*, III. 69, 70, 74.

5 *Vedas*, Ward, II. 98.

6 Comp. *Müller*, Glauben, Wissen und Kunst der alten Hindu, pp. 257 *sqq.*; 535; *Pfanner*, Systema theol. gent. pur., pp. 349 *sqq.*

## V. THE HEBREW APPELLATION OF SACRIFICE AND ITS MEANING.

The name (קָרְבָּן), by which the notion of sacrifice is designated in the Old Testament, affords no clue as to its nature and significance; it is general in import and vague in its etymological sense; it means merely *something that is brought forward* or presented;[7] and it may hence be best rendered by the comprehensive term *offering*.[8] Attempts have been made to invest that name with a deeper interpretation. It has been supposed to imply "a means for effecting a close proximity[9] between God and the offerer",[10] or "a means for *bringing* the Israelites *near* God", and "an instrument of *intercession* (קֵרֵב) with Him";[11] it has hence been explained as "an agency of *sanctification* through the priests who are *near* God",[12] or as "a connection and a community of life with the deity."[13] But these and similar views have no foundation in the Hebrew Scriptures; they were suggested by preconceived theories on the nature of sacrifices; and their framers, instead of deducing the thing from the name, expounded the name from the supposed attributes of the thing — a process which the indistinctness of the former renders both easy and tempting. Such premises naturally led to untenable conclusions: the end of the Mosaic sacrifices was declared to be "that the existence or life of the soul (that is, of sin) be given up to God unto death, in order to obtain the true existence or sanctification by the union with God, who alone has true existence (יהוה), and therefore true holiness", so that the sacrifice is "at once a symbolical (or subjective) and sacramental (or objective) act"[14] — a fanciful definition devoid of probability and Biblical support.[15] It is true that the word קָרְבָּן is exclusively used in reference to objects devoted to the

[7] From הִקְרִיב *to make approach* or *to bring near*, the Hiphil of קָרַב *to be near*, to which corresponds, in the Phoenician sacrificial tablet discovered at Marseilles, עמם פנת אלם *to bring before the gods* (line 13), or also יכן למעלת *to prepare for the altar* (ibid. lines 3, 7) or יכן לכהנם *to prepare for the priests* (lines 13, 15).

[8] Germ. *Opfer*, also from *offerre*. Comp. Lev. I. 2, 14; II. 1, 4; III. 1, 6; Num. XXXI. 50; etc. etc. [9] קִרְבָה רַבָּה.

[10] Comp. Deut. IV. 7, so *Abarbanel*, Introd. to Levit. c. I.

[11] *Bähr*, Symb. II. 198; *S. Braun* in Frankel's Zeitschrift, 1857, p. 168 (Erhebung, Annäherung): which would require a derivative of Hiphil rather than of Kal.

[12] קְרוֹבִים or קְרֹבִים; see Treatise on Priesthood, chapt. I.

[13] *Bähr*, l. c. p. 263. The Parians called the priests *Kabronoi* (*Bochart*, De coloniis et sermone Phoenicum, Lib. I. col. 413), which is supposed, by transposition of letters, to be identical with *Korbanoi*, or קרבנין *offerers*.

[14] *Bähr*, l. c. pp. 211, 215, 219.

[15] Comp. notes on XVII. 11, ("for the life of the flesh is the blood; and I have given it to you on the altar" etc.), from which text that definition has been strangely derived.

deity for religious worship. It is, in this respect, at once the most generic and the most specific name: for on the one hand, it includes not only all classes of sacrifice,[1] but also sacred gifts not intended as sacrifices in the stricter sense, and not presented on the altar;[2] and on the other hand, it signifies the special portion of an offering devoted to God or His priests.[3] In fact, with a few exceptions easily to be traced and accounted for,[4] it occurs solely in the Third and Fourth Books of the Pentateuch: it seems, therefore, at a comparatively remote period, to have been restricted to the sphere of religion, and to have fallen into disuse with regard to secular donations.[5] But it implies, etymologically, nothing else but *gift* or *present;* it is so taken and expressed by most of the ancient authorities,[6] and the sacrifices are distinctly called *gifts.*[7] The literature of the old Testament exhibits

---

1 עולה (Lev. I. 3, 10, 14); מנחה (II. 1, 4); שלמים (III. 1, 2, 6); תודה (VII. 13, 15); חטאת (IV. 23, 28, 32; V. 11); מנחת קנאות (Num. V. 15); פסח (Num. IX. 7, 13); ראשית (Lev. II. 12).

2 Comp. Num. VII. 3, 13, 19 *sqq.*; XXXI. 50; Neh. XIII. 31; comp. in general, Lev. I. 2; VII. 38; XXII. 27; XXVII. 9, 11; Num. XVIII. 9.

3 Lev. VII. 29; see Comm. *in loc.* In this sense, and not in that of offering generally (De Saulcy, Judas), the word משאת is repeatedly employed on the Phoenician tablet of Marseilles (lines 3, 6, 10, 17, 18, 20, 21), or the plural משאתת on the sacrificial inscription of Carthage (the 90th of Davis' collection, line 1); see Sect. X.'12.

4 Ezek. XX. 28; XL. 43; Neh. XIII. 31.

5 In a similar manner, the verb זבח *to kill* was gradually limited to slaughtering for the purpose of sacrifice, while שחט was used for slaying animals generally.

6 Septuagint simply *δῶρον* (and so in the New Testament, Mark VII. 11 — *κορβᾶν ὅ ἐστιν δῶρον* — Matth. V. 23, 24; VIII. 4; XXIII. 18, 19; Hebr. V. 1; VIII. 3, 4; IX. 9; or *προσφορά*, Acts XXI. 26); Vulgate *oblatio*, and hence rendering קרבן מנחה *oblatio sacrificii* (Lev. II. 1), and מנחה promiscuously *sacrificium* (II. 3) and *oblatio* (II. 11). Rashbam (on Levit. II. 1) explains מנחה likewise by דורון; comp. Gen. IV. 3, 4, where מנחה (from מנח *to present*), though commonly restricted to bloodless sacrifices (see Sect. XI), is employed for sacrifice in general, both animal and vegetable, and hence rendered in the Peshito קורבנ; comp. also the phrase הקריב מנחה *to offer a present* (Judg. III. 17, 18); Josephus *δῶρον θεοῦ* (Ant. IV. iv. 4, *κορβᾶν . . . δῶρον σημαίνει*); contr. Ap. I. 22 (where he, however, singularly remarks that among the oaths forbidden to the Tyrians or Phoenicians is one called *κορβᾶν*); and *Plato*, Alcibiad. II. p. 149 (*θύειν τε καὶ δῶρα τελεῖν τοῖς θεοῖς*). Early Christian writers by a subtlety foreign to the Hebrew Scriptures, distinguished between *προσφορά* (oblatio) and *θυσία* (sacrificium), the former consisting in a material object, the latter essentially in prayer (*λόγος εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας*), and offered to the eucharist, in which bread and wine are subordinate to supplication and thanksgiving (so *Justin*, Dial. c. 28; Apol. I. 67; comp. *Steitz* in Herzog's Real-Encykl. XX. 1 p. 158).

7 מתנות, Num. XVIII. 11; comp. Exod. XXVIII. 38 (מתנות קדש); Deut. XVI. 17; Ezek. XX. 26, 39.

indeed several instances of a gradual modification in the meaning of words which, in accordance with the progress of religious culture, were imperceptibly understood in a purer, more refined, or more profound sense, as is undoubtedly manifest in many anthropomorphic expressions employed with respect to God even in passages emphatically teaching His incorporeality:[8] but there is no evidence to prove that the word קָרְבָּן was subjected to a similar change, that it lost its simple and primary meaning, or that it was spiritualised in harmony with later or more definite conceptions regarding sacrifices. Nor was the infusion of a new idea into the old designation necessary; for the names of the various kinds of offering conveyed, with sufficient distinctness, their specific nature or their peculiar object.[9] Yet this etymological meaning of the word does not justify us in tracing the character of the sacrificial laws *of the Pentateuch* to the injunction which commands the Hebrews "not to appear before the Lord empty:"[10] the origin of similar conceptions is separated, by a wide interval of time and spiritual advancement, from the concluding stages of the Levitical system; in fact, the injunction quoted did not at all refer to sacrifices in the stricter sense, but to the dedication of firstlings and tithes on the three great agricultural festivals.

The definition of קָרְבָּן is therefore, clearly, a gift offered to God for any of the various religious purposes arising in the life of individuals or of the nation. It is of collateral, if not subordinate, importance that the gift was presented in a place bearing the character of holiness, and with rites typifying worship and devotion. Yet the offerings more properly so called were those presented on the altar of the common Sanctuary; it is these offerings alone that are here treated of, while other religious gifts, dedicated to the sustenance of the priests, the servants of God, or contributions destined for to the support of the Sanctuary,[11] are entirely excluded. And in as much as every sacrifice was connected with burning to God on the altar either the whole or a part of it, and as this was naturally considered as the gift *par excellence*, the name אִשֶּׁה or *oblation made by fire* is frequently used in reference to all classes of offerings,[12] even to the frank-incense placed upon the shew-bread cakes, because it was burnt after their removal.[13]

History and experience do not countenance the numerous speculations which have been propounded on this subject. Sacrifice has

---

8 Comp. Comm. on Genes. pp. 199, 200.

9 As קרבן חטאת, קרבן תודה, etc.

10 See p. 4; comp. *Kurtz*, Opfercultus, p. 33.

11 Comp. *supra* p. 72, note 6.

12 Comp. Lev. I. 9, 13, 17; II. 2, 10, 16; III. 3, 5, 11; IV. 35; V. 12; VI. 10; etc.

13 Lev. XXIV. 7; comp. *Jos.* Ant. III. x. 7.

been defined as "a devotion of the perishable and unreal existence to the eternal and absolute being";[1] as "a negation by which man divests himself of his subjectivity";[2] as a means "of proving by deed the freedom of religious life through liberation from finite limits";[3] or as "an agent for effecting the approach of sensual man to God, by releasing him from his material condition and elevating his nature into the sphere of the spiritual and the Divine."[4] Nations capable of such and similar abstractions may well be expected to have passed entirely beyond the childlike stage of sacrifices.[5]

## VI. GENERAL SURVEY AND CLASSIFICATION OF HEBREW SACRIFICES.

THE offerings of the Hebrews, consisting like those of most other nations, either of animals or of vegetable productions (p. 10), were divided into the *bloody* and the *bloodless* kind.[6] Now the sacrifice may either be designed to evince the offerer's absolute submission to the Divine sovereignty, and to acknowledge God's unlimited sway over the destinies of man; or it may be intended as an expression of gratitude for blessings enjoyed; or it may serve to implore forgiveness and ex-

---

[1] Marheinecke.

[2] *Hegel*, Relig. Philos. I. p. 169.

[3] *Rosenkranz*, in Ersch und Gruber's Encyclop. 3 Sect. IV. 74.

[4] *Philippson*, Comment. p. 570.

[5] On Baader's work "Ueber eine künftige Theorie des Opfers oder des Cultus", see *Bähr*, Symb. II. 288 *sqq.*

[6] Called זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה (Ps. XL. 7; 1 Sam. II. 29; III. 14; Isai. XIX. 21; Am. V. 25; Dan. IX. 27; comp. Jer. XVII. 26); for זֶבַח denotes every sort of bloody sacrifice, whether of quadrupeds and birds or men (comp. Deut. XII. 21; 1 Sam. I. 21; II. 15, 19; 1 Ki. XIII. 2; Ezek. XVI. 20; Ps. CVI. 37; Eccl. IX. 2), but not as has been asserted (from 1 Sam. XV. 22; Isai. I. 11; Prov. XV. 8) bloodless offerings too: as, however, the bloody sacrifices were the most frequent and the most valued class, the altar was called מזבח, even that altar which was exclusively devoted to the burning of incense (מזבח קטרת). On the sacrificial tablets of Marseilles and Carthage, זבח occurs in the same generic sense as in Hebrew (Mars. l. 14, 15, 17; Carth. l. 9, 10), and בעל הזבח for *offerer of the sacrifice* (M. 4, 8, 10, 21; C. 2, 3; comp. *Mishn.* Zebach. XII. 3, 4), or in the combinations זבח שמן *bloody sacrifice with oil*, or זבח צר *one with a bloodless offering* (M. 12; C. 9). Although the verb זבח is, in certain respects, synonymous with שחט *to slaughter* (see p. 72), the noun זֶבַח implies the sacrifice of birds also, which were not properly *slaughtered* (see Sect. XIII. 3). On the probable reason why the combination זבח ועולה is frequently employed to describe the whole class of bloody sacrifices, see Sect. XV. But as the holocaust (עולה) was the most frequent of the animal offerings, all oblations are occasionally comprised in the phrase עולה ומנחה (Am. V. 22; Jer. XIV. 12). In Josh. XXII. 17, where עולה, זבח, and שלמים are used together, שלמים seems to be intended as the apposition or explanation of זבח (comp. ver. 23, זבחי שלמים).

piation for offences committed; or lastly, it may mark the return of a state of purity after a period of uncleanness, as after the recovery from leprosy or "a running issue."[7] In the first case, it was a *Burnt-offering* (עֹלָה); in the second, a *Thank-offering* (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים) or *Praise-offering* (זֶבַח תּוֹדָה); in the third, a *Sin-offering* (קָרְבַּן חַטָּאת) or a *Trespass-offering* (קָרְבַּן אָשָׁם); and in the last, a *Purification-offering.*[8] The thank-offerings included *the Paschal Sacrifice* (קָרְבַּן פֶּסַח), the offering of the *firstborn* of sacrificial animals (קָרְבַּן בְּכוֹרוֹת) and of the *firstfruits* (מִנְחַת בִּכּוּרִים), whether these be the new ears of corn (מִנְחַת הָעֹמֶר), or the loaves baked from the new grain (קָרְבַּן רֵאשִׁית), or any other vegetable production of the land (ק׳ רֵאשִׁית);[9] and to the sin-offerings may be counted the *Offering of Jealousy* presented to test a woman's conjugal fidelity (מִנְחַת קְנָאוֹת or מ׳ זִכָּרוֹן). As a rule, the burnt-, the expiatory, and the purification-offerings were animal sacrifices, though in exceptional cases a cereal sin-offering was permitted or prescribed, while the thank-offerings could either be animals or vegetable oblations.

The animal sacrifices, regarded as pre-eminently acceptable, were generally accompanied by bloodless offerings, and in many cases also by a libation of wine or a *drink-offering* (נֶסֶךְ), varied in quantity and graduated according to the nature of the chief sacrifice. Bloodless offerings were, however, also presented alone and independently of animal sacrifices, whether for the whole people and regularly, as the *shew-bread* (לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים) consisting of twelve unleavened cakes, and the *frank-incense* burnt by the High-priest every morning and every evening on the golden altar in the Holy; or for individuals and on special occasions, as eucharistic oblations,[10] the offerings of the firstlings and firstfruits, the cereal sin-offering (מִנְחַת חוֹטֵא), and the offering of jealousy.[11]

The Hebrew sacrifices may, therefore, be surveyed in the following table:

---

[7] Lev. XIV. 10 *sqq.*; XV. 14, 15, 29, 30; comp. also XII. 6—8.

[8] Generally, the three first divisions only are distinguished (comp. *Philo*, *De Victim.* 4 (τρία εἴδη θυσιῶν, τὸ μὲν ὁλόκαυτον, τὸ δὲ σωτήριον, τὸ δὲ περὶ ἁμαρτίας): but it is evident that the fourth forms a separate and important class of its own.

[9] For the generic name is מנחת בכורים, which applies both to מ׳ העמר and to מ׳ ראשית (see Lev. II. 14; XXIII. 17); though ראשית is naturally also used with regard to מ׳ העמר (Lev. XXIII. 10); comp. also Levit. II. 12; Deut. XXVI. 2, 10.

[10] Lev. II. 1—10.

[11] See in general Sect. XI.

I. Burnt-offering (עֹלָה) — exclusively an animal sacrifice (זֶבַח).

II. Joy-offering (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים) — either animal or vegetable (מִנְחָה).

  1. Praise-offering (זֶבַח תּוֹדָה or זֶבַח תּוֹדַת שְׁלָמִים).
  2. Thank-offering (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים).
  3. Paschal offering (קָרְבַּן פֶּסַח).
  4. Offering of firstborn animals (קָרְבַּן בְּכוֹרוֹת).
  5. Offering of Firstfruits (מִנְחַת בִּכּוּרִים).
     a. Offering of the first new ears of corn (מִנְחַת הָעֹמֶר).
     b. Offering of the first new bread (קָרְבַּן רֵאשִׁית).
     c. Offering of the firstfruits or other vegetable productions (ק׳ רֵאשִׁית).

III. Expiatory offering.

  1. Sin-offering (קָרְבַּן חַטָּאת) — mainly animal.
  2. Trespass-offering (קָרְבַּן אָשָׁם) — animal.
  3. Offering of Jealousy (מִנְחַת קְנָאוֹת or מ׳ זִכָּרוֹן) — vegetable.

IV. Purification-offering — mainly animal.

  1. After childbirth.
  2. After recovery from leprosy.
  3. After recovery from a running issue.

V. Drink-offering (נֶסֶךְ).

VI. Shew-bread (לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים).

VII. Incense-offering (קְטֹרֶת).

Besides this classification, another in Voluntary and Obligatory Sacrifices might be established: the former comprised the private holocausts, and the thank-offerings presented in consequence of a vow or as a free-will gift;[1] the latter, the public holocausts, the private and public praise-offerings, and the other sacrifices above enumerated.[2]

Again, offerings may be divided into those that were *most holy* (קָדְשֵׁי קָדָשִׁים) which stood in the closest connection with the altar or the sanctuary, and those that were *less holy* (קֹדֶשׁ or קָדָשִׁים קַלִּים). The former could only be touched by holy persons, that is, by priests,[3] to whose share all that was not burnt on the altar or elsewhere exclusively fell, and by whom alone — the male Aaronites — it was to be consumed,[4] in the holy place,[5] that is, in the Court of the Sanctuary,[6] near the brazen altar,[7] and of course in a state of purity:[8] they comprised the incense-offering and the shew-bread,[9] because both were

[1] See Sect. XIV.

[2] The distinction made by Ebn Ezra (on Lev. II. 14) that only the ראשית בכורים is obligatory, while מנחת בכורים is voluntary, is untenable; see *supra* p. 75, note 9.

[3] Lev. VI. 11, 20.

[4] Lev. VI. 11, 22; VII. 6. Num. XVIII. 10.

[5] Lev. VII. 6; X. 13; XXIV. 9.

[6] Lev. VI. 9, 19.

[7] Lev. X. 12.

[8] Lev. XXII. 3—7; Num. XVIII. 11; comp. vers. 9, 10.

[9] Exod. XXX. 36; Lev. XXIV. 9.

presented in the Holy itself, and the other vegetable oblations[10] of which a part was burnt on the altar "as a memorial" before God, and which were therefore, like the shew-bread, unleavened;[11] the sin- and trespass-offerings,[12] and the holocausts,[13] which were invariably killed on the northern side of the altar,[14] and not like the thank-offerings, in whatever part of the Court.[15] The less holy offerings might be eaten, whether partially or completely, in any locality within the holy town, in a clean place,[16] by the officiating priests, their families, including their wives and daughters, and every clean member of the household,[17] but not by anyone else or "a stranger", not even the married daughter of a priest living in the house of her husband;[18] whoever partook of them inadvertently had to make increased restitution:[19] they were the thank-offerings,[20] the firstborn of clean sacrificial animals,[21] the firstlings of oil, wine, and corn,[22] and the paschal sacrifice; of the thank-offerings and the firstlings, the fat and the fat parts alone, of the paschal lamb, which was roasted entire, nothing came on the altar; the first-fruits were merely placed before that holy structure.[23]

Some of the offerings were presented by *individuals* exclusively, viz. the Pesach, the trespass-offering, the offering of jealousy, of the firstborn animals, of the firstfruits of vegetable productions, and of purification; others in the name of the *nation* alone, viz. the shew-bread, the incense, the offering of the first new ears of corn and of the first new bread; the rest — burnt-, praise-, thank-, sin-, and drink-offering — were presented both as private and public sacrifices.[24]

The Hebrew offerings had a threefold aim — they were either designed to *express* the harmony of the worshipper with God, or to *restore*, or to *preserve* it: the first end was attained by the joy-offerings, the second by the expiatory and the purification-offerings,

---

[10] Lev. II. 3, 10; VI. 10; X. 12.

[11] Lev. VI. 9, 10; comp. II. 11.

[12] Lev. VI. 10, 18, 22; VII. 1, 6; X. 17; XIV. 13; Num. XVIII. 9.

[13] Though the holocausts are nowhere expressly so called, they were certainly not, as has been supposed, merely "holy" (so *Keil*, Levit. p. 26; a. o.).

[14] Lev. I. 11; VI. 18; VII. 2; XIV. 13.

[15] Comp. Lev. III. 2, 8, 13; see Sect. X. 3. Devoted property (חרם) of whatever description was also most holy (Lev. XXVII. 28); comp., however, Num. XVIII. 14.

[16] Lev. X. 14; comp. XXII. 3—7.

[17] Num. XVIII. 11, 13; Lev. VII. 34; X. 14, 15; Exod. XXIX. 28; Num. XVIII. 19.

[18] Lev. XXII. 10—13. [19] Lev. XXII. 14.

[20] Lev. XXIII. 20; Num. VI. 20; Exod. XXIX. 27.

[21] Num. XVIII. 17.

[22] Num. XVIII. 12.

[23] Deut. XXVI. 4, 10. Holy were also the tithes of the priests (Num. XVIII. 26—30), and the tithes of the Levites (Lev. XXVII. 30—33), but they were no offerings standing in connection with the altar.

[24] Comp. *Joseph*. Ant. III. ix. 1.

the third by the holocausts, the shew-bread, and the incense — a division which clearly discloses the internal nature of the various sacrifices.

## VII. ANIMALS AND VEGETABLES OFFERED.

The animals prescribed for sacrifices, were naturally limited to those characterised in the Pentateuch as "clean" (טָהוֹר).[1]

Of quadrupeds, therefore, the cloven-footed and the ruminants were permitted.[2] But among these again the Law singled out the species which formed the ordinary food of the Israelites, were most valuable to agriculturists, and therefore really involved a *sacrifice*, an act of devoted self-denial; especially as the same animals, being bred, reared, and domesticated by the worshipper, bore a close connection with his pursuits and his ordinary life, and were creatures which he "had toiled for and made grow." Hence the quadrupeds ordained for sacrifices were not beasts like the hart, the roebuck, or the fallow deer, though these were considered clean and lawful for food,[3] but mainly *cattle* (בְּהֵמָה),[4] whether from the *herd* (בָּקָר) or from the *flock* (צֹאן);[5] of the former class the *bullock*[6] and *ox*,[7] the *cow*[8] and *calf*;[9] of the latter class, the *sheep*,

1 Comp. Gen. VII. 2, 3; VIII. 20; Lev. XI. 47; XIV. 4; XX. 25; Deut. XIV. 11, 20.

2 Lev. XI. 3.

3 Deut. XIV. 5.

4 The word בהמה comprises properly all quadrupeds, but is generally applied to the domestic or tame kinds only, while the free beasts of field or forest are termed חיות (comp. Gen. I. 24, 25; VII. 21), or חיות השדה (Gen. II. 19). The third but unclean class of terrestrial animals are the *reptiles* (רֶמֶשׂ or שֶׁרֶץ, Gen. I. 24; VII. 21), which, together with the birds and the denizens of the water, complete the animal creation (Gen. I. 21, 24; VII. 21—23; comp. Ps. VIII. 8, 9).

5 That is, either a שׁוֹר or a שֶׂה; for the one denotes a single piece of the herd, the other of the flock (Lev. XXII. 23, 28; XXVII. 26; Ezek. XLV. 15); therefore, both בקר and שור may be applied to פר and עגל (comp. Lev. XXII. 27, 28); and both פר and עגל are called בן־בקר (Lev. IV. 3; IX. 2; 1 Sam. XIV. 32); while שֶׂה comprises sheep (כשב) and goat (עז) of either sex (Exod. XII. 5; Num. XV. 11; comp. Gen. XXX. 32, like the Homeric μῆλα), both being distinguished as שֶׂה כְבָשִׂים and שֵׂה עִזִּים (Deut. XIV. 4). בקר is also applied to either sex (comp. Gen. XXXIII. 13; Lev. III. 1; 2 Sam. XVII. 29); and the same is the case with שור (comp. Exod. XXI. 28; XXXIV. 19; Lev. IX. 4; XXII. 27; Num. XVIII. 17; Deut. XXV. 4); hence בקר and שור are used promiscuously (comp. Exod. XXII. 1; Num. VII. 3; 1 Sam. XIV. 32, 34; XV. 3, 9). Later writers designate the class בקר with הבהמה הגסה, the class צאן with הבהמה הדקה.

6 פַּר בֶּן־בָּקָר or בֶּן־בָּקָר (Lev. IV. 3, 14) or פַּר הַשּׁוֹר (Judg. VI. 25).

7 שׁוֹר, see *supra* note 5; comp. Ezra VI. 9, 17; or poetically אַבִּיר (Ps. XXII. 13; L. 13; etc.), or אֶלֶף (Deut. VII. 13; XXVIII. 4; Isai. XXX. 24; Ps. VIII. 8; Prov. XIV. 4), or אַלּוּף (Ps. CXLIV. 14). In the Phoenician language אלף is the ordinary name for bullock (*Plut.* Sympos. IX. ii. 3), and it occurs on the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles (line 3).

8 פָּרָה, Num. XIX. 2.

9 עֵגֶל or עֵגֶל בֶּן־בָּקָר (Lev. IX. 2, 3),

male[10] or female,[11] the *ram*[12] and the *lamb*,[13] the *goat*,[14] male[15] or female,[16] and the *kid of the goats*.[17]

Of FOWLS (עוף), *turtle-doves* (תורים) alone and *young pigeons*[18] were to be offered;[19] not only because, as Philo observes,[20] the pigeon

or עֶגְלָה or עֶגְלַת בָּקָר (Gen. XV. 9; Deut. XXI. 3; Judg. XIV. 18; 1 Sam. XVI. 2; Hos. X. 11; Isai. VII. 21; Jer. L. 11), or מְרִיא *fatling* (2 Sam. VI. 13; 1 Ki. I. 9; Isai. XI. 6; etc.). It appears that the calf (עגל or עגלה) was properly so called during the first year only (comp. Lev. IX. 3; Mic. VI. 6); and that it became bullock or cow (פר, פרה) when its horns grew strong and conspicuous (comp. Ps. LXIX. 32; Job XXI. 10; Num. XIX. 2), or according to Rabbinical tradition, after the completion of the third year (comp. *Maimonid.* Yad Chazakah Hilch. Par. Adum. I. 1; De Sacrif. I. 14); yet עגלה is used of a cow three years old (Gen. XV. 9) yielding milk (Isai. VII. 21), and fit for ploughing and threshing (Judg. XIV. 18; Hos. X. 11; Jer. L. 11); and עגל even of a bullock seven years old (Judg. VI. 25; comp. *Aristot.* Hist. An. VI. 21).

10 כֶּשֶׂב or כֶּבֶשׂ, Lev. I. 10; III. 7; IV. 32: the כשב is, in age, between the טלה and איל, or about one year old; comp. *Hom.* Od. IX. 221, 222, χωρὶς μὲν πρόγονοι, χωρὶς δὲ μέτασσαι, χωρὶς δ' αὖθ' ἕρσαι; and Kimchi, "it is called כשב if one year old, and איל if older."

11 כִּשְׂבָּה or כַּבְשָׂה, כִּבְשָׂה (Lev. V. 6; XIV. 10; 2 Sam. XII. 3) or רָחֵל *ewe* (Gen. XXXI. 38; XXXII. 15; Is. LIII. 7; Cant. VI. 6).

12 איל, Gen. XXII. 13; Lev. V. 15; etc.

13 שֶׂה, Gen. XXII. 7, 8; Is. XLIII. 23, also the *sucking lamb* (טְלֵה חָלָב, 1 Sam. VII. 9) up to the fourth month (comp. Is. XL. 11).

14 עֵז, Lev. I. 10; III. 12; etc.

15 שָׂעִיר (Lev. XVI. 9, 10) or שְׂעִיר עִזִּים (Lev. IV. 23; comp. Ezra. VI. 17), prop. the *hairy* or *hirsute* (Gen. XXVII. 11; comp. *hircus* and *hirtus*, *hirsutus*), that is, the *older* and therefore longer-haired animal, never killed for food (for Joseph's brothers did not slaughter the שעיר עזים for the purpose of *eating* it, Gen. XXXVII. 31), and therefore never employed for burnt- or thank-offerings, which were "the food" of the Lord (p. 7), but only for sin-offerings (see *infra*); or עַתּוּד (prop. *ready, vigorous*), the younger and stronger animal (Arab. عتود, *Freytag*, Lex. Arab. III. 103) employed for breeding (Gen. XXXI. 10, 12) and killed for food (Deut. XXXII. 14; Jer. LI. 40), and hence, like the bull, the ram, and the lamb, presented as burnt- and thank-offerings (Num. VII. 17, 23, 29 *sqq.*; Isai. I. 11; XXXIV. 6; Ezek. XXXIX. 18; Ps. L. 9, 13; LXVI. 15); therefore, the princes and chiefs of the people are called עתודים (Isai. XIV. 9; Zechar. X. 3); the word is most likely identical with תַּיִשׁ (properly the *pushing* or *goring* animal; Gen. XXX. 35; XXXII. 15; Ps. XXX. 31; 2 Chr. XVII. 11). That שעיר and עתוד are distinct from each other, is evident from Num. VII. 16 and 17, 22 and 23 (comp. *Bochart,* Hieroz. II. pp. 640—649), but the difference is nearly the reverse of that stated by Kimchi (Seph. Hashar. sub עתוד): הגדולים יקראו עתודים והתישים והקטנים יקראו שעירים.

16 שְׂעִירַת עִזִּים (Lev. IV. 28; V. 6); also עֵז simply (Num. XV. 27).

17 גְּדִי עִזִּים (Judg. VI. 19; XIII. 19; comp. Exod. XXIII. 19).

18 בְּנֵי הַיּוֹנָה, or גוזל (Gen. XV. 9).

19 On צִפֳּרִים mentioned in Lev. XIV. 4, whether meaning pigeons or any other kind of clean birds, see notes *in loc.*

20 De Victim. c. 1.

**is by nature the most gentle of all birds which are domesticated and gregarious, and the turtle-dove the most unoffending of those which love solitude;[1] but because they were abundantly reared and kept in Palestine,[2] and formed the principal animal food of the poor: they were also found wild in mountains and ravines throughout the country;[3] travellers were struck by their vast numbers in the vicinity of Ashkelon, and especially near Jerusalem, where in one tower more than 5000 were observed;[4] they are met with near the Dead Sea and the Lake of Tiberias,[5] and in every part of Syria.[6] As their value was inconsiderable, they were indeed in exceptional cases admitted as holocausts and sin-offerings,[7] but they were unlawful for thank- or praise-offerings, and could never be presented as a public sacrifice. Yet in such large numbers were they constantly required, especially by women who had to offer them in all cases of impurity, issue of blood, and childbirth,[8] that they sometimes rose to a very high price, and even compelled the adoption of sacrificial regulations of less stringency.[9] Geese were, and are still, very rare in Palestine, and are not mentioned in the Old Testament.[10] Cocks and hens are supposed to have been rejected because they seek for food in dunghills, and might therefore be polluted by unclean insects or reptiles,[11] or because they were not valued as food;[12] but more probably because, at the time of the compilation of Leviticus, they were not yet domesticated in Palestine; they are, in fact, never alluded to in the Hebrew Scriptures;[13] they do not seem to have been common in western Asia before the Persian period;**

---

1 Comp. *Bochart,* Hieroz. II. pp. 18—25.

2 Comp. Isai. LX. 8; 2 Ki. VI. 25.

3 Ezek. VII. 16; Jer. XLVIII. 28; Cant. II. 14; Ps. XI. 1; John II. 14; comp. *Bochart*, l. c. II. pp. 17—19.

4 Comp. *Joseph*. Bell. Jud. V. iv. 4. (*πύργοι πελειάδων ἡμέρων*); *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. VIII. 14 (*ἀμήχανόν τι πελειάδων πλῆθος*); etc.; comp. *Rosenmüll.* on Levit. I. 14.

5 *Seetzen,* Reisen, II. 309.

6 "You find in many places", says Maundrell, "more dove-cots than houses" (Early travels in Palestine, ed. Wright, p. 385).

7 Comp. Lev. I. 14; V. 7; XII. 6, 8; XIV. 22; XV. 14, 29; Num. VI. 10; comp. the notes *in locc.*

8 See p. 21.

9 Comp. *Mishn*. Kerith. I. 7; Bab. Bathr. II. 5; Bab. Kam. VII. 7.

10 בַּרְבֻּרִים in 1 Ki. V. 3 is of uncertain meaning (comp. *Bochart*, Hieroz. II. 127—135; *Gesen*. Thesaur. p. 246; *Fürst*, Lex. p. 216); in the Talmud geese are called אווזין or קאקי (Zebach. 70*b*; Gittin 73*a*, etc.). The assertion of Michaelis that the goose is included in the list of the forbidden birds (Lev. XI. 13—19), has no other foundation than his presumption that it must necessarily have been interdicted to a people liable to skin-diseases (*Michaelis*, M. R. § 203).

11 Comp. Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan c. 35; *Mishn*. Bab. Kam. VII. 7; Kelim VIII. 5; *Talm*. Bab. Kam. 82*b*.

12 *Rosenm*. l. c.

13 Nor by Homer and Hesiod.

but they are repeatedly alluded to in the New Testament,[14] and appear extremely frequent in the Talmudical period.[15]

*Fishes* were not at all accepted as sacrifices, evidently because they multiply freely in the water, without the care and control of man; not, as has been contended, because they belong to a very low class in the animal creation;[16] or because they have no heart;[17] or did not yet, in the time of Moses, form a favourite or appreciated article of food(!);[18] or can but rarely be brought to the altar alive;[19] or because their flesh, supposed to be weak and engendering effeminacy,[20] was deemed unworthy of the Deity.[21]

The significance of all these restrictions is manifest: the Law demanded for sacrifices not merely the tamest animals[22] and such as were most readily at hand,[23] but those which, at the same time, reminded the worshippers of their daily labour, of their dependence on Him who had allowed it to prosper, and of their deep obligations to His unceasing beneficence. Although the stag and the deer, when kept and bred, were unquestionably the property of individuals, they could, as a species, not be claimed by legal owners; and might well be regarded, even if not presented on the altar, as belonging to God, the Lord of nature: "I will take no bullock, says God, out of thy house, nor he-goats out of thy folds; for every beast of the forest is Mine, and the cattle upon thousands of hills."[24] Not all the productions of the land, nor all the articles of food, were demanded, but those only which man had made his own by honest exertion and watchful care. The oblations were indeed to represent the property and sustenance, but also the active life and energy of the people. They were a partial restitution of the blessings which God had mercifully vouchsafed to the offerer;[25] they impressed the seal of religion upon his gain and the

[14] Matth. XXVI. 34; Mark XIV. 30; Luke XIII. 34; XXII. 34, etc.; comp. *Bochart*, Hieroz. II. 109—126; *Winer*, Real-Wört. I. 515.

[15] In the Talmud, the cock is called תרנגל or תרנגולא, שכוי, נרגול, and גבר; the hen תרנגלות, גבריה, or סכות; comp. *Othon*. Lexic. Rabbin. I. 256 *sqq*.; *Lewysohn*, Zoolog. des Talm. p. 194.

[16] Philo (De Mund. Opif. c. 21) calls them *κινητὰ ἄψυχα*.

[17] *Vegetus*, De natatilibus ad aram Jehovae non factis.

[18] *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 112; *Rosenm*. Excurs. I. in Levit. p. 193; comp. *Hom*. Od. IV. 368; XII. 331; etc.

[19] *Cornelius a Lapide* on Levit. I. 2.

[20] *Plato*, Polit. III. 13 (404); *Corn. a Lapid*. l. c. (adde pisces, quia humore et semine abundant, symbolum esse ignaviae et luxuriae).

[21] Comp. *Plut*. Symp. VIII. 8; comp. *Winer*, Real-Wört. I. 374.

[22] Philo (De Victim. 1) *ἡμερώτατα καὶ χειροηθέστατα*; comp. *Theodoret*. Quaest. in Lev. I.

[23] Comp. *Midr. Rabb*. 197*b*; *Bammidbar* 277*a*; *Abarban*. Introd. to Levit. c. 1.

[24] Ps. L. 9, 10; comp. Isai. XL. 16.

[25] Comp. Deut. XVI. 17; XXVI. 10; Hos. IX. 4.

produce of his work; they hallowed his life, for the maintenance of which that gain was destined.[1]

But though this conception appears obvious, the ordinances in respect to the sacrificial animals have frequently been explained in a manner both so fantastical and so foreign to the spirit of the Pentateuch, that a refutation is scarcely required. It has been supposed that such animals were appointed which heathens held sacred or worshipped, and which the Hebrews were therefore to be accustomed to slaughter: but there is scarcely an animal which was not so revered in the ancient world; and the Levitical law does not systematically carry out the principle of opposition to pagan rites or notions.[2] More objectionable still than this opinion, which has at least an historical tendency, is the *typical* view. It was asserted that the bullock, the sheep, and the goat, valuable in the order mentioned, were designed to recall the memory of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaak, and Jacob, who present the same gradation of excellence and virtue;[3] while the turtle-dove and the pigeon were symbols of Moses and Aaron.[4] By some, those animals were regarded as emblems of the people of Israel itself.[5] Others contended that the bullock was chosen because it appeared most suitable to typify the power of Christ and of his work, the lamb his innocence, the goat his appearance as a sinner, the pigeon his gentleness, the turtle-dove his intimate relationship with God, the oil and wine his blood, and the flour his flesh and sacrifice, or his obedience manifesting itself in good works.[6] But these explanations, trifling and playful, are well calculated to reveal the baseless fallacy of all typical theories.[7]

Now the value of the victim was generally proportionate to the dignity or importance of the occasion. The noblest sacrifice was that of the *bullock* (פַּר), which was so considered also by the Greeks[8] and Romans,[9] the Phoenicians and Carthagi-

[1] Comp. *Kurtz*, Opfercultus, pp. 39—41; *Keil*, Archäol. I. 197—203.

[2] Comp. Sect. IX. 10.

[3] Comp. Gen. XVIII. 7; XXII. 13; XXVII. 9.

[4] So *Abarbanel*, Introd. to Lev. c. 1.

[5] Comp. Hos. IV. 16; X. 11; Isai. XLVIII. 17; L. 6, 17; Ezek. XXXIV. 20, 31; Cant. II. 14; etc.

[6] Comp. *Corn. a Lap.* on Lev. I. 2 and II. 1; *Michaelis*, Typische Gottesgelahrtheit, p. 88; comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. 315.

[7] Comp. Sect. IX. 11.

[8] Hence *βουθυτεῖν* and *βουθυσία* were used to express sumptuous splendour (*Erasm.* Adag. 2150, p. 720, "Divitium enim est vel regum potius, boves immolare").

[9] It was the *victima maxima* (*Virg.* Georg. II. 146) or "victimae opimae et laudatissima deorum placatio" (*Plin.* H. N. VIII. 45 or 70); comp. *Varro*, De Re Rust. II. 5 ("nam bos in pecuaria maxima debet esse auctoritate, praesertim in Italia, quae a bubus nomen habere sit existimata", etc.); *Columella*,

nians,[10] the Egyptians and Persians,[11] who offered it, on solemn opportunities, to their principal deities, to Zeus, to Isis and Osiris, to Baal and the Sun. It formed the *burnt-offering* of the whole nation on the days of the new-moon and on the high festivals,[12] and for inadvertent transgressions;[13] of the chiefs of the people at the consecration of the Tabernacle;[14] of the Levites at their initiation;[15] and of private individuals on all momentous emergencies.[16] It was the *sin-offering* for the whole theocratic community, or for its representative, the High-priest;[17] for the priests at the inauguration in their solemn functions,[18] and for the High-priest when, on the Day of Atonement, he implored the pardon of God for his sins and those of his house;[19] while Aaron, when actually entering upon his pontifical duties, offered a young calf.[20] It was even chosen for *thank-offerings* in cases of peculiar joyfulness.[21]

Next in value and estimation stood the *ram* (אַיִל), which, like the bullock, was the type of strength and boldness.[22] It was presented as a *holocaust* or a *thank-offering* by the whole people,[23] or its chiefs;[24] by the High-priest or an ordinary priest,[25] and by the God-devoted Nazarite;[26] but never by a common Hebrew; and as it was primitively employed for a medium of exchange and barter,[27] it was the ordinary animal for the *trespass-offering* originally instituted to expiate violation of the rights of property.[28]

*Goats* were prized less highly and deemed less palatable than even sheep.[29] Yet a *kid of the goats* (שְׂעִיר עִזִּים) was the special victim for *sin-offerings*, partly because the chief species of cattle had long been appropriated to the other sacrifices when the expiatory offerings were

---

De Re Rust. VI. Praef. ("nec dubium quin . . . celeras pecudes bos honore superare debeat . . . quod laboriosissimus adhuc hominis socius in agricultura", etc.).

[10] *Plut.* Symp. IX. ii. 3. ("they assign to the bullock the very first place among the necessaries of life"); *Lucian*, Dea Syr. c. 54; *Herodian.* V. 5; *Ach. Tat.* Am. II. 15; *Mov.* Opferw. p. 42.

[11] *Xen.* Cyr. VIII. iii. 11.

[12] Num. XXVIII. 11, 19, 27, etc.

[13] Num. XV. 24. [14] Num. VIII. 12 *sqq.*

[15] Num. VIII. 12.

[16] Lev. I. 3, etc.; see Sect. XIII.

[17] Lev. IV. 3, 14.

[18] Exod. XXIX. 14, 36; Lev. VIII. 14—17.

[19] Lev. XVI. 3, 6, 11.

[20] עגל בן בקר, Lev. IX. 1—8.

[21] See Sect. XIV.

[22] That the איל was regarded superior to the כבש, is evident from Num. XV. 5, 6, 11; XXVIII. 11—13, 19—21, 27—29.

[23] Lev. IX. 4, 18; XVI. 5; XXIII. 18; Num. XXVIII. 11—14; XXIX. 2, 3.

[24] Num. VI. 14, 17; VII. 15, 21, 27, etc.

[25] Lev. VIII. 18, 22; IX. 2; XVI. 3.

[26] Num. VI. 14; comp. Am. II. 11, 12.

[27] *Pecunia*; comp. *Varro*, l. c. and Ling. Lat. V. 95; *Columella*, l. c.

[28] Lev. V. 15, 18, 25; XIX. 21; Num. V. 8; see notes on V. 14—26.

[29] Comp. Matth. XXV. 32—42; Luke XV. 29, 30.

introduced, and partly because the legislators desired to bring this most important and most spiritual class of sacrifice within the means of poorer people — a consideration which prompted even the admission of a *vegetable sin-offering*, though the sprinkling of blood was ordinarily the very centre of the rituals of atonement.[1] It was ordained for the sin-offering of the whole people, on the days of the new-moon and the festivals,[2] after unintentional transgressions,[3] and immediately after the consecration of the priests and the Sanctuary;[4] and of the chiefs and private Israelites on all ordinary occasions;[5] it was admitted for private *burnt-* and *thank-offerings*;[6] but it was never prescribed for public burnt-offerings. Of the gradual substitution of bullocks instead of goats for expiatory offerings we have treated above (pp. 40, 41).

The *lamb* (כֶּבֶשׂ), the usual animal food of eastern tribes, was regularly employed for the daily *public holocausts*,[7] presented on festivals in increased numbers and accompanied by bullocks and rams;[8] and very commonly for private burnt- and thank-offerings, for sin-, trespass-, and purification-offerings.[9]

The gradation in the choice of the victims is plainly manifest from the precepts as to sin-offerings: the High-priest or the whole community required a bullock; a chief of the people a male kid of the goats; and a common Israelite a female kid of the goats or a female lamb.[10]

The *pigeon* and the *turtle-dove* were enjoined as burnt- and sin-offerings in cases of lustration after a period of uncleanness, as after the cessation of a "running issue", whether of a man or a woman,[11] or after a Nazarite's unavoidable contact with a corpse;[12] they were allowed as private holocausts,[13] and accepted from poorer people, instead of more valuable animals, as sin-offerings, and as purification-offerings after recovery from leprosy and after childbirth;[14] but they were not

---

1 See Sect. X. 7. — It is too vague to suppose that, as the sin-offering was no "food of Jehovah", any animal sufficed, which represented the substitution of its life for that of the offerer (*Knobel*, Lev. pp. 389, 390); while the view that the goat recalls the idea of sin and grief by its long and shaggy hair (*Bähr*, Symb. II. 398) finds no support in the O. T.

2 Lev. XVI. 9, 15; XXIII. 19; Num. XXVIII. 15, 22, 30; XXIX. 5, 11, 16.

3 Num. XV. 24.

4 Lev. IX. 3, 15; X. 16.

5 Lev. IV. 23, 28; V. 6.

6 Lev. I. 10; III. 12; XXII. 19; Num. VII. 17, 23; XV. 11; see *supra*.

7 Exod. XXIX. 38—42; Num. XXVIII. 3—8; comp. Lev. IX. 3; Ezek. XLVI. 13.

8 Num. XXVIII. 11, 19, 27, etc. See Sect. XIII.

9 Lev. I. 10; III. 7; IV. 32; V. 6; XII. 6—8; XIV. 10; Num. VI. 12, 14.

10 Lev. IV. 3, 14, 23, 28, 32; see Sect. VIII; comp. *Philo*, De Victim. c. 10.

11 Lev. XV. 14, 15, 29, 30.

12 Num. VI. 10, 11; comp. Lev. XIV. 49.

13 Lev. I. 14—17.

14 Lev. V. 7; XII. 8; XIV. 22.

admitted as thank-offerings, nor ever formed a part of the great public or festival sacrifices.[15]

All these animals were variously combined, multiplied, or exchanged in accordance with the occasions for which they were required; the reasons for the choice, though not always obvious, may in many instances be pointed out with some degree of probability, and they testify to the thoughtful character of the sacrificial ordinances.

No less manifest is the principle of the Pentateuch in the selection of the *vegetable productions* that were to be taken for the bloodless offerings: it is entirely identical with that set forth in respect to animals. The chief materials were *flour* (סֹלֶת), or in some cases, *roasted grains* rubbed out of the early ears of corn,[16] and *wine* (יַיִן);[17] for bread and wine are frequently named as the principal means of sustenance, and the choicest blessings of a fertile soil;[18] and next in importance came *oil* (שֶׁמֶן), which, belonging to the daily necessaries of Eastern life,[19] was commonly employed for libations and for preparing cereal offerings: these three productions therefore are often coupled to express the staple of Canaan's wealth and of the people's nourishment.[20] Moreover, as accessories were ordained *frank-incense* (לְבֹנָה) and *salt* (מֶלַח), the latter to be added on nearly all occasions;[21] and *leaven* (שְׂאֹר) or *honey* (דְּבַשׁ) to be used in a few instances.[22] Not the free and common gifts or the spontaneous vegetation of nature, however esteemed and precious, were to be dedicated to the deity, not figs, pomegranates, dates, or almonds, though forming characteristic products of Palestine, but those objects only, which the offerer had made his individual property by exertion and anxious attention and which he had obtained by the sweat of his brow:[23] gratitude, humility, self-abnegation, and the reality of a hard-working life, were to be mirrored in every offering.

The simplicity of these regulations appears more strikingly still if compared with the practice of other nations. As offerings were extensively supposed to be the sustenance of the gods (p. 6), we find, indeed, theoretically the principle adopted almost everywhere that the victims

---

[15] Comp. Num. XXVIII. XXIX.

[16] אָבִיב קָלוּי בָּאֵשׁ גֶּרֶשׂ כַּרְמֶל. Lev. II. 14; see Comm. *in loc.*

[17] Comp. Exod. XXIX. 40; Lev. XXIII. 13; etc.

[18] Gen. XXVII. 28, 37; Judg. XIX. 19; 1 Sam. I. 24; XVI. 20; XXV. 18; Ps. CIV. 15; Lam. II. 12; Neh. V. 15; Luke VII. 33; etc.; comp. also Gen. XIV. 18.

[19] Sir. XXXIX. 31; Jer. XXXI. 12.

[20] Num. XVIII. 12; Deut. XI. 14; XII. 17; XVIII. 4; XXIV. 19—21; XXVIII. 39, 40; Josh. XXIV. 13; Judg. XV. 5; 2 Ki. XVIII. 32; Mic. VI. 15; Neh. XIII. 5, 12.

[21] Lev. II. 13; see Sect. IX. 1.

[22] Lev. VII. 13; XXIII. 17; comp. II. 12; see Sect. VIII.

[23] Gen. III. 17—19.

should be animals useful to man as food, such as bullocks, sheep, stags, pigs, and fowl; while those which are serviceable to him by their labour merely, as donkeys and elephants, were not acceptable; and useless and noxious animals, as monkeys and serpents, were entirely rejected.[1] Accordingly, the eatable domestic animals were very commonly killed for offerings.[2] Ancient writers supposed that pigs were the earliest victims,[3] though these were by some nations scrupulously avoided as sacrifices, either because they were held in veneration or in abhorrence.[4] Bullocks and cows, sheep, especially lambs, and goats, were ordinarily offered by the Greeks[5] and Romans,[6] by the Ethiopians,[7] the Syrians,[8] and Phoenicians, though the latter included game also, especially stags, geese, and other birds.[9] But the practice was regulated by a consideration connected with the very root of paganism. In the Laws of the Twelve Tables, it is enjoined, "Such beasts should be used for victims as are becoming and agreeable to each deity".[10] Now every divinity represented, as a rule, a power or manifestation of nature; the victim singled out was, therefore, designed to possess a *cosmic* significance; it bore a certain internal affinity to the deity itself — a point which will be more fully developed in its due place.[11] But the fluctuations involved in this doctrine are obvious. "What is the reason", exclaimed Arnobius,[12] "that this God should be honoured by bullocks, another by goats or sheep? the one by sucking pigs, the other by unshorn lambs, some by sterile kine, and some by pregnant sows; the one by white, the other by black animals, one by female, and the other by male victims?" Were those animals more pleasing to a god which had been dedicated to him as sacred, or those which stood in no such relation? The customs followed in this respect differed even to direct opposition. The former principle was indeed most extensively adopted.

---

[1] *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 25.

[2] Comp. *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 16, 17; see also *Spencer*, De Legg. Ritt. Lib. III. Diss. II. c. 2 (pp. 755, 756).

[3] So *Aristot.* Eth. Nicom. VIII. 11; *Ovid*, Fast. I. 349; *Varro*, R. R. II. 4; comp. *Hom.* Od. XIV. 419.

[4] *Herod.* II. 47; *Lucian*, Dea Syr. c. 54.

[5] Comp. *Eustath.* ad Odyss. XI. 130; Schol. ad *Aristoph.* Plut. 820; *Suidas sub* βοῦς ἕβδομος (*πρόβατον*, ὗς, *αἴξ*, *βοῦς*, *ὄρνις* [hen], *χήν*).

[6] *Tacit.* Ann. VI. 37; *Plin.* H. N. VIII. 70, 72 (magna et pecori gratia vel in placamentis deorum vel in usu vellerum); *Varro*, Ling. Lat. V. 95—99.

[7] *Plin.* H. N. XII. 42.

[8] *Lucian*, l. c. and De Sacrif. c. 12; *Herodian.* V. 5.

[9] Corresponding to the Levitical division in בהמה and עוף, the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles distinguishes between מקנא and צפר, and systematically adheres to this classification (lines 3 to 10, 11, 12, 15); comp. *Movers*, Opferwesen der Karthager, p. 41—58; *Ewald*, Phönik. Inschr. zu Marseilles, p. 15 *sqq.*

[10] Quaeque cuique divo decorae gratae sint hostiae providento.

[11] See Sect. XX.

[12] Adv. Nat. VII. 18; comp. c. 21 (si caper caedatur Jovi etc.).

The Greeks and Romans laid it down as a rule that every deity was to be honoured by its own favourite or kindred animals[13] — the Olympians by refulgently white, the terrestrial, the marine, and lower gods by dark-coloured victims;[14] the former also by birds, the latter mainly by quadrupeds.[15] The Greeks sacrificed, therefore, game of any kind and especially stags to Artemis;[16] swine, the emblem of fruitfulness, to Demeter; he-goats to Dionysos, notorious for amorous desires;[17] cows to Latona;[18] black cattle and sometimes horses to Poseidon;[19] donkeys to Priapus; dogs to Hecate, — selections which a reference to the mythological character of the deities will render intelligible. In a similar manner, the Romans appeased Jupiter Capitolinus with white cattle except bulls and rams;[20] Apollo, Neptune, or Mars with bulls; Juno Calendaris with a white cow, on account of her moon-shaped horns;[21] Mars also with wolves; the virgin Minerva with an intact heifer; Venus with doves and sparrows, "the wanton birds";[22] while swine in general were immolated to all agrarian deities, and to Mars, Ceres, and Tellus, for confirming imprecations or ratifying treaties.[23] But other nations followed the contrary law, and abstained from offering to a deity the animals sacred to it. Thus the Egyptians never sacrificed cows, because holy to Isis,[24] or rather to Athor,[25] worshipped throughout the land as the primary principle of all things and the creative power of nature. In the Thebais, they offered goats and no sheep, in Mendes sheep and no goats, because the sheep were held sacred in the one district, and the goats in the other.[26] They avoided the sacrifice

---

[13] *Τῷ ὁμοίῳ χαίρει τὸ ὅμοιον*, was a proverbial adage; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 9.

[14] Comp. *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 20 (quia nigra nigris conveniunt et tristia consimilibus grata sunt); *Hom.* Od. XI. 32, 33; *Virg.* Aen. VI. 243.

[15] Comp. *Euseb.* l. c.; see also *Porph.* De Antr. c. 6.

[16] *Ovid*, Fast. I. 388; *Pausan.* VII. xviii. 7; *Servius* ad Virgil. Aenaeid. II. 116.

[17] Comp. *Hor.* Od. III. vii. 6; *Martial*, III. xxiv. 1—14. [18] Liv. XXV. 12.

[19] Comp. *Pausan.* VIII. vii. 2.

[20] *Serv.* ad Virg. Aen. IX. 628; *Macrob.* Sat. III. 10.

[21] *Virg.* Aen. IV. 59—61.

[22] Comp. *Ovid*, Fast. I. 451, 452; *Apulej.* De Magia, p. 52, ed. Bipont.; *Lucian*, Dea Syr. c. 49; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 9.

[23] Comp. *Ovid*, Fast. I. 671—679; IV. 634; Metam. IV. 755, 756; XII. 151; *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 22; *Eustath.* ad Iliad. II. 550; X. 292; Od. III. 382; see also *Creuzer*, Symb. IV. 93, 289, 291, 378, 380. [24] Herod. II. 41; comp. *Porph.* Abst. IV. 7.

[25] For Herodotos excusably confounds Isis and Athor whose attributes bear a close resemblance, and who are, in later monuments, scarcely distinguishable; see *G. Wilkinson* on Herod. II. 40, note 5, in Rawlinson's edition.

[26] Herod. II. 42. It cannot be proved, and is in itself improbable, that the animals were sometimes chosen on account of their *enmity* to the gods, and that it was desired to destroy or to ex-

of turtle-doves from a curious reason.[1] The Syrians and Assyrians regarded the pigeon as so inviolable that even an accidental contact caused uncleanness for the day, because Semiramis was supposed to have finally been changed into that bird.[2] But in order to force or to annoy an *evil* deity, sometimes animals were killed, that were consecrated to it. Thus in times of serious illness, great misfortune, or protracted drought, which they attributed to the malice of Typhon, the Egyptians furtively and silently took some of his holy animals to a dark place, and tried to intimidate them by threats; if the calamity did not abate, they slaughtered them as a punishment (*κολασμός*) of the hated demon. At the interment of Apis, they threw some of Typhon's animals into the open grave, in order to vex him and to diminish his exultation at the death of the sacred bull.[3] In this manner, the strangest aberrations might arise; and not unfrequently the gravity of sacrificial rites was converted into futile play. When the animals deemed necessary for certain occasions could not be procured, various devices were resorted to. Sheep were sacrificed instead of stags, but were then named stags — an expedient similar to that adopted in the temple of Isis at Rome, where the priests used water of the Tiber instead of the Nile, but called it water of the Nile.[4] In fact, the principle was set forth that, in sacrificing, the appearance is taken for the reality; accordingly, if animals were required which it was difficult to obtain, such as the Sibylline books occasionally ordered, images of them were made in bread or wax, and offered as substitutes. This was also frequently done by poor people, who presented figures of animals, whether baked of flour or imitated in wax.[5] — Sometimes they offered even

---

terminate them by killing them as sacrifices; that, for instance, pigs were offered to Ceres, because they injure the crops, or goats to Bacchus, because they are fatal to the vine (comp. *Serv.* ad Virg. Aen. II. 180); or that in Egypt generally Typhonic animals were employed as victims (*Bähr*, Symb. II. 32. 235, 236), an opinion which cannot be derived from *Herod.* II. 39 or *Lucian*, De Isid. 30, 31, 50, and which is both against experience and reason: not the noxious, but the most useful animals were offered to the gods.

[1] *Ἱέραξ γὰρ, ἔφασαν, πολλαχῆ τὸ ζῶον συλλαβὼν ἀφίησι μισθὸν ἀποδιδοὺς μίξεως σωτηρίαν*; *Porph.* Abst. IV. 7.

[2] *Diod. Sic.* II. 4, 20; *Xenoph.* Anab. I. iv. 9; *Tibull.* I. vii. 17, 18; *Lucian*, Dea Syr. cc. 14, 54; Jup. trag. c. 42.

[3] Comp. *Plut.* De Isid. c. 73.

[4] *Festus* s. v. Cervaria ovis; *Serv.* ad Aen. II. 116.

[5] *Herod.* II. 47; *Varro*, R. R. VII. 44. *Suidas* s. v. *βοῦς ἕβδομος* — *πέμματα κέρατα ἔχοντα κατὰ μίμησιν τῆς πρωτοφαοῦς σελήνης· ἐκάλουν δὲ αὐτὸ βοῦν κτλ.* — The Egyptians sometimes offered cones of baked clay with a religious sentence stamped on the base, or small stone-pyramids with an inscription on each of the four sides (see *Sharpe*, Egyptian Myth. and Egypt. Christian. etc. pp. 39, 40).

apples (μῆλα) instead of sheep (μῆλα), on account of the identity of their *names!*[6]

It would be impossible to specify all the animals sacrificed in the heathen world; wherever they did not bear that cosmic relation to the gods which has above been alluded to, they represented either the productions of the country or the wealth of the population generally. We must, therefore, restrict ourselves to a few instances.

Among the Hindoos, the most solemn, or "the queen" of offerings, was the horse-sacrifice or *Âswamedha*;[7] to the goddess Kali, the personification of the destructive power of Shiva, and to the avenging demons Bhairawas they presented, besides bullocks and goats, stags, antelopes, and wild boars, also tortoises, ichneumons, and alligators, buffaloes and the rhinoceros, lions and tigers, and nine other species of wild beasts.[8] — The Arabs offered also camels;[9] the Ethiopians gazelles and gryphs;[10] the Laplanders rein-deer. White horses were extensively killed to the Sun, because it was deemed appropriate to dedicate the swiftest animal to the swiftest god;[11] this was the custom of the Persians and the Ethiopians, of the Magi at the river Strymon, the Scythians, and the Massagetae.[12] Northern tribes frequently slaughtered boars, the emblems of fruitfulness and generative power, especially in honour of those gods to whom the fructification of the soil was attributed, as to Freya in the beginning of February, to Freyr or Frikko, the god of the sun and of procreation, on the eve of the Jul festival in mid-winter, to whom nuptial sacrifices also were commonly offered.[13] The Danes, on their great festival celebrated every 9 years, sacrificed horses, dogs, cocks, and hawks, besides men, 99 of each species:[14] the number 9 so markedly prevailing in these arrangements, evidently points to generation and birth; and the same characteristic is manifest

---

6 *Pollux*, I. 30, 31 (*μῆλα θύουσι, λέγω δὲ οὐ τὰ πρόβατα . . . ἀλλὰ τὰ ἀκρόδρυα κτλ*).

7 *Manu* V. 53; XI. 75; comp. *Maurice*, Indian Antiqq. II. 162—174; *Wilson's* Translation of Rig-Veda-Sanhita, II. pp. 112—125; Introd. pp. XII—XV; *Lassen*, Ind. Alterth. I. 793; *Colebrooke*, Essays, p. 351, ed. 1858.

8 See the "blood-chapter" in Kalika-Purana, translated by Blaquiere, in the Asiat. Res. V. 371 *sqq*.

9 *Diod. Sic.* III. 43.

10 *Heliod.* X. 4.

11 Hence the neighing of horses, considered as an inspiration of the Sun, was on important occasions employed as an oracle, which was also the case among the old Teutons (comp. *Grimm*, Deutsche Mythol. p. 378).

12 *Herod.* I. 216; IV. 61, 62, 71; VII. 113; *Xenoph.* Cyrop. VIII. iii. 24; *Heliod.* X. 16; *Pausan.* III. 20; *Ovid*, Fast. I. 385, 386; comp. *Tacit.* Ann. VI. 37.

13 *Mone*, Geschichte des nordischen Heidenthums, I. p. 258; *Grimm*, Deutsche Mythol. p. 138 *sqq*.

14 *Mone*, l. c. p. 271; *Grimm*, l. c. p. 29.

in a corresponding festival of the Swedes, who every 9 years presented, as a great sin-offering, 9 men and 9 animals of every chief species.[1] Birds were also frequently sacrificed — geese by the Egyptians, especially to Isis,[2] by the Phoenicians,[3] the Greeks, and Romans; cocks by the Chinese, and by the Egyptians to Anubis,[4] guinea-fowls,[5] and eagles frequently by the Roman emperors, whose grand sacrifice[6] consisted of hecatombs of eagles, lions, and other rare animals.

As regards the bloodless offerings of the pagans, there was scarcely any vegetable production that was not presented on the altars either in its natural or in a prepared state.

In some religious systems of western Asia, frank-incense was offered in vast profusion. The Babylonians, on the great annual festival of Bel, burnt not less than a thousand talents of the precious perfume,[7] and the term "burning incense" became equivalent with sacrificing and worshipping generally.[8] Several Greek tribes adopted a similar practice; they brought offerings of fragrant wood, as of the cedar, the fig-tree, the vine, and the myrtle;[9] and later, of frank-incense itself,[10] which was generally laid on the altar in conjunction with other gifts, but was occasionally offered alone, as on the feast of the Diasia, when it was burnt to Zeus Meilichios; indeed, the frank-incense strewn on the victim was extensively supposed to be the most essential part of the animal sacrifice.[11]

The vegetable offerings of the Greeks were pre-eminently varied; they consisted of cakes,[12] in honour of Apollo and other deities;[13] dressed vegetables, as the pots of pulse (*χύτραι*) with which altars and statues of inferior deities were consecrated;[14] an olive or laurel branch enveloped in wool and hung round with various kinds of fruit (*εἰρεσιώνη*), carried about by singing boys on certain festivals, and then suspended at the house-door;[15] gall, regarded as a symbol of life, in opposition to honey typifying spiritual death;[16] and many other oblations suggested by Greek ingenuity and enthusiasm.

---

[1] *Mone*, l. c. p. 260; *Grimm*, l. c. p. 32.

[2] *Herod.* II. 45; *Pausan.* X. xxxii. 9; *Philostr.* Vita Apoll. V. 25; *Juven.* VI. 539.

[3] Comp. the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles (lines 11, 12, 15); *Movers*, l. c. p. 55.

[4] *Plut.* De Isid. c. 6.

[5] *Pausan.* l. c.

[6] Sacrificium imperatorium, *Capitolin.* in Maxim. et Balbin. c. 11.

[7] *Münter*, Rel. der Babylon. p. 66.

[8] Comp. 2 Ki. XXII. 17; XXIII. 5; Hos. XI. 2; Isai. LXV. 3; Jer. I. 16; VII. 9; comp. *Mich.* M. R. § 206.

[9] *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 5; comp. קרבן העצים, Nehem. XIII. 31.

[10] *Plin.* H. N. XIII. 1.

[11] Comp. *Porphyr.* l. c.

[12] *πέλανοι, πέμματα, πόπανα.*

[13] Comp. *Lucian*, De Sacrif. 12.

[14] *Aristoph.* Pac. 923, 924; Plut. 1197.

[15] *Aristoph.* Eq. 729; Vesp. 399; Plut. 1054.

[16] *Porphyr.* Antr. Nymph. c. 18 *fin.*; see Sect. IX. 10.

The Romans presented at first only salted cakes,[17] or other cakes[18] with wine, to Janus or Jupiter; or wine alone,[19] herbs, laurels, or violet-chaplets; then myrrh, the aromatic branches of the zeodary (costum),[20] frank-incense,[21] whether alone or mixed with wine, to Janus, Jupiter, and Juno,[22] the firstfruits (primitiae) of the crops, both in their natural state and prepared, and other vegetable productions, whether ready at hand or particularly valued.

But as a general rule, the pagans offered such oblations as were most palatable and savoury to themselves; so the Canaanites presented grape-cakes;[23] the Aramaeans baked cakes;[24] the negroes, besides coral-beads, cowries, and silver-money, also brandy or rum;[25] the American Indians tobacco; and the Samojedes employ greese, with which they besmear the faces of their idols — a natural consequence of the anthropomorphic character of their sacrifices.

The ancient Hindoos devoted to the gods rice,[26] and frequently clarified butter[27] poured on fire.[28] But their most general, as it was their earliest, offering consisted of the expressed and fermented, milky and subacid juice of the *soma* plant.[29] The fluid was mixed with curds, barley flour, and a species of wild corn,[30] and then presented in ladles to the deities invoked; a part of it was sprinkled on the fire, or on the ground, or on the sacred grass,[31] which, after the roots had been cut off, was spread on the altar, or strewn over the floor of the chamber, or arranged as a seat for the deity invited to the sacrifice; the residue was then drunk by those who assisted in the sacred act.[32] The *soma* was extolled, with enthusiastic praise, in many works of Hindoo literature, as the Rig-Veda,[33] and especially the Sama-Veda. It was called the grace of sacrifice, the exhilarator of mankind, on account of its

---

[17] See Sect. IX. 1.

[18] *Fest.* pp. 85, 310 strues fereta or ferta (Strues genera liborum sunt, digitorum conjunctorum non dissimilia, qui superjecta panicula in transversum continentur); *Cato*, R. R. 134, 141; *Ovid*, Fast. I. 276. [19] *Cato*, l. c. 132.

[20] *Prop.* IV. vi. 5; comp. *Plin.* H. N. XIII. i. 2; *Colum.* XII. 20; etc.

[21] *Ovid*, Fast. IV. 934; *Hor.* Od. I. xix. 14; *Dion. Hal.* VII. 72.

[22] *Cato*, l. c. 134.

[23] אשישי ענבים, Hos. III. 1; comp. 2 Sam. VI. 19; 1 Chr. XVI. 3; Cant. II. 5.

[24] כַּוָּנִים, Jer. VII. 18; XLIV. 19.

[25] Comp. *Burton*, Mission to Gelele, II. 332.

[26] *Manu* III. 82, 88, 215, 224.

[27] *Havis* or *havja*.

[28] Manu I. 94; III. 76.

[29] Or *Sarcostema viminalis* (the acid Asclepias), generally procured from the mountains of Ghilan or Mazenderan in the neighbourhood of Yezd (comp. *J. Stephenson's* Translation of the Sanhita of the Sama-Veda, Preface pp. 1 *sqq.*).

[30] Nivara or trin' adhanja.

[31] *Kusa* or Poa cynosuroides.

[32] See *Wilson's* Translation of Rig-Veda-Sanhita, Introd. I. pp. XXIII; 6, 9, 12, 13, 21, 34, 35, etc.

[33] Comp. hymn 91.

narcotic properties, the noblest of the life-giving powers of nature; it was supposed to secure immortality, and to be the delight of the gods, especially of Indra, who achieves his deeds of glory when inspired by its powers.[1] Gradually it was understood not merely as a drink, but as the god of drink, and was invested with the qualities of a supreme deity.[2] However, it did not maintain its place among the Hindoos; its sale and use were even considerably restricted by the laws of Manu.[3]

An old oblation of the Parsees was the *miezd*, a mixture of meat, bread, and fruit, which was blessed and then eaten. But to the *soma* of the Hindoos corresponds the *hom* or *hasma* of the Parsees, the juice of that wonderful tree through which an evil demon sent by Ahriman seduced and ruined the first human couple.[4] It was both their most important and most common sacrifice. The visions which it produced when tasted were regarded as prophetic. Thus *hom* became itself a genius or god, the sacrament of religion, the medium of divine revelation. He appeared to Zoroaster, whose father is, in the Zendavesta, represented as the most perfect of beings, and the first harbinger of the Law. He was worshipped already by the oldest fathers of the tribes and heroes, who were born by his grace; for *hom* is the protector of houses, cities and countries; he removes death, imparts health and vigour, grants children and long life, secures victory over the hatred of evil spirits, awards a place among the saints, and leads the soul the way to heaven.[5]

But the offerings of the heathens, however multifarious and diversified never embraced metal or other lifeless objects (ἄψυχα); they consisted exclusively of vegetable productions, of beasts, or of men (or ἔμψυχα), that is, of gifts connected with the soul of the cosmos or the life of nature, to which the individual existence of the worshipper was given up; they were thus rendered subordinate to the central idea of pagan theology; and herein presented one of the most striking and most interesting differences from the sacrifices of the Hebrews.

## VIII. QUALIFICATION OF THE OFFERINGS.

As the main object of sacrifices was to do homage to the Deity, whether by acknowledging His power, or thanking Him for His bounty, or imploring His forgiveness, the offerings were naturally required, from their value and condition, to be worthy of their important purpose.

---

[1] Comp. *S. Fr. Windischmann*, Ueber den Soma-Cultus der Arier, p. 6.

[2] Rig-Veda, I. 91, 22.

[3] Comp. *Manu* III. 158; XI. 7; see also III. 85, 87, 211; V. 96; IX. 129.

[4] See Comm. on Gen. p. 87.

[5] See the 9th and 10th *Hâ* of the *Jaçma*; Journ. Asiat. Quatrième Série, IV. 449; V. 409; VI. 148; VII. 5, 105, 214; *Lassen*, Ind. Alterth. I. 791.

Hence the qualifications, too essential to be left to individual arbitrariness, were strictly regulated by the Levitical law. The principles which, in this respect, guided the legislators, were mainly *excellence*[6] and *significance* of the gift. This is manifest from a consideration of the particular attributes.

A. The Animals were commanded to be

1. *Faultless* or *perfect.*[7] The precepts on this point are distinct and explicit; they are not only given in general terms, as, "Thou shalt not sacrifice to the Lord thy God any bullock or sheep, wherein is blemish (מום) or any defect;"[8] or, "If the beast has any blemish, as if it is lame or blind, thou shalt not sacrifice it to the Lord thy God;"[9] but the disqualifying faults are elaborately specified, "Whosoever will offer a sacrifice to the Lord for a burnt-offering, shall offer it for your acceptance, a male without blemish; ... but whatsoever has a blemish, that you shall not offer; for it shall not be acceptable for you. And whosoever will offer a thank-offering to the Lord ... it shall be perfect to be accepted; it shall have no blemish: animals that are blind, or broken, or maimed, or ulcerous, or scurvy, or scabbed, you shall not offer to the Lord ... You shall not offer to the Lord animals that are bruised, or crushed, or broken, or castrated; you shall not offer the food of your God of any of these; ... because their corruption is in them, and blemishes are in them; they shall not be accepted for you."[10] This law is specially enjoined with regard to burnt-,[11] thank-,[12] and expiatory offerings,[13] and to the paschal lamb.[14] Its rigour is somewhat relaxed in one single case. A bullock and a lamb with limbs either too short or too long were lawful for thank-offerings presented as free-will gifts (נדבה), though not as vows (נדר): but animals of that description are not properly disfigured by a defect (מום), but are merely abnormal in the proportion of their members; their flesh is not necessarily inferior; they could, therefore, be deemed acceptable for sacrifices offered from spontaneous impulse, without a positive religious obligation.[15] To devote faulty animals was regarded as an abomination to the Lord,[16]

---

6 Comp. 1 Sam. XV. 15; Ps. LXVI. 15; Mal. I. 7, 8.

7 תָּמִים, Sept. ἄμωμος, τέλειος; Onkelos שְׁלִים; Rashi, Ebn Ezra, and others בְּלֹא מוּם.

8 Deut. XVII. 1.

9 Deut. XV. 21.

10 Lev. XXII. 18—25; see Comm. *in loc.* Jewish tradition counts 50 different defects.

11 Lev. I. 3, 10; IX. 2, 3; XXIII. 18.

12 Lev. III. 1, 6; XXII. 21.

13 Lev. IV. 3, 23, 28, 32; V. 15, 18, 25; IX. 2, 3; XIV. 10.

14 Exod. XII. 5.

15 It is, therefore, obviously against the spirit of the Bible, to declare, as Talmudists have done, birds with minor defects as admissible (תמות וזכרות בבהמה ואין תמות וזכרות בעופות); *Maimon.* Hilch. Issur. Mizbeach, III. 1; comp. *Siphra* 239*a*.

16 Deut. XVII. 1.

a criminal desecration of the Divine name, and a pollution of the Temple and the altar.[1] It was certain to cause the rejection of the worshipper and his gift.[2] For man who owes all to God, ought, when he approaches His Sanctuary with new supplications, to dedicate to Him what is best and choicest, and to present to Him who is perfect only perfect oblations;[3] "lest the things consecrated to the most High appear contemptible, and His worship be degraded."[4] But that law of faultlessness is hardly intended as a symbol of the *offerer's* perfection, or of his required freedom from all failings and diseases of the soul whenever he enters the Temple;[5] it refers exclusively to the *sacrifice* which was to be worthy of God, the holy One;[6] much less can it be regarded typically to point to the unblemished purity of Christ.[7]

Hence the greatest care was bestowed on the selection of the victim. According to Jewish tradition, it was, before being admitted to the altar, examined from head to foot by experienced officials.[8] Among the Egyptians, a chief section of the priests[9] had the duty to mark the beasts which, on the closest inspection, had been declared fit for sacrifice, by tying a piece of papyrus round the horns, and stamping it with a signet-ring on sealing-clay: whoever offered an animal not sanctioned in this manner suffered death.[10] In fact, the Egyptians sacrificed only "such bulls and calves as were pure" or perfect.[11] Among the Greeks, the same rule was observed with conscientious strictness. They fixed as indispensable a considerable number of qualities; the victims were required to be "perfect, faultless, sound, healthy, unmaimed, complete and strong in limbs, unhurt, not deformed, not without horns, and not crippled".[12] Indeed, they established the comprehensive law, "The victim must be pure in body and life, and uninjured and uncorrupted";[13]

---

1 Mal. I. 6, 7. 2 Mal. I. 8, 9, 13.

3 Comp. *Eustath.* ad Hom. Il. I. 66, *τοῖς θεοῖς ὡς τελείοις προσάγειν χρῆται τέλεια.*

4 *Maimon.* Mor. Neb. III. 46; *Clericus* on Lev. XXII. 20 (sperni certe cultus Dei visus esset, si pecudes vitio quodam minus utiles illi oblatae fuissent).

5 Comp. *Philo*, De Victim. c. 2 (*μηδὲν ἀῤῥώστημα ἢ νόσημα ἢ πάθος ἐπιφέρεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ*); *Theodoret.* Quaest. in Lev. I; *Clericus* l. c. (eos demum homines placare deos qui quam minimis animi vitiis inquinati sunt).

6 Comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. 321.

7 Comp. 1 Petr. I. 19; Sect. IX. 11.

8 Called מבקרי מומי קדשים (comp. *Reland*, Antiqq. III. i. 11) or *μωμοσκόποι* (Clem. Alex., Chrysostom., a. o.); comp. *Philo*, De Victim. 2 (*οἱ δοκιμώτατοι τῶν ἱερέων, ἀριστίνδην ἐπικριθέντες εἰς τὴν τῶν μώμων σκέψιν, κτλ.*).

9 The *μοσχοσφραγισταί*, *Porphyr.* Abstin. IV. 7.

10 Comp. *Herod.* II. 38; see also *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 55.

11 *Herod.* II. 45 (*ὅσοι ἂν καθαροὶ ἔωσι*).

12 *Ἱερεῖα ἄρτια, ἄτομα, ὁλόκληρα, ὑγιῆ, ἄπηρα, παμμελῆ, ἀρτιμελῆ, μὴ κόλαβα, μὴ ἔμπηρα, μὴ ἠκρωτηριασμένα, μὴ λιάστροφα* (*Pollux*, Onom. I. 29).

13 *Δεῖ γὰρ τὸ θύσιμον τῷ τε σώματι*

or, "In general, whatever is not perfect and sound, must not be sacrificed to the gods."[14] Porphyry, desirous to prove the unreasonableness of animal sacrifices, observes, "Ought beasts which must be killed, to be offered to the gods? But how is this right, if they are worthless? And yet it is more befitting to offer these than faulty animals; for thus we should present the firstlings of evil, and not do honour to the gods."[15] Nor were the Romans less scrupulous on this point. They were careful to offer "select" animals,[16] which designation was explained to mean *perfect* and *faultless*;[17] or such that could be designated as *eximia*, which word, far from being a poetical epithet, was a sacerdotal or technical term.[18] On the Phoenician tablet of Marseilles, the attribute "perfect" (כלל) is almost invariably used in connection with the purification- and thank-offerings.[19] Indeed, all nations acted upon the same view which naturally suggests itself. The Eretrians alone, by a strange fancy, sacrificed to Artemis in their town Amarynthus *maimed* victims.[20]

2. For most occasions, the animal was ordered to be *male* (זָכָר). This was pre-eminently the case with regard to the more important classes of sacrifice — for the burnt-offerings, the paschal lamb, the principal expiatory offerings, and all sacrifices of whatever description presented in the name of the whole people.[21] In other instances, a *female* victim (נְקֵבָה) was demanded, as for the sin-offering of the common Israelite.[22] In others again, either a male or a female was permitted, as for private thank-offerings and firstlings.[23] For pigeons and turtle-doves no particular sex was prescribed in the Law.[24] It was

---

καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ καθαρὸν εἶναι, καὶ ἀσινὲς καὶ ἀδιάφθορον (*Plut.* De Defect. Orac. c. 49); comp. Schol. in Iliad. I. 66 (τὴν ἡλικίαν ἤτοι ὁλοκλήρων· λελωβημένον γὰρ οὐ θύεται, ἀλλ' ὑγιὴς ἡ τῶν τελουμένων θυσία).

[14] *Καὶ καθόλου ὅπερ ᾖ μὴ τέλειον καὶ ὑγιὲς οὐ θύεται τοῖς θεοῖς* (Schol. Aristoph. Acharn. 785); comp. *Suidas* sub *κόλουρα*; *Lucian*, De Sacrif. 12.

[15] *Οὐθὲν γὰρ μᾶλλον ταῦτα ἢ τὰ ἀνάπηρα θυτέον. Κακῶν δὲ οὕτως ἀπαρχὴν καὶ οὐ τιμῆς ἕνεκα τὰς θυσίας ποιήσομεν*; De Abstin. II. 23.

[16] Mactant *lectas* de more bidentes (*Virg.* Aen. IV. 57; VI. 38, 39; VIII. 544).

[17] "Lectae dicuntur hostiae . . . quae claudae, morbosae, aut vitiosae non sunt" (*Alex. ab Alex. Genial.* III. 12); comp. *Serv.* ad Aen. IV. 57 (moris fuerat ut ad sacrificia eligerentur oves quibus nihil deesset); *Ovid*, Metam. XV. 13 (victima labe carens); *Plin.* H. N. VIII. 45 or 70; *Tertull.* Apol. c. 40.

[18] *Macrob.* Sat. III. 5 (Verranius enim docet, eximias dictas hostias, quae ad sacrificium destinatae eximantur e grege); comp. *Virg.* Georg. IV. 550.

[19] Lines 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 16. Comp. *Movers*, Opferwesen der Carthager, pp. 58—60.

[20] *Aelian.* Hist. Nat. XII. 34; comp. *Plato*, II. p. 149.

[21] Comp. *Mishn.* Temur. II. 1. קרבנות צבור אין נוהגין אלא בזכרים.

[22] Lev. IV. 28, 32.

[23] Lev. III. 1, 6; *Siphra* 86*a*.

[24] Comp. *Talm.* Temur. 114*a*; *Siphra* 84*a*; *Abarb.* Introd. to Lev. c. 1. Hermaphrodite (אנדרוגינוס, ἀνδρόγυνος)

very generally supposed that the male is superior to the female.[1] The sin-offering of a chief was a kid of the goats (שעיר עזים), that of a common Israelite a female of the same species (שעירת עזים) or a female lamb.[2] Human sacrifices, the choicest of all offerings, consisted of males exclusively. It was regarded as base deceitfulness, sure of Divine punishment, if a man possessed a male animal, and yet vowed or sacrificed a female one.[3] We may thus understand the subtlety with which Philo refined the current notions. "A male", he observed, "is both more lordly than a female and more perfect, and more nearly related to the efficient cause;[4] while the female is imperfect, subordinate, and more fit to be passive than active;[5] so that the rational part of our soul, as intellect and reason, belongs to the male, the irrational part, as the outward senses, to the female sex."[6] Nor can we be surprised to find similar views prevailing among other nations also. In the temple of Venus at Paphos, victims of whatever species were allowed, provided they were males.[7] The sacrificial animals of the Hindoo divinities Kali and the Bhairawas were exclusively males. The Egyptians universally sacrificed male kine and male calves, but never the females, which were sacred to Isis, or rather to Athor; and cows especially were more venerated than any other animal.[8] Though the Mendesians paid reverence to all goats, they honoured the males more than the females; they esteemed the goatherds who tended the former more highly; and when one particular he-goat died, public mourning was observed throughout the district.[9] But another consideration, foreign and even antagonistic to motives of religion, frequently determined the choice. The killing of certain beasts was prohibited, when it would have been detrimental to the increase or quality of the species, or when they were too highly prized to be spared for offerings. The Egyptians and Phoenicians regarded it as a detestable crime to sacrifice or to consume female cattle; "they would sooner have eaten human than cow's flesh"; for the female animals, being more valuable, had become extremely scarce among them, and were to be left untouched for the sake of their breeding.[10] The Arabs released from labour any she-

---

or sexless (טומטום) animals were forbidden according to Rabbinical law (see *Talm.* Bechor. 41; comp. Rashi on Lev. I. 3).

1 הזכר נבחר מהנקבה, *Ebn Ezra* on Lev. I. 3; comp. Gen. XXXII. 15; and Comm. on Gen. p. 567.

2 Lev. IV. 23, 28, 32. 3 Mal. I. 14.

4 *Ἡγεμονικώτερον καὶ τελειότερον καὶ συγγενέστερον αἰτίῳ δραστικῷ.*

5 *Ἀτελές, ὑπήκοον, ἐν τῷ πάσχειν μᾶλλον ἢ ποιεῖν ἐξεταζόμενον.*

6 De Victim. c. 5; comp. De ebr. c. 14.

7 *Tacit.* Hist. II. 3 (hostiae ut quisque vovit, sed mares deliguntur).

8 *Herod.* II. 41; see p. 87.

9 *Herod.* II. 46.

10 *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 11 (*αἴτιον δέ, ὅτι χρήσιμον τὸ ζῷον ἐν τούτῳ ἐσπάνιζε παρ' αὐτοῖς . . . τῶν. δὲ θηλειῶν*

camel that had successively brought forth ten females; she was declared at liberty and hence called *sayiba*, the free one; she could not be used for riding or for carrying burdens;[11] her hair was not allowed to be cut, and her milk was reserved for her young ones and for guests only: if, in this state of privileged exemption, she gave birth to another female, the latter enjoyed the same distinctions.[12] The Egyptian priests pronounced some of the most useful animals as sacred, ostensibly from some mysterious cause, but really in order to guard against a diminution of their breed: so in the Thebaid, mutton, although the most wholesome meat in Egypt, was interdicted at a time when sheep were rare.[13] It was an old custom among the Athenians, for the sake of the produce of the flocks, never to slay a sheep which had not been shorn, or which had not brought forth any young; the priests of Minerva never, up to a late period, sacrificed a lamb. The Libyans and the Derbices in Mount Caucasus prohibited by law the killing of cows.[14] From this point of view, two opposite practices will easily be accounted for. On the one hand, the tribes of ancient Italy laid down the rule, that for all kinds of sacrifices the females are more valuable than the males; and therefore, when desirous to evince special gratitude to the gods, and to present a particularly acceptable offering, they sacrificed a female animal.[15] On the other hand, the Athenians on one occasion passed a decree that no oxen should be killed on account of their scarcity.[16] The Scythians and Phrygians punished with death any one who killed a ploughing ox.[17] The ancient Romans valued the oxen so much as "their companions in labour", that they long abstained from slaying them for food; and it is related by various writers, that a man was publicly condemned to exile, because he had killed a working ox[18] for that purpose, which act was deemed scarcely less criminal "as if he had assassinated one of his peasants";[19] for the slaughter of oxen was regarded as an iniquity which began to prevail only after the disappearance of the golden age.[20] Some nations offered male and female animals indiscriminately; thus the Ethiopians killed to Helios a male, to Selene a female

*φειδόμενοι τῆς γονῆς ἕνεκα, ἐν μύσει τὸ ἅψασθαι ἐνομοθέτησαν*); IV. 7; comp. Gen. XXXII. 15, 16.

[11] Koran VI. 139.

[12] See *Spencer*, Leben und Lehre des Mohammed, II. p. 476.

[13] *Herod.* II. 41; *Porphyr.* Abstin. II. 11, 61.

[14] *Herod.* IV. 186; *Strabo* XI. xi. 8; comp. *Hieron.* Adv. Jovian. 7.

[15] *Serv.* ad Virg. Aen. VIII. 641 (in omnibus sacris feminei generis plus valent victimae).

[16] *Athen.* Deipnos. IX. 17.

[17] *Ael.* Hist. Anim. XII. 34; *Stobaeus* XLIV. 41 (vol. II. pp. 185, 186 ed. Meineke).

[18] "Domito bove occiso", *Val. Max.* VIII. i. 8 (De Damnatis).

[19] "Tanquam colono suo interempto", *Plin.* H. N. 45 or 70.

[20] *Virg.* Georg. II. 536—538; comp.

victim;[1] the Scythians a female lamb to Hecate;[2] the Greeks and Romans generally observed the characteristic rule, unless modified by other considerations, that the sex of the victim should correspond with the sex of the deity to which it was sacrificed.[3] The same principle partially prevailed among northern tribes, as the Laplanders, who sacrificed male reindeer to the gods Tiermes and Storjunkare, and females to the goddess Baiwe, the three deities just named forming a northern trinity representing the powers of creation, preservation, and destruction, in a manner so perfectly analogous to the Hindoo *trimurtis* that even the colours particular to each divinity, red, white, and black, are those of Brahmah, Vishnu, and Shiva respectively; while the only difference is this that, in the northern mythology, a *god* not inappropriately corresponds with the Hindoo *goddess* of destruction, Shiva.[4]

3. As regards the *age* of victims, it was ordained that none should be offered earlier than the seventh day from their birth;[5] till then, they were not only regarded as unclean, but as too weak and imperfect to represent their species, and to guarantee a well-secured existence.[6] The only restriction enjoined in this respect was, that the young animal and its mother should not be killed on the same day,[7] a law supposed to have been suggested by reasons of humanity, "for it is the excess of barbarity, to destroy in one day the offspring and her who is the cause of its birth; it is slaughter rather than sacrifice";[8] and from similar motives, pregnant animals seem to have been excluded from the altar; "for the animals which are still in the womb, are looked upon as equal to those that have just been born."[9] The firstborn male animals were to be killed within the first year.[10] Burnt-,[11] sin-,[12] thank-, and praise-offerings[13] were required to be above one year (בני שנה), and so consequently also the paschal lamb.[14] It is in harmony with the spirit of the sacrificial laws of the Pentateuch to suppose

---

*Sueton.* Domit. c. 9; *Aelian.* Var. Hist. V. 14; see, however, *Juven.* X. 268; *Lucian*, De Sacrif. c. 12.

1 *Heliod.* X. 7.

2 *Apollon. Rhod.* Argon. III. 1033.

3 *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 19.

4 Comp. *Mone*, Geschichte des nordischen Heidenthums, I. pp. 26—28, 37, 41.

5 Lev. XXII. 27; comp. Exod. XXII. 29.

6 Comp. *Maimon.* Mor. Neb. III. 46 (מפני שהוא כנפל).

7 Lev. XXII. 28.

8 *Τὰ γὰρ τοιαῦτα σφάγια, οὐ θυσία*, *Philo*, De Humanit. c. 18; and later, *πάντων ἀνοσιώτατον*.

9 *Ὁ νόμος τὰ κατὰ γαστρὸς ἐν ἴσῳ τοῖς ἀποκυηθεῖσι λογισάμενος*, *Philo*, l. c.

10 Deut. XV. 19, 20 (שנה בשנה); comp. *Maimon.* De Primit. Anim. c. 1. § 6.

11 Exod. XXIX. 38; Lev. IX. 3; XII. 6; XXIII. 12; Num. XXVIII. 3, 9, 11, 19, 27.

12 Lev. XIV. 10; Num. VI. 12, 14; XV. 27.

13 Num. VII. 17, 23, 29 etc.; Lev. XXIII. 19.

14 Exod. XII. 5; comp. *Joseph.* Antiqq. III. ix. 1, 2.

that the victims were not to be too old; for "in an advanced age, the animal is not perfect in its nature",[15] and ought, therefore, if possible, "not to be presented to God, on account of His exalted glory."[16] According to the Talmud, the bullock (פַּר) was to be less than three years old,[17] the ram (אַיִל) and kid of the goats (שְׂעִיר עִזִּים) between one and two years, the calf (עֵגֶל) or lamb (כֶּבֶשׂ) one year; and it is considered that animals, except the firstlings and those singled out for tithes, were rarely offered before they had reached the thirtieth day.[18] However, on solemn occasions, for instance on the conclusion of treaties, the animals were required or allowed to be above three years;[19] and Gideon, on a very extraordinary emergency, offered a bullock seven years old.[20] For turtle-doves (תּוֹרִים) and young pigeons (בְּנֵי יוֹנָה) no age was prescribed in the Pentateuch; but Jewish practice and tradition determined, that the former should be sacrificed "old and not young",[21] the latter "young and not old";[22] because the former were considered better and therefore more valuable when old, the latter when young;[23] and this was so defined that neither of them were to be sacrificed at the time when the plumage begins to assume distinct colours; for at that period, the turtle-doves are called young, and the pigeons old.[24]

The practices of other nations were diversified. The Babylonians presented on one of the altars of Bel sucklings only, on another full-grown animals.[25] The early Greeks killed bullocks and pigs five years old,[26] and more frequently bullocks and cows of one year;[27] later, it is recorded that cows and sheep were sacrificed after they had changed their teeth, and pigs, if less than 15 months old; while Pallas was honoured with calves two years and cows three years old.[28] In some instances indeed new-born pigs were offered to the lower gods,[29] or new-born calves to Dionysos;[30] and for purification-offerings sucking pigs were generally chosen: yet as a rule, a certain maturity of age was deemed essential for victims.[31] The Romans did not admit the young

---

15 *Abarban.* Introd. to Lev. c. 1.

16 *Siphra* (שאין מביאין זקנים מפני הכבוד).

17 Comp. *Rashi* on Lev. IV. 3.

18 Comp. *Maimon.* Maas. Hakkorb. c. 1; *Bähr,* Symb. II. 297.

19 Gen. XV. 9; see Comm. on Gen. p. 366.

20 Judg. VI. 25.

21 גדולים ולא קטנים.

22 קטנים ולא גדולים; *Tal.* Chul. 22.

23 Comp. *Mishn.* Chul. I. 5; *Maimon.* Issur. Mizb. c. 3; Mor. Meb. III. 46; *Bochart,* Hieroz. II. i. 5, p. 25.

24 *Mishn.* l.c. תחילת הציהוב פסול.

25 *Herod.* I. 183.

26 *Hom.* Il. II. 403; Od. XIV. 419; *Aristoph.* Ach. 782.

27 *Hom.* Il. VI. 94, 275, 309; X. 292; Od. III. 382.

28 Comp. Corp. Inscr. No. 2360, 3538.

29 *Pausan.* IX. viii. 1 (*ἀφιᾶσιν ὗς τῶν νεογνῶν*).

30 *Ael.* H. N. XII. 34.

31 *Ἱερὰ τέλεια*; comp. *Hesych.* sub *τέλεια*; *Hermann,* Gottesdienstliche Alterth. § 26, note 21.

pigs before they were five days, lambs and kids seven days, and calves one month,[1] though some authorities fixed the age of young pigs at ten days;[2] but they particularly preferred for sacrifices animals that had the two rows of teeth complete, and were therefore strongest and most perfect.[3] In fact, some considered them absolutely unfit before that time.[4]

4. On some occasions, an animal was demanded that had done no work, and had drawn no yoke. This was the case with regard to the "red cow" killed and burnt for purposes of purification, and the heifer slain at the rite of expiation for a murder not traceable the perpetrator:[5] though both were not sacrifices in the proper sense, it was deemed becoming that animals employed for symbolical acts of such solemnity, should not have served any worldly end, but that their full strength and value should be given up to the sacred ceremonials. To enjoin such a qualification for all sacrifices, would have been an impossibility, and would have encumbered the sacrificial legislation with a new and insuperable difficulty. It is well-known that other nations frequently adhered to a similar practice. Diomedes promised to offer to Athene a bullock "untamed, never yet led under the yoke."[6] The Romans sacrificed to the gods "untouched"[7] or "yokeless" beasts;[8]

---

1 *Plin.* H. N. VIII. 51 or 77, suis fetus sacrificio die quinto purus est, pecoris die septumo, bovis tricesimo.

2 *Varro*, R. R. II. 4.

3 They were then called *bidentes*, especially the sheep; comp. *Hor.* Od. III. xxiii. 14; *Virg.* Aen. IV. 57; VI. 39; VII. 93; XII. 170; *Ovid*, Metam. X. 227; XV. 575.

4 *Plin.* H. N. l. c. Corruncanius ruminalis hostias donec bidentes fierent, puras negavit. — "*Ambidens* sive *bidens* ovis appellabatur, quae superioribus et inferioribus est dentibus" (*Fest.* p. 5); although others contended less plausibly that *bidentes* is a corruption of *bidennes*, two years old, or gave this explanation, "Quae bidens est hostia, oportet habeat dentes octo, sed ex his duo ceteris altiores, per quos appareat, ex minore aetate in majorem transcendisse (*Gell.* Noct. Att. XVI. 6; *Macrob.* Sat. VI. 9; *Fest.* p. 28; *Isid.* Orig. XII. i. 9; *Boch.* Hieroz. I. ii. 43, pp. 430, 431); in which case bidens would be synonymous with בן שנה (*Knob.* Lev. p. 529); for sheep and goats get the two first permanent teeth after their first year, while they lose from the second to the fifth — two annually — the 8 front-teeth which they cut during the first.

5 Num. XIX. 1—10; Deut. XXI. 3, 4.

6 *Βοῦν ... Ἀδμήτην, ἣν οὔπω ζυγὸν ἤγαγεν ἀνήρ*, *Hom.* Il. X. 293; comp. *Babr.* Fab. XXXVII. 1, 7 (*δαμάλης ἄφετος, ἀτριβὴς ζεύγλης*, and *ὁ μόσχος ἀδμής*).

7 Grege de *intacto* (*Virg.* Aen. VI. 38); *intacta* cervice juvencas (Georg. IV. 540, 551).

8 Hostiae *injuges*, quae numquam domitae aut jugo subditae sunt, *Macrob.* Sat. III. 5; comp. *Hor.* Od. II. v. 1, 2; Epod. IX. 22; *Ovid*, Fast. III. 376; IV. 336 (juvencam ... operum conjugiique rudem); *Senec.* Oed. 300; Agam. 354, 355.

and sheep that had not been shorn.[9] But these instances refer mainly to occasions of peculiar importance or interest.

5. It needs scarcely to be observed that the offering was required to be the *lawful* and *exclusive property* of the worshipper — a consideration which prompted the appointment of clean *domestic* animals for sacrifices. To offer the property of others has justly been described as a preposterous contradiction in terms.[10] When David intended to sacrifice on the threshingfloor of Araunah, and the latter offered to him the victim and the wood as a present, he declined in the words, "Nay, I will surely buy it of thee at a price; and I will not offer burnt-offerings to the Lord my God of that which costs me nothing";[11] and the Levitical law declares it to be "an abomination to the Lord", if a man offers for a vow "the gain of unchastity or the price of a dog."[12] In the distressed periods after the exile, the impoverished people presented indeed on the altar the offerings supplied to them by foreign kings;[13] but they had, in that exceptional condition, no alternative but to neglect the public worship or to defray its expenses from presents of strangers; and they provided the necessary means as soon as their circumstances at all improved.[14]

6. So far the customs of the Hebrews with regard to the qualification of victims nearly coincided with those of other nations. But the latter did not stop there; they were, by the nature of their religious systems, almost inevitably led to complicated or artificial and often whimsical rules. Some attached a mystical importance to the *colours* Black was the emblem of grief and misfortune,[15] white of joy and life. Saturn, conceived as "the great calamity", was worshipped in a *black* hexagonal temple by black-robed priests; Mars, the blood-stained, or "the minor calamity", in a *red* temple, in blood-sprinkled garments.[16] It is still customary in the East for a chief or prince, when he replies in state to important petitions, to appear on a black horse if he refuses, on a grey one if he leaves the matter undecided or delays the decision, and on one of spotless white if he consents.[17]

---

[9] Intonsa bidens, *Virg.* Aen. XII. 170.

[10] Comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. 317; *Ewald*, Alterth. pp. 26, 32; comp. *W. Neumann*, in Schneider's deutsch. Zeitschr. 1858, No. 42, p. 332.

[11] 2 Sam. XXIV. 24.

[12] אתנן זנה ומחיר כלב, Deut. XXIII. 19.

[13] Ezra VI. 9; VII. 17, 22; 1 Macc. X. 39; 2 Macc. III. 3; IX. 16; *Jos.* A. XII. iii. 3.

[14] Nehem. X. 33—35.

[15] Comp. *Heliod.* IV. 19.

[16] Comp. *Gesen.* Comm. über den Jes. II. 344, 345.

[17] So when, in the beginning of 1864, the venerable and benevolent Sir Moses Montefiore interceded for his co-religionists with the emperor of Morocco, this prince appeared, in the court-yard of his palace, on a white steed, and immediately issued decrees guaranting the protection and security of the Jews.

Thus the Greeks and Romans considered *black* cattle necessary for the gods of the nether world and for Poseidon, but *white* cattle for the heavenly deities,[1] though they conciliated Poseidon also by reddish or even white animals.[2] They used for offerings of expiation black cattle which was meant to typify guilt;[3] and such they presented at Athens to the Tempests and Hurricanes.[4] Jupiter Capitolinus was, in Rome, to be honoured with a white bullock; but as a beast perfectly of that colour is rarely found, the unfavourable spots were generally whitened with chalk, whence such animal is by Juvenal called "a chalked bullock."[5] The Egyptians sacrificed to Osiris reddish oxen, because that colour was attributed to Typhon, his enemy and persecutor;[6] so scrupulous were they on this point that a single black hair disqualified the animal.[7] A remnant of this conception was preserved among the Hebrews in the ordinance of the "red cow."[8] In China, the victims presented at the four great annual sacrifices differed in colour according to the four seasons, at the beginning of which the festivals were celebrated.[9] The northern and Germanic tribes chose a red, white, or black victim, to correspond with the deity to which it was offered.[10] The boar sacrificed at the beginning of February to Freya, to pray for abundance of corn, was yellow, the colour of the golden ears.[11]

7. We have above alluded to the cosmic nature of the Greek and Roman gods and of their sacrifices (p. 86); that character appears nowhere more strikingly than in the laws as to the qualification of victims. The deities were viewed in their supposed relations to productiveness and fertility. Therefore, Proserpine, the symbol of decaying and sterile nature, was honoured by *barren*, Ceres, the goddess of harvest, by *pregnant* cows, or by pigs, the types of extraordinary fruitfulness.[12] Such sacrifices were offered especially in spring, when the seed had just been entrusted to the earth; they formed, therefore, a chief feature of the Roman festival of the Fordicidia, which was celebrated, in honour of Tellus, in the middle of April.[13] The manes of the departed were

---

1 Comp. *Hom.* Il. III. 103; Od. III. 6; XI. 33; *Virg.* Aen. III. 120; V. 97, 736; VI. 243, 249; Schol. Soph. Oed. Col. 42; *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 19.

2 *Pind.* Pyth. IV. 365 (205); Ol. XIII. 98 (69).

3 *Diogen. Laert.* Epimenid. 3.

4 *Aristoph.* Ran. 847, 848.

5 Bos cretatus, *Juv.* Sat. X. 66; comp. cretata ambitio, *Pers.* V. 177.

6 *Diod. Sic.* I. 88.

7 *Herod.* II. 38; *Plut.* Isid. 31.

8 Num. XIX. 1—10.

9 *Du Halde*, Beschreib. des chines. Reich. III. p. 11.

10 See *supra* p. 98; comp. *Grimm*, Deutsche Mythologie, p. 33.

11 *Wachter*, in Ersch und Gruber's Encyclop. III. iv. p. 99.

12 *Hom.* Od. XIX. 396; *Virg.* Aen. VI. 251; *Prudentius*, Contra Symmach. I. 359; *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 21; comp. *Varro*, R. R. I. 2.

13 Comp. *Ovid*, Fast. IV. 629—634

also propitiated by a barren cow.[14] But occasionally this principle, intelligible as it is from a certain point of view, could not be carried out with consistency on account of the contradictory attributes of the pagan gods; thus the Eumenidae received, at Sicyon, the offering of pregnant sheep,[15] because they were believed not only to spread blast and destruction among the crops, but also to protect and to bless them, and to grant offspring and domestic concord.[16]

Other regulations were futile or ludicrous. Importance was attached to the condition of the tail. The Greeks considered a pig unfit for sacrifice, unless the tail was complete.[17] The Romans excluded the calf from the altar, unless its tail reached to the pastern joint,[18] since the tail, small at the birth of the calf, grows gradually larger, till the beast arrives at maturity;[19] or unless the tail was rounded off at the end, the tongue not cloven, and the ear not black.[20] They disqualified calves which had been carried to the altar on men's shoulders, or struggled to get away from the altar,[21] on which latter point more will be said in the proper place.[22] Some tribes sacrificed to Mars asses distinguished by stentorian loudness of voice.[23]

B. The materials of BLOODLESS SACRIFICES were prescribed to possess the following qualifications.

1. The *ears of corn* (אָבִיב), presented as a first-fruit offering,[24] were to be of the earlier and superior sort, carefully cultivated as if in a garden (כַּרְמֶל), and the grains were to be rubbed or beaten out (גֶּרֶשׂ).[25]

2. The *flour*[26] was ordinarily to be of the *finest* or *best* quality, in

("Forda ferens bos est, foecundaque dicta ferendo ... Nunc gravidum pecus est, gravidae quoque semine terrae. Telluri plenae victima plena datur": in which words the leading idea is distinctly expressed); *Macrob.* Sat. I. 12 (sus praegnans mactatur, quae est hostia propria Terrae); *Varro*, Ling. Lat. V. 3; *Fest.* pp. 83, 102; *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 22.

[14] *Hom.* Od. XI. 30 (στεῖρα βοῦς).

[15] Pausan. II. xi. 4.

[16] *Aeschyl.* Eumen. 835 *sqq.*; comp. *Jul. Braun*, Naturgeschichte der Sage, II. 177.

[17] *Aristoph.* Acharn. 750, 751 (ἀλλ' οὐδὲ θύσιμός ἐστιν αὑτηγί, κέρκον οὐκ ἔχει); comp. *Suidas* sub κόλουρα.

[18] Victimarum probatio in vitulo ut articulum suffraginis contingat (cauda).

[19] *Plin.* H. N. VIII. 45 or 70.

[20] *Serv.* ad Virg. Aen. VI. 38, ne habeant caudam aculeatam, ne linguam fissam, ne aurem nigram.

[21] *Plin.* l. c. [22] See Sect. XX.

[23] *Ael.* H. A. XII. 34.

[24] Lev. II. 14.

[25] See Comm. on II. 14—16, Philological Remarks.

[26] סֹלֶת (Lev. II. 1, 5; VII. 12; Num. VII. 13, 19, 25, etc.), from סלת, to be ground or crushed, hence explained by Kimchi (s. v.) הקמח שהוא טחון טחינה גסה *the flour which is ground very much;* while Josephus (Ant. III. ix. 4), perhaps taking the root סלת in the sense of *purifying* or *sieving through*, describes it ἄλευρον καθαρώτατον; similarly Philo (De Victim. c. 15) ἀπὸ τοῦ καθαρωτάτου τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης

contradistinction to the coarser sort,[1] and from the choicest species of grain, *wheat.*[2] However, the offering presented for the wife suspected of faithlessness, consisted of the common flour of the less valuable grain of *barley.*[3]

3. The flour, of which never less than an *omer* or a tenth of an ephah was used for an offering,[4] because this quantity was, as a rule, deemed sufficient for one person's daily sustenance,[5] after having been mixed with water and converted into dough,[6] was either leavened,[7] or remained more generally unleavened.[8] It was baked either into *loaves,*[9] into *thin cakes* or *wafers,*[10] or into *thick cakes* pierced with little holes:[11] the thickness is supposed never to have exceeded one finger; and the holes were produced by the small and smooth flints, with which the pot or pitcher used for preparing the cakes was half filled, and over which the dough was spread; such holes are still made in the unleavened cakes of the Arabs and the passover-cakes (מַצּוֹת) of the Jews, though in the latter, of course, not in the primitive way just described. Both the thick and the thin cakes are believed to have been round in form.[12]

4. The *Oil* (שֶׁמֶן) employed for the bloodless offerings, was to be the white *olive-oil* (שֶׁמֶן זַיִת)[13] obtained from the green, unripe berries squeezed or beaten in a mortar (כָּתִית); not that inferior though more abundant kind gained from the ripe olives trodden out with the feet or thrown into oil-presses or oil-mills; much less the very valueless and

---

*τροφῆς*; and Ebn Ezra (on Lev. II. 1) קמח חטה נקיה, which is in Arabic סמיד, سميذ (*Freytag*, Lex. Arab. II. 351, simila, panis albus); and therefore rendered by Targ. Jonath. קמחא סמידא (comp. *Mishn.* Men. VIII. 1); Sept. *σεμίδαλις*; Vulg. simila; Luther Semmelmehl.

1 Or קֶמַח; comp. Num. V. 15; 1 Ki. V. 2; *Mishn.* Aboth, V. 15 (a winnowing fan which removes the קמח, but retains the סלת); although the combination קמח סלת is also used (Gen. XVIII. 6), קמח being evidently the generic name, with סלת as a qualifying term.

2 חִטָּה or חִטִּים; comp. Exod. XXIX. 2; 1 Chr. XXI. 23; Ezra VI. 9; *Plin.* H. N. XVIII. 7.

3 שְׂעֹרִים, Num. V. 15.

4 Comp. Num. XV. 4.

5 Comp. Exod. XVI. 16.

6 עריסה; Num. XV. 20, 21; Ezek. XLIV. 30; Neh. X. 38.

7 Lev. VII. 13; XXIII. 17.

8 Lev. II. 11.

9 לחם; Exod. XXIX. 2; Lev. XXIII. 17

10 רקיקים (from רקק *to flatten, to make thin by beating*); Exod. XXIX. 2; Lev. II. 4; VIII. 26; 1 Chr. XXIII. 29. The Samaritan has רקריקין, from רקרק *to extend, to level;* the Talmud (Betsah 21*b*) places רקיקין into opposition to גריצין, which are *thick* cakes.

11 חַלּוֹת (from חלל *to perforate*); Exod. XXIX. 2; Lev. II. 4.

12 Comp. *Ebn Ezra* on Lev. II. 1; comp. also Sect. XI.

13 Oleum omphacium of Pliny (H. N. XII. 27 or 60).

unsavoury oils extensively used in the East.[14] It was to be pure (זָךְ), that is, not mixed with any other fluid.[15]

Now this oil was used in different ways. It was often simply *poured over* the offering,[16] whether over the plain flour,[17] or over the pieces into which the oblation was divided,[18] or over the roasted ears of corn presented as firstfruits.[19] The thicker cakes (חַלּוֹת), that is, the flour of which they were prepared, were *mingled* with oil;[20] the thinner cakes (רְקִיקִים), after having been baked, were *anointed*, that is, brushed over with it,[21] according to Jewish tradition in the form of the Greek letter X.[22] In a few cases, the offering was *soaked* in oil and almost saturated with it;[23] this was the case with the oblation which both the common and the High-priests presented on the day of their consecration; and with the flour which formed a part of the cereal accompaniment of the praise-offering.[24] It is evident, that the ampler or scantier use of the oil stood in significant relation to the nature of the offering, and harmonised with the symbolical attributes of the oil.[25]

5. The *frank-incense*,[26] largely imported into Palestine from Arabia Felix, especially from Sheba,[27] and obtained from a thorny shrub, *Amyris kataf* or *Juniperus thurifera*,[28] growing on mountainous tracts, with leaves and fruit resembling those of the myrtle, was ordered to be *pure* (זַכָּה), which epithet probably refers to the white and superior frank-incense, procured by incisions in the bark of the plant in the beginning of autumn; while the reddish kind gathered in the winter, is of much meaner quality.[29] The quantity required for each offering is not fixed in the Pentateuch, and was probably left to the piety and

---

[14] Comp. *Harmer*, Observ. I. 413.

[15] Hence the holy oil is described as שמן זית זך כתית. Comp. Exod. XXX. 34—38, and Comm. on Exod. pp. 482, 483.

[16] יצק, also נתן (Lev. II. 15).

[17] Lev. II. 1.

[18] Lev. II. 4; see Sect. X. 9.

[19] Lev. II. 16.

[20] בלולת (from בלל *to mix up*), Lev. II. 4; or סלת בלולה בשמן (Lev. II. 5; Num. VII. 19, 25, etc.), or merely סלת בשמן (Lev. II. 7). The word בלל occurs also on the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles (line 14).

[21] משחים, Lev. VII. 12; Sept. *διακεχρισμένα ἐν ἐλαίῳ*.

[22] *Mishn.* Menach. VI. 3; Siphra 73*b*.

[23] מֻרְבֶּכֶת, from רבך *to dip, to mix*, or *to prepare by mixing*. Philo (De Victim. c. 15) has *ταγηνισθὲν ἐν ἐλαίῳ*; the Sept. render carelessly both בלול and מרבך by *πεφυραμένος*; Ebn Ezra gives as its meaning מובחרת; other Jewish expositors רכה or במהרה (see *Ebn Ezra* on Lev. VI. 14), which are mere hazards. The *modus operandi* described by Ravius (in *Relandi* Antiqq. Sacr. p. 623) seems too complicated.

[24] Lev. VI. 14; VII. 12; 1 Chr. XXIII. 29; comp. *Maimon.* Maas. Hakkorb. XIII. 6; *Thalhofer*, Unblut. Opfer, pp. 122 *sqq.*

[25] See Sect. IX. 2.

[26] לְבֹנָה, Sept. *λιβανωτός, λίβανος*.

[27] Although the best kinds are found in Hadhramaût.

[28] Or in India, from the Boswellia serrata.

[29] Comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 569.

capability of the worshipper. — While frank-incense was, by the Israelites, presented only as an accompaniment of other oblations, it was by several Greek and many middle Asiatic tribes presented alone[1] and often in copious abundance.[2]

6. The *wine* ordained for libations (נֶסֶךְ) is in no manner described or qualified. Hence, probably, the ordinary or red wine was understood, especially as it easily admitted of a welcome symbolical meaning,[3] and the fine red colour of the wine was admired and extolled.[4]

7. Once another fluid — שֵׁכָר — is mentioned as a libation;[5] it is probably some strong[6] or intoxicating liquor,[7] resembling wine in its nature and effects,[8] though distinct from it,[9] and hence, like wine, interdicted to priests during their sacred functions,[10] to Nazarites,[11] and other persons of peculiar sanctity.[12] The Arabs designate by the same name (سَكَر) wine made from dry grapes or dates.[13]

8. Nor is the *salt* (מֶלַח), which was to be used not only with the bloodless, but with all sacrifices generally,[14] described in any way. It is well known that the Dead Sea is strongly impregnated with salt which is partly brought thither from the salt-mountain (Usdum) on the southwestern shores, and partly, especially in the northern regions, deposited at the bottom of the lake itself; so that the mineral covers, by exhalation, the surrounding trees with a thick crust, sometimes imparts to the whole neighbourhood the appearance of a snowy plain; and is, after the annual inundations, plentifully found in the marshes

---

1 *Hom.* Il. VI. 270, comp. ver. 301; *Hesiod*, Op. et D. 338; comp. *Nitzsch*, Od. II. p. 15; *Voss*, Antisymb. II. 456; *Ritter*, Erdk. XII. pp. 356 *sqq.*

2 See p. 90; comp. *Ovid*, Fast. I. 339; *Plin.* H. N. XIII. 1; XXII. 118; XXIV. 102 or 61; *Porphyr.* Abstin. II. 17; *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 26 (where, however, the antiquity of the use of frank-incense for sacrifices is underrated).

3 See Sect. IX. 3.

4 Comp. Prov. XXIII. 31. The rules laid down by Jewish tradition may be found in *Mishn.* Menach. VIII. 6, 7.

5 Num. XXVIII. 7.

6 Targ. Onk. and Jerus. חֲמַר עַתִּיק.

7 *Onk.* Lev. X. 9 מְרַוֵּי; Sept. in 1 Sam. I. 15 *μέθυσμα* (and in Isai. XIX. 10, reading שֵׁכָר for שֶׂכֶר, *ζύθον beer*; comp. *Diod. Sic.* I. 34; IV. 2; *Dioscor.* II. 109); Vulg. *omne quod inebriare potest* (Lev. X. 9; Num. VI. 3; etc); and שִׁכּוֹר is *drunk* or *drunkard* (1 Sam. XXV. 36; 1 Ki. XVI. 9), and שִׁכָּרוֹן *drunkenness* (Ezek. XXIII. 33; XXXIX. 19).

8 Isai. V. 11; XXIV. 9; XXVIII. 7; Mic. II. 11; Prov. XX. 1.

9 Lev. X. 9; Num. VI. 3; Judg. XIII. 4, 7; 1 Sam. I. 15.

10 Lev. X. 9.

11 Num. VI. 3.

12 Judg. XIII. 4, 7.

13 Kimchi (Lib. Rad. s. v.) explains it as an intoxicating beverage made of fruits (משקה שעושין מפירות שהוא משכר); Ebn Ezra (on Lev. X. 9) of wheat, honey, or dates; comp. *Herod.* II. 77; *Diod. Sic.* I. 20; *Dioscor.* l. c.

14 Lev. II. 13; see p. 85.

and pits abounding in the vicinity.[15] It was hence called *Sodomitic salt.*[16] It was most probably this species which the Hebrews employed for sacred purposes. Large quantities of it were kept in the second Temple, in a room specially set apart for the stores;[17] and Antiochus the Great sent to the Jews, among other gifts, 375 medimni of salt for use at the sacrifices.[18] In default of Sodomitic salt the Hebrews availed themselves of that of Ostracine,[19] a town near Pelusium or Rhinocolura and the lake Sirbonis,[20] where salt was dug out of the earth "like blocks from a quarry."[21] But Jewish tradition mentions as unlawful a certain sort,[22] which is probably *preserved* salt,[23] prepared by the addition of various odoriferous substances, and serving as a choice sauce to season all kinds of food;[24] it is hence explained in the Talmud[25] as salt used by the rich in Rome, but to be avoided by the Jews because it was supposed to have been mixed with the entrails of unclean fishes, or soaked in pigs' fat. It is sufficient to mention the opinion of those who believe the salt of sacrifices to have been *bitumen*,[26] or *nitre*, because sea-salt was deemed unclean by the Hebrews as it was by the Egyptians.[27]

9. *Leaven* (שְׂאֹר) and *honey* (דְּבַשׁ), though generally banished from the altar,[28] were admitted in a few exceptional cases: the former for the first new bread offered on Pentecost,[29] and for every praise-offering,[30] when the bread and the cakes were to be leavened; the latter, if presented as a firstfruit-offering.[31] The reason for these concessions will be pointed out in the following section of this treatise (IX. 9, 10).

Leaven was, in the earliest times, prepared from millet, or fine wheat-bran, kneaded with must; or from the meal of various plants, as the fitch (*ervum*) and the chicheling vetch (*occercula*); or from barley and water baked in cakes upon a hot hearth or in an earthen dish placed upon hot ashes and charcoals, after which the cakes were kept

---

15 Comp. Ezek. XLVII. 11; Zeph. II. 9; *Joseph.* Ant. XIII. iv. 9.

16 מלח סדומית; *Talm.* Menach. 21*b*; see Comm on Gen. p. 418.

17 *Mishn.* Midd. V. 3 (לשכת המלח); comp. Ezra VI. 9; VII. 22.

18 *Joseph.* Ant. XIII. iii. 3.

19 מלח אוסתרוקנית.

20 Comp. *Plin.* H. N. V. 12 or 14.

21 *Plin.* XXXI. 7 or 39; comp. *Reland*, Antiqq. III. i. 31; Palaest. I. 11.

22 מֶלַח סַלְקֹנְטִית (*Mishn.* Abod. Sar. II. 6), also written מֶלַח סַלְקוֹנְדְּרִית *Talm.* Abod. Sar. 39*b*).

23 Sal conditum.

24 *Plin.* H. N. XXXI. 7 (41).

25 Abod. Sar. 39*b*.

26 Lightfoot, Schoettgen, Hardt, a. o.; comp. *Carpzov*, Appar. Crit. pp. 718, 719.

27 So Michaelis (Suppl. IV. p. 1507), who unwarrantably punctuates מלח בְּרִית instead מלח בְּרִית (comp. Num. XVIII. 19).

28 Lev. II. 11.

29 קרבן ראשית, Lev. XXIII. 17.

30 זבח תודת שלמים, Lev. VII. 13.

31 קרבן ראשית, Lev. II. 12; comp. 2 Chr. XXXI. 5; Am. IV. 5.

close in vessels till they turned sour. In later periods, it was made chiefly from the bread-flour without salt, kneaded, and then either boiled to the consistency of porridge and left till it became sour, or simply allowed to stand for a few days.[1] Among the Hebrews, this last method seems to have been most common, but they employed for fermentation must or wine-lees also.[2]

10. But we confess our inability to determine the sort of *honey* understood by the Hebrew law — whether it was the bee-honey,[3] so plentiful in Palestine;[4] or, as is less probable, the grape-honey, or *dibs* of the Orientals, which is prepared from must boiled down to one third (when it was called *syraeum*), or one half (when it bore the name *defrutum*);[5] or whether it was the date honey (דְּבַשׁ תְּמָרִים);[6] or fruit-honey generally.[7] Theophrastus, however, who erroneously represents the Hebrews as having used much honey in their libations offered with the holocausts,[8] was, no doubt, like those whom he followed, misled by the usage extensively prevailing among other nations, as the Persians and Eleans, who offered, especially to the gods of the lower world and at the sacrifices for the dead,[9] either honey alone, or mixed with the holy cakes, or spread on fruits,[10] whence honey was called the "sweet food of the gods",[11] which they eagerly desire.[12]

## IX. SYMBOLICAL MEANING OF OBJECTS CONNECTED WITH SACRIFICES.

The sacrificial rites and observances cannot be meaningless and hazardous. They were evidently devised to facilitate the ends which they were intended to serve. They must be understood as instrumental either in restoring or in testifying to the peace of mind and its harmony

---

[1] See *Plin.* H. N. XVIII. 26 (11).

[2] Comp. *Mishn.* Pesach. III. 1.

[3] *Philo*, De Victim. c. 6.

[4] Exod. III. 8, 17; XIII. 5; Lev. XX. 24; Num. XIII. 27; Deut. VI. 3; Josh. V. 6; Jer. XI. 5; Ezek. XX. 6.

[5] See Comm. on Genes. p. 667.

[6] See *Ebn Ezra* and *Rashbam* on Lev. II. 11. Rabbinical authorities even assert that wherever דְּבַשׁ is mentioned in the Pentateuch, without qualification or epithet, date-honey is meant; comp. *Hottinger*, Jus Hebracor. p. 166.

[7] כל מחיקת פרי קרויה דבש, so Rashi (on Lev. II. 11), Maimon. (Issur. Hammizb. V. 1; Maas. Hakkorb. XII. 14); Abarban. and other Jewish interpreters; comp. *Cels.* Hierob. II. 462—467.

[8] De Abstin. II. 26, *πολὺ μέλι καὶ οἶνον λείβοντες*; comp. Ezek. XVI. 19.

[9] *Eurip.* Orest. 115; *Aesch.* Orest. 612; *Heliod.* VI. 14; *Porphyr.* De Antro Nymph. 18.

[10] *Pausan.* V. 15; *Plat.* Legg. VI. 22 (p. 682, *πέλανοι δὲ καὶ μέλιτι καρποὶ δεδυμένοι*); comp. *Sophocl.* apud *Porphyr.* De Abstin. II. 19; *Sil. Ital.* XIII. 434; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 20.

[11] *Θεῶν ἡδεῖα ἐδωδή*, Hymn. in Mercur. 562.

[12] Batrachom. 39; comp. *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. II. xi. 2; *Bochart*, Hieroz.

with God. They are, therefore, visible embodiments of spiritual ideas — they bear a symbolical character.[13] However, the slaughtering of animals and the offering of gifts unavoidably involve certain requirements and acts, without which they cannot be accomplished. Though, therefore, some of the ceremonies have a spiritual meaning, others cannot, without unprofitable playfulness, be interpreted symbolically: a correct appreciation of the nature of the Law will aid the judgment in fixing the distinction. We begin with the sacrificial *objects* which seem to imply a symbolical meaning; after which we shall attempt to explain the *acts* which belong to the same category.

### 1. Salt.

Salt was indeed, in primitive sacrifices, probably employed merely because it formed an indispensable ingredient in all human food. But when religious education advanced beyond the anthropopathic stage, this seasoning, though still deemed necessary in every sacrifice, was invested with a symbolical meaning. Its significance cannot be mistaken; it was accepted not only by the eastern but the classical nations; and passed, in many languages, into a standing and proverbial metaphor. Enjoined, in the Levitical law, immediately after the prohibition of leaven and honey (II. 13), salt was evidently regarded to be exactly opposed to them in its nature; and as leaven and honey were repudiated because they recall the notions of corruption, decay, and impurity, salt was prescribed, because it implies the ideas of preservation and life, of vigour and permanence, of purity and holiness. It was, therefore, connected with the very essence of sacrifices; it typified that for which all offerings were mainly presented. Starting from the observation that salt shields many objects from decomposition and putrescence,[14] the early and imaginative generations, following their symbolising propensities,[15] employed it in sealing relations which they desired to be binding and enduring. They used it particularly in concluding friendships and treaties. This custom prevailed among the Greeks[16]

---

II. iv. 12; *Sykes*, Von der Natur, Absicht, und dem Ursprung der Opfer, p. 117.

[13] Comp. *Philo*, De victim c. 5, *Σύμβολα δέ ἐστι τὰ λεχθέντα φανηρὰ ἀδήλων καὶ ἀφανῶν.*

[14] Comp. *Theophylact.* in Luc. XIV. 34, *ἄσηπτον μένον καὶ ἀβλαβὲς καὶ ἕτερα διαφυλάττει ἄσηπτα οἷς ἂν μεταδῷ τῆς παιότητος*; *Diog. Laert.* Pythag. 19 (VIII. 35), *οἱ γὰρ ἅλες πᾶν σώζουσιν ὅ,τι ἂν παραλάβωσι*; *Plin.* H. N. XXXI. 9 (45), Salis natura est per se ignea... defuncta etiam a putrescendo vindicans, ut durent ita per saccula; *Macrob.* Sat. VII. 12.

[15] Comp. *Porphyr.* De Antr. 36.

[16] *Eustath.* ad *Iliad.* I. 449 (*φιλίας οἱ ἅλες σύμβολον*); IX. 214 (*συναγωγός ἐστιν ὁ ἅλς εἰς φιλίαν καὶ εὐνοίας σύμβολον τοῖς ξένοις ἐν τῇ τραπέζῃ παρετίθετο*).

who hence designated the salt as holy,[1] and it still obtains among the Arabs.[2] Dipping a piece of bread in salt, each of the contracting parties exclaims, "Salam (Peace)! I am the friend of your friends, and the foe of your foes." Solemn affirmations are corroborated by invoking the sacredness of salt, and may then more surely be relied upon than upon an oath.[3] A place where salt is found is deemed inviolable.[4] The Hebrews described an eternal and indissoluble alliance as a *salt-covenant* (בְּרִית מֶלַח).[5] Now, as the sacrifices were designed to effect an intimate and perpetual unity between God and man, they were to be offered with salt; and this was hence called "the salt of the covenant of God."[6] Thus salt was undoubtedly prescribed not for bloodless oblations alone, but for every kind of animal sacrifice;[7] and this is confirmed by later allusions[8] and express statements;[9] and according to tradition, it was to be used with the shew-bread also,[10] even with the oil and frank-incense;[11] in fact, with all substances connected with sacrifices, except the wine, the blood, and the wood.[12] It may hence be explained why salt was cast into springs of unwholesome water for the purpose of improving it.[13] This act may indeed have had a natural and physical foundation, since some substances, among which was probably salt, were believed to possess the power of correcting distasteful qualities of the water:[14] but it recommended itself

---

1 *Ἱεροὶ ἅλες* (*Heliod.* IV. 16); see *infra*.

2 *Volney*, Travels, I. 314; *Tischendorf*, Reisen, I. 267.

3 Comp. *Rosenmüller*, Morgenland, II. 151, 153, 154. This usage, therefore, does not owe its origin to the stone-like *hardness* of several sorts of salt, which, as Bruce remarks, passes from hand to hand, and serves as a coin without wearing off.

4 Comp. *D'Herbelot,* Biblioth. Orient. sub Jacoub ben Laith; *Rosenmüller*, l. c.

5 Num. XVIII. 19, לחק עולם ברית מלח עולם; 2 Chr. XIII. 5, לעולם...ברית מלח. This term hardly means "a covenant not deficient in the seasoning of truth and earnestness" (*Hengstenberg*, Opfer p. 47): the latter notions are not the fundamental but derivative meanings of the word salt (see *infra*).

6 Lev. II. 13, מלח ברית אלהיך; comp. John VI. 27 (*ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*).

7 Though the Hebrew text (Lev. II. 13) seems, at first glance, to allude to the מנחה only (וכל קרבן מנחתך במלח חמלח), it adds, by way of qualification, a general injunction (על כל קרבנך חקריב מלח).

8 Comp. Ezek. XLIII. 24, where the priests are ordered to throw salt on the holocausts (עולה); and herewith agrees the description of Josephus (Ant. III. ix. 1); comp. *Mishn.* Zebach. VI. 5, 6.

9 Mark IX. 49, *πᾶσα θυσία ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται.*

10 Sept. in Lev. XXIV. 7 (*ἐπιθήσετε ἐπὶ τὸ θέμα λίβανον καθαρὸν καὶ ἅλα*).

11 *Talm.* Menach. 21, 26.

12 Comp. *Jos.* Ant. XII. iii. 3; *Mishn.* Midd. V. 2; *Maimon.* Maas. Hakkorb. c. 6; Issure Hammizbeach c. 5.

13 2 Ki. II. 20, 21.

14 See Comm. on Exod. p. 279.

chiefly on account of the symbolical significance of preservation and healing attributed to salt; and therefore the narratives which relate such changes in the nature of the water bear a miraculous character.

Again, as decay is associated with the ideas of death and impurity, salt, which prevents or counteracts decay, became the type of life and purity, the more so as it was believed "to be itself composed of the purest particles of water and sea";[15] it could be used for a metaphor like this, "have salt in yourselves", meaning benevolence, righteousness and good-will, and a peaceful communion with your fellow-men;[16] and thus we may understand the pithy expression, "every man shall be salted with fire",[17] that is shall be *purified*, since the same power was attributed to the salt as to the fire, which is pre-eminently the purifying element.[18]

These Biblical notions were gradually extended and amplified, in which process they not always retained their original simplicity. Philo,[19] correctly describing salt to imply a duration for ever (*ἅπαν διαμονήν*), concludes, in his accustomed manner of spiritualisation, that it is second in rank only to the soul, "for as the soul is the cause of preserving the bodies from destruction, so likewise is salt, which best keeps them together, and to some extent makes them immortal."[20] Therefore Philo compares it to the altar, "which preserves the sacrifices in a proper manner, and this too, though the flesh is consumed by fire."[21] Christian mystics understood the salt to symbolise *Christ* preserving from corruption the soul by his doctrine, and the body by the promised resurrection; or they compared it to the *Word of God* which strengthens and purifies.[22] More commonly accepted, however, was the following view. Unity with God is not possible, unless the heart be pure. But the heart can only remain so by steeling itself against temptation. Hence the "salt of the covenant" was regarded to typify wisdom which discerns sinful inclinations, and fortitude which conquers them; it was taken to intimate that untruth und hypocrisy, envy and malice, and all evil passions that corrupt and taint the health of the mind, render

---

[15] *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 35.

[16] Mark IX. 50, *Ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἅλα καὶ εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις.*

[17] Mark IX. 49, *πᾶς πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται*; comp. Matth. III. 11.

[18] See Sect. X. 13.

[19] De Victim. Offer. c. 6.

[20] The same ideā is similarly expressed by Plutarch (Sympos. V. x. 3; IV. iv. 3). Plautus also (Trinum. II. iv. 91) calls the soul of man his *salillum,* instead of which word, however, modern editions (as that of Fleckeisen in Teubner's collection) read *scintillula*.

[21] For, as usual, basing his etymology on the *Greek* text of the Old Testament, he derives *θυσιαστήριον altar* from *διατηρέω* and *θυσίας* — *παρὰ τὸ διατηρεῖν ὡς ἔοικε τὰς θυσίας.*

[22] See *Carpzov*, Appar. p. 720.

the offering unavailing in the eyes of God; and it was invested with the power of converting the sacrifice into a perpetual bond with God under the condition only that it reminded the worshipper himself of his moral obligations and religious aims. Salt thus obtained a twofold significance and holiness. In this sense, Pythagoras commended that salt ought to be set before people as an admonition to justice.[1] But it could thus also be used as a synonym for wisdom and penetration, judgment and intelligence. "Let your speech", wrote Paul to the Colossians, "be always with grace, seasoned with salt[2] that you may know how you ought to answer every man." The apostles were called "the salt of the earth",[3] that is, those who by teaching and guiding the world, guard it from degeneration and moral decay; so that, in that phrase, the term salt implies both the original and the collateral sense. The Greeks employed the word *salt* (ἅλες) for wit or sarcasm.[4] The Romans, on the testimony of Pliny,[5] had no better term[6] to express "the pleasures of the mind, the effusions of humour, and in fact all the amenities of life, supreme cheerfulness, and relaxation from toil",[7] or intellectual acuteness, good sense and shrewdness.[8] The Greeks and Romans shared indeed, on the whole, the Hebrew notions with regard to the use of salt at the sacred rites. They maintained the principle that no sacrifice ought to be offered unless accompanied by salted grits.[9]

---

[1] ὑπόμνησις τοῦ δικαίου; *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 35.

[2] ἅλατι ἠρτυμένος, Col. IV. 6.

[3] Matth. V. 13.

[4] Comp. *Plut.* Sympos. V. 10.

[5] Hist. Nat. XXXI. 7 (41).

[6] Both in the singular and plural, *sal* and *sales*.

[7] Comp. *Hor.* Sat. I. x. 3; Ars Poet. 271; *Catull.* LXXXVI. 4; *Cic.* De Orat. II. 23 (98); Nat. Deor. II. 29 (74); Tuscul. V. 19 (55); Brut. 34 (128); *Plin.* H. N. XXXV. 10 (37).

[8] *Terent.* Eun. III. i. 10; *Hor.* Epist. II. ii. 60; *Catull.* XIII. 5; *Quinctil.* X. i. 94; *Cicer.* Orat. 26 or 87.

[9] *Mola salsa,* that is, grains of spelt coarsely ground and mixed with salt (Festus, p. 141 ed. Müll., Mola vocatur far tostum et sale sparsum, quod eo molito hostiae adspergerentur); and *immolare* to sacrifice, is properly to sprinkle the victim with mola salsa (*Serv.* Virg. Aen. IV. 57). "Maxume tamen in sacris intelligitur auctoritas, quando nulla conficiuntur sine mola salsa", *Plin.* H. N. XXXI. 7 (41); XVIII. 2; comp. *Ovid,* Fast. I. 127, 337, 338 (Ante deos homini quod conciliare valeret, Far erat et puri lucida mica salis); II. 538; III. 284 (farra salsa); *Plaut.* Amph. II. ii. 108 (740); *Virg.* Aen. II. 133 (salsae fruges); Ecl. VIII. 82 (sparge molam); *Cic.* De Div. II. 16; *Mart.* VII. v. 4; *Lucan,* Phars. I. 610; *Stat.* Sylv. I. iv. 130, 131. Corresponding to the *molae salsae,* the Greeks had the οὐλαί or οὐλοχύται (*Hom.* Od. III. 441, 445; IV. 761; Il. I. 449, 458; *Herod.* I. 132; *Dion. Hal.* VII. 72), which the Scholiast (on Iliad. I. 449) explains as κριθαὶ μετὰ ἁλῶν μεμιγμέναι ἃς ἐπέχεον τοῖς ἱερουργουμένοις ζώοις πρὸ τοῦ θύεσθαι; comp. Schol. Aristoph. Equit. 1163. The assertion of Schömann (Griech. Alterthüm. II. 229), who denies the usage among the Greeks, is, therefore, hardly tenable.

They even ascribed to the salt divine attributes,[10] because they believed it conduces to generation; and as the marine animals are the most fruitful of all, cattle that were to be incited to breeding were fed with salt-beef and other salted food.[11] Among the Romans, the salt-cellar (*salinum*), the symbol of food and sustenance, was held in equal honour with the lares, and placed in the middle of the table at all meals, which thereby received the character of sacrifices;[12] it formed an heirloom in the family, was preserved with the utmost care, and kept with scrupulous neatness.[13] The sumptuary laws which restricted the use of all articles of luxury, permitted a bowl (*patera*) and salt-cellar of silver;[14] the latter was, especially for the sacrificial service, made in the most elegant and costly manner possible, and was even in the earliest times of severe simplicity, of precious metal, chiefly of silver.[15] The Greeks called the salt "grace" (χάρις), "because it makes the food palatable that is necessary for life";[16] therefore they often worshipped Poseidon and Demeter in the same temple. They maintained that as all colours need light, so all fluids require salt to have an effect upon our sensation; that all meat is dead; and that the power of salt which joins it like a soul, imparts to it "grace" and a pleasant taste.[17] If in the East, persons eat together bread and salt, they are most solemnly pledged to mutual friendship which it is considered the height of impiousness to betray; their persons and their property, their safety and their honour, become objects of each other's sacred solicitude.[18]

The Egyptian priests alone, if they did not entirely abstain from salt,[19] excluded it from their meals during the time of their purification, because they thought it whets the appetite beyond the natural necessities.[20] But they were apparently singular in this view; and even they

---

[10] *Homer* (Iliad IX. 214) calls it θεῖος, and *Plato* (Tim. XXV or 60 E) θεοφιλής. Comp. *Heyne*, Opuscul. Academic. I. 368 *sqq.*; *Wächter*, l. c. p. 95.

[11] *Plut.* Sympos. V. x. 4; comp. No. 10 of this Section. We may, therefore, be well surprised at the assertion of Maimonides (Mor. Neb. III. 46) that the Pentateuch demanded salt from motives of opposition to heathen usages. Nor was it enjoined because "Moses desired to restore the ancient simplicity of sacrificial rites" (*Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. III. ii. 2), as it probably had always formed an ingredient of offerings.

[12] Sacras facitis mensas salinorum adpositu et simulacris deorum, *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. II. 67.

[13] Comp. *Hor.* Od. II. xvi. 13, 14 (paternum splendet in mensa tenui salinum); Sat. I. iii. 14; *Catull.* XXIII. 19; *Pers.* III. 25 (purum et sine labe salinum); V. 138; the phrase *purior salillo* was proverbial.

[14] *Plin.* H. N. XXXIII. 12 (54).

[15] Comp. *Liv.* XXVI. 36; *Valer. Max.* IV. iv. 3.

[16] *Plut.* Symp. V. x. 3; comp. תָּפֵל, Job VI. 6.

[17] *Plut.* Symp. IV. iv. 3.

[18] Comp. *Rosenmüller*, Morgenl. II. 154—156.

[19] *Plut.* Symp. V. x. 1.

[20] *Plut.* Is. 5.

distinguished between pure and impure salt, the former salpetre or nitre, the latter marine salt, which was forbidden at sacrifices.[1] Yet the Hebrews observed the peculiar custom of scattering salt over places destined for perpetual desolation, such as destroyed cities which were never to be rebuilt.[2] This practice probably originated in the noticed fact that tracts containing salt are remarkable for sterility and unproductiveness,[3] and this opinion was naturally strengthened, in Palestine, by the aspect of the dreary regions round the Dead Sea, where the vegetation is scanty and stunted, and where the salt accumulates in cheerless pits and marshes.[4]

## 2. Oil.

Men were easily taught by experience to appreciate the valuable properties of oil. They found that it stimulates the vital powers of the healthy, revives the languishing energy of the feeble, and checks even the incipient decomposition of the dead. Oil was, therefore, from primitive ages, employed as a means for refreshing the body;[5] as a restorative remedy in cases of illness, especially for wounds;[6] and as a chief ingredient for embalming corpses.[7] It was used as a symbol and accompaniment of joy,[8] especially at festive repasts;[9] it was resorted to when persons prepared to appear before superiors, or when they rose from their ordinary life to proceed to some higher and more solemn function;[10] while it was avoided in times of grief and mourn-

---

1 Comp. *Michael.* on Exod. XXX. 35; De Nitro, § 7.

2 Judg. IX. 45; comp. Deut. XXIX. 22.

3 So says Pliny (H. N. XXXI. 7 or 39), omnis locus in quo reperitur sal, sterilis est nihilque gignit; and the same remark is more copiously made by Virgil (Georg. II. 238—240), though it hardly holds good in so general a form (comp. *Van Goes.* Scriptor. Rei Agrim. p. 137). Hence מְלֵחָה (Job XXXIX. 6; Ps. CVII. 37) and אֶרֶץ מְלֵחָה (Jer. XVII. 6) are synonymous with עֲרָבָה or מִדְבָּר; comp. Sir. XXXIX. 28.

4 Comp. Zeph. II. 9 (ממשק חרול ומכרה מלח); Ezek. XLVII. 11. But in the Greek proverb *ἅλασιν ὕει it rains salt*, that is, great fertility prevails, salt is taken in the more usual sense of food and provision.

5 Comp. *Strabo*, XVI. 20 (p. 746); *Hom.* Il. X. 577; *Herod.* I. 195; Ruth III. 3; Judith X. 3.

6 Isai. I. 6; Ps. CIX. 18; Mark VI. 13; Luke X. 34; Jam. V. 14; comp. *Mishn.* Shabb. XIV. 4; *Plin.* H. N. XXIII. 4 (38); XXIV. 9 (38); XXIX. 13; *Strab.* XV. 60 (p. 713); *Dion Cass.* LIII. 29; *Curt.* IX. 10 (38); *Joseph.* Ant. XVII. vi. 5; Bell. Jud. I. xxxiii. 5.

7 Mark XIV. 8; John XII. 3.

8 Comp. Isai LXI. 3 and Ps. XLV. 8 (שמן ששון); Prov. XXI. 17.

9 Ps. XXIII. 5; XCII. 11; CIV. 15; Ezek. XVI. 9; Am. VI. 6; Eccl. IX. 8; comp. Deut. XXVIII. 40; Mic. VI. 15; Wisd. II. 7; Luke VII. 38, 46; John XII. 3; comp. *Hom.* Il. X. 577; *Lucret.* IV. 1125; *Athen.* XII. 78; *Petron.* Sat. LXV. 7.

10 Comp. *Knobel* on Exod. XXX. 30.

ing,[11] and even of solemnity, as on the Day of Atonement.[12] It was thus naturally chosen to typify *life*, the more so as life and *light* appeared to be kindred qualities, and were more completely than in any other fluid or substance found united in oil, one of the choicest and richest products of the promised land.[13] Hence oil was extensively regarded as an emblem of *the spirit* (רוּחַ) of God, of intelligent and godlike reason, of the higher and rational life of man.[14] Anointing became synonymous with imparting the Divine spirit,[15] which is the source of life and light in the ideal world, as oil in the world of matter. Now, the worship of God, and especially its centre, the sacrificial service, aims at the diffusion of the light of the mind and the life of the soul, of truth and righteousness, of wisdom and peace, of the knowledge of the Law and its exercise, of wisdom and happiness;[16] in a word it tends to *holiness*, God's most comprehensive attribute and Israel's ultimate goal;[17] it is intended to rouse the Divine or *holy spirit*.[18] Therefore oil was also termed "the oil of holiness",[19] or "the oil of holy ointment";[20] anointing was equivalent to bestowing holiness or *sanctifying*,[21] and this again coincided with *consecrating* or *installing* in the priestly office to serve before the Lord:[22] these three notions were coupled in the command, "And thou shalt anoint Aaron and his sons, and hallow them, to serve Me as priests."[23] Therefore, oil accompanied most of the bloodless offerings,[24] whether the flour and cakes were mixed, poured over, anointed, or soaked with it (p. 105); and it marked them as consecrated to God. It was employed, with peculiar abundance, in the bloodless offering presented by the High-priest on the day of

---

[11] 2 Sam. XIV. 2; Dan. X. 3; Matth. VI. 17; comp. 2 Sam. XII. 20.

[12] *Mishn.* Yom. VIII. 1; Shabb. IX. 4.

[13] Num. XVIII. 12; Deut. XXVIII. 40; XXXII. 13; Judg. IX. 8; Isai. X. 27; Jer. XXXI. 12; XLI. 8; Ezek. XVI. 13, 19; Mic. VI. 7, 15; Joel II. 19; Job XXIX. 6.

[14] *Kliefoth*, Liturg. Abhandlungen, IV. 106, 120. Less exact is the meaning of *faith* (*Hengstenberg*, Opfer, p. 47), or "the gentle comfort and relief of an all-pervading, restoring, and peaceful power, or the Mercy of God" (*W. Neumann*, in Schneider's Zeitschrift, 1853, p. 340).

[15] Comp. Isai. LXI. 1; 1 Sam. X. 1, 6; XVI. 13, 14; Zechar. IV. 3, 6; and so χρίειν and χρῖσμα in the New Testament, Acts IV. 27; X. 38; 1 John II. 20, 27; 2 Cor. I. 21.

[16] Comp. Prov. VI. 23 (נר מצוה ותורה אור); Ps. XXXVI. 10.

[17] See p. 3, and Comm. on ch. XI.

[18] רוּחַ קֹדֶשׁ (Ps. LI. 13; Isai. LXIII. 10, 11), or πνεῦμα ἅγιον (John III. 6—8; XIV. 26; XVI. 13; Gal. V. 25; VI. 8; 1 Cor. II. 12; Tit. III. 5).

[19] שמן קדש (Ps. LXXXIX. 21).

[20] שמן משחת קדש (Exod. XXX. 25, 31).

[21] קִדֵּשׁ (Exod. XXIX. 36; XXX. 29, 30; XL. 9—11, 13; Lev. VIII. 12).

[22] Exod. XXIX. 1.

[23] Exod. XXX. 30; comp. XXVIII. 41; XL. 13.

[24] Comp. Lev. II. 1, 4, 7, 15; VI. 8; VII. 12; etc.

his consecration.[1] It was used to set apart objects for religious purposes, or to appoint persons for sacred service. Thus the Hebrews anointed with oil memorial-stones or *betylia*;[2] the Tabernacle with all its vessels, and particularly the altar, the instrument of atonement;[3] the priests, the mediators between God and the people,[4] and more especially the High-priest, who was "the anointed priest" *par excellence*,[5] and was himself termed "the holy one of the Lord";[6] the prophets, the interpreters of God's will;[7] and the kings, the earthly representatives of the Divine ruler.[8] Whether such kings only were anointed as commenced a new dynasty or had no legal right to the throne, or whether all kings alike were so consecrated, is not quite certain: the instances in which the Old Testament mentions the rite, would favour the former alternative; though the appellation "the anointed of the Lord" (מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָֹה) employed with reference to all legitimate kings might point to a more general custom.[9] But oil was excluded, like frank-incense, from the sin-offering and the offering of jealousy.[10] Its symbolical significance in the ordinances of the מנחה seems to be indisputably established by these two exceptions, which prove that the oil did not form, as has been supposed,[11] a chief part of the oblation itself, like the flour, but that it was a characteristic *addition*, like the frank-incense[12] — a circumstance rendered indubitable by the plain text, "And when any one will offer a bloodless offering to the Lord, his offering shall be of fine flour, and he shall pour oil upon it, and put frank-incense thereon."[13] The same conclusion is confirmed by the ordinance which fixes the relative quantity of flour,

---

[1] Lev. VI. 14; see Comm. on VI. 12—16; and Sect. XI.

[2] Gen. XXVIII. 18; XXXV. 14: this was not merely a libation, which is mentioned separately; see Comm. on Gen. pp. 523, 524.

[3] Exod. XXIX. 36; XXX. 23—30; Lev. VIII. 10, 11; Num. VII. 1.

[4] Exod. XXVIII. 41; XXIX. 7; XL. 13, 15; comp. Lev. VI. 13; VII. 36; VIII. 12; X. 7; XIV. 15—18, 26—29; XVI. 32; Num. III. 3.

[5] הכהן המשיח (Lev. IV. 3, 5, 16; VI. 15; comp. XXI. 10, 12; Num. XXXV. 25); see the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. I.

[6] קְדוֹשׁ יְהוָֹה, Ps. CVI. 16; see notes on VIII. 6—13.

[7] 1 Ki. XIX. 16.

[8] 1 Sam. IX. 16; X. 1; XV. 1, 17; XVI. 12, 13; 2 Sam. I. 14; II. 4; V. 3; XII. 7; XIX. 11; 1 Ki. I. 34, 39; XIX. 15, 16; 2 Ki. IX. 1—6; XI. 12; XXIII. 30.

[9] Comp. 1 Sam. II. 10, 35; XVI. 6; XXIV. 7; XXVI. 16, 23; 2 Sam. XIX. 22; Ps. II. 2; etc.; compare also למשוח עליהם מלך (Judg. IX. 8) simply for *electing* or *appointing* a king.

[10] Lev. V. 11; Num. V. 15; see Sect. XI.

[11] *Bähr*, Symb. II. 302, 320; comp. *Winer*, Real-Wört. II. 169, note 1; *Neumann*, l. c. p. 339; *Kliefoth*, l. c. IV. 101, 103; *Öhler*, l. c. p. 626; *Thalhofer*, Die unblut. Opfer, p. 85.

[12] Comp. *Hengstenb.* Opfer, p. 45; *Keil*, Archäol. I. 202; *Kurtz*, Opferc. § 143.

[13] Lev. II. 1; comp. ver. 15.

oil, and wine to be used for a מנחה and its accompanying drink-offering.[14] As oil is never consumed alone, like wine or bread, but together with other products or preparations, which it is meant to make more savoury, especially in the East, where it is a frequent substitute for fat and butter, so it is never mentioned as an independent gift, like the wine, but appears mingled or otherwise combined with the flour or the pastry.[15]

The oil used for ordinary consumption and that employed for anointing, were probably identical in early times. But the Levitical law deemed it desirable to distinguish the latter, especially in the consecration of the Sanctuary and its ministers, by the admixture of four sweet-smelling ingredients, myrrh, cinnamon, calamus, and cassia;[16] because four was regarded as the number of perfection and totality; it indicated, on the one hand, that the sacred anointment should comprehend the entire wealth of fragrance which pervades the vegetable kingdom; and on the other hand, that the holiness of those for whom it was intended, should be absolute and perfect; hence the imitation of the compound and its use for profane purposes were threatened with excision, since God's holiness could manifest itself in His Sanctuary and in His servants only.[17]

### 3. Wine.

The application of wine in connection with offerings is too natural to demand any figurative interpretation. The wine "gladdens God and man"[18] — reason enough why it was deemed pre-eminently fit for the altar. But it is not impossible that the symbolising spirit of the ancients endowed it with a peculiar significance. *Red* wine was generally employed to recall the colour and nature of blood. The wine offered with the vegetable oblations represented the blood of animal sacrifices.[19] The High-priest is declared to have poured out, as a libation, "the blood of the grape";[20] the same metaphor occurs repeatedly in the Hebrew

---

[14] Num. XV. 4—10.

[15] See p. 105. The log of oil in Lev. XIV. 10 does not belong to the *sacrifice*. It has been asserted, that oil was used with the bloodless offerings in order to feed the sacrificial fire (*Scholl*, in Klaiber's Studien, V. 1, 131 *sqq.*); or in order to accustom the Hebrews to take oil for pastry, and thus to promote the cultivation of the olive-tree (*Michael.* Mos. R. § 191); these and similar opinions require no refutation.

[16] Exod. XXX. 23, 24; comp. Comm. on Ex. pp. 564—568.

[17] See Comm. on Exod. p. 564; comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. 167 *sqq.*; *Winer*, Real-Wört. II. 169, 357—359; *Kurtz*, Opferc. §§ 143, 144; etc.

[18] Judg. IX. 13 (המשמח אלהים ואנשים); Ps. CIV. 15; see Comm. on Genes. p. 230.

[19] See Sect. XI. XII.

[20] Ἔσπεισεν ἐξ αἵματος σταφυλῆς, Sir. L. 15.

Scriptures;[1] and the Romans mixed blood of the victim with red wine to express the kindred meaning of both.[2]

### 4. Frank-incense.

The frank-incense was no doubt originally chosen for sacrifices on account of its fragrance, which was supposed to be pleasing to the gods.[3] It was, therefore, employed among most of the ancient nations whenever they were able to procure it;[4] and in some religions of middle and western Asia, it rose lavishly on the altars, and formed the chief offering (p. 90). It was burnt either as an independent oblation or as an accompaniment of other gifts; and it was deemed especially desirable in conjunction with animal sacrifices, to counteract the ill-odour inseparable from the total or partial burning of the victims.[5] In their earliest stages, the Israelites naturally shared these anthropomorphic views, of which a trace is left in the Hebrew phrase "a sweet odour to the Lord."[6] However, as in all other instances, they gradually modified the primitive and pagan notions, in accordance with their purer conceptions of the nature of the Deity.[7] They understood the terms in a spiritual sense. Frank-incense was regarded as a symbol of the devotion of the soul to God, and of its approach to His holiness. It became a metaphor for fervent and contrite *prayer*.[8] It was, therefore, burnt *entire*; no part of it, as was the case with the oil, belonged to the priest,[9] because the prayer was addressed to God exclusively, to none else. It was put alone, with the exclusion of wine and oil, on the shew-bread,[10] which symbolised the daily worship and supplication of the holy community.[11] It became customary for the people to pray in the Court while the fumigation was performed in the Holy;[12] and the fragrance of the incense and the prayers of the pious were believed to

---

[1] See Gen. XLIX. 11 (דם ענבים); Deut. XXXII. 14 (דם ענב); comp. 1 Macc. VI. 34 (*αἷμα σταφυλῆς*); Sir. XXXIX. 26.

[2] "*Assiratum*", says Festus, "apud antiquos dicebatur genus quoddam potionis vino et sanguine temperatum; quod Latini prisci sanguinem assir vocarent." Other explanations, as that of Abarbanel (Introd. to Lev. c. IV), who considers wine as a type of that moral and spiritual perfection which is attainable through the Law, are less simple and obvious.

[3] Incense is sometimes simply called *εὐωδία* (*Max. Tyr.* diss. 34); comp. *Diod. Sic.* I. 84 (*εὐωδίας θυμιῶντες*).

[4] Comp. *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 28; *Plin.* H. N. XIII. 1.

[5] Comp. Sect. X. 13; *Abarban.* Introd. to Lev. c. 1 *fin.*; *Maimon.* Mor. Neb. III. 45; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 112, 113; II. 213—216.

[6] ריח ניחוח ליהוה, see pp. 7, 8.

[7] Comp. Sect. XII.

[8] Ps. CXLI. 2.

[9] Lev. II. 2, 16, 18, etc.

[10] Lev. XXIV. 5—7.

[11] See Comm. on Exod. p. 481.

[12] Luke I. 10.

ascend simultaneously to the throne of God.[13] It was, therefore, invested with the power of atonement.[14] It thus had, in vegetable offerings, the force attributed to the blood in animal sacrifices.[15] Its fragrance might even represent the Divine spirit and godlike sanctity.[16] Sometimes the incense has been interpreted as an emblem of the *name of the deity*, or, if applied to Jehovah, of the *holy* name of God; therefore, the phrase "to burn incense to God" was considered to be identical with "proclaiming or confessing His name", or with worshipping and praising Him:[17] but this opinion, subtle and specious in itself, is derived from very doubtful premises.[18] With greater truth has the incense been taken to typify moral perfection, as a counterpart to oil, the emblem of intellectual greatness;[19] though this view is neither strictly accurate, nor applicable to all instances.

But frank-incense was, like oil, interdicted at the sin-offering and the offering of jealousy;[20] for the latter also was an oblation "that brings iniquity to remembrance."[21] Both were presented in a condition very different from the qualities symbolised by oil and frank-incense. They reflected neither peace nor devotional prayer; the former had, or might have been, forfeited by guilt; and the latter is accepted from a pure mind only. Other reasons have been assigned for that prohibition. As oil and frank-incense are ornamental and cheering additions, it was believed they could not be admitted in the offering of jealousy, which might possibly reveal baseness and criminal levity;[22] or as the adulteress had loved darkness, her offering was to be unconnected with oil, which, moreover, symbolized a good name forfeited by her: the former view is too vague, the latter trifling. It suffices to allude to the strange opinion that both accompaniments were remitted in sin-

---

13 Revel. VIII. 3, 4; comp. V. 8; comp. *Ovid*, Metam. VI. 164 (turaque dant sanctis et verba precantia flammis); Pont. I. iv. 55; Fast. IV. 410; Trist. I. ii. 104; *Mart.* VIII. xxiv. 4; *Sil. It.* IV. 795, 796.

14 See Num. XVII. 6—15; comp. Lev. XVI. 12, 13.

15 Comp. Lev. II. 1, 2, 15, 16; Num. VII. 14, 20, 26, etc.

16 Comp. Sir. XXXIX. 13, 14; 2 Cor. II. 12: but it is precarious to support this opinion by the etymological affinity of the Hebrew terms רוח and ריח (*Bähr*, Symb. I. 458—470).

17 Comp. מזכיר לבנה, Isai. LXVI. 3. So *Bähr*, Symb. II. 327, 329; I. 462 *sqq.*; der salomon. Tempel, p. 181; comp. *Kurtz*, Opferc. § 146.

18 For it cannot be proved that the term הזכיר בשם יהוה means *to burn incense*, like קרא בשם יהוה; the passages quoted for the purpose (Josh. XXIII. 7; Ps. XX. 8; Isai. XXVI. 13; XLVIII. 1; LXIII. 7; Am. VI. 10) are inconclusive. That burning incense to *heathen* gods is often synonymous with worshipping them, has been explained above (p. 90).

19 *Abarban.* Introd. to Levit. c. IV.

20 Lev. V. 11; Num. V. 15.

21 מַזְכֶּרֶת עָוֹן.

22 Rashi on Lev. V. 11; comp. *Chrysostom*. Orat. V. adv. Jud. ἐπειδὴ πέν-

offerings, in order to save the poor the expense:[1] as if the Levitical law had fettered itself by external considerations, when these were opposed to its main principles.

The thoughtful symbolism of the sacrificial rites will, therefore, be evident from the following survey. Both oil and frank-incense were employed at the independent vegetable oblations; oil alone at the offering of the High-priest on the day of his initiation;[2] incense alone with the shew-bread; but neither oil nor incense at the sin-offerings and the offering of jealousy. Both were naturally also excluded from the two firstling-loaves of Pentecost, because these loaves were leavened,[3] and could therefore not be burnt on the altar, either wholly or partially.

But while plain frank-incense accompanied the sacrifices, the daily fumigations (קְטֹרֶת) in the Sanctuary consisted of four ingredients specified in the Law.[4] For incense was primitively and universally employed with offerings; it was a simple and natural means of external worship; it was, therefore, *retained* in the Pentateuch from early usage. But the preparation from the four ingredients is of later introduction; it is specifically Levitical; it is ordained in harmony with the complicated and more splendid ritual of the Tabernacle and the Temple. Hence incense was prescribed for all private worshippers, but the compound was reserved for the priests; the one was burnt mostly in the Court, the other in the Holy only.[5]

### 5. 6. Wheat and Barley.

Wheat was naturally regarded as the choicest, barley as an inferior grain. The former was, therefore, employed for all ordinary oblations, the latter in some exceptional cases, where its use may readily be accounted for. As wheat is compact and nutritious, and as it is heavy in weight[6] and has little bran, the term "fat of wheat" occurs as a usual methaphor,[7] and later writers declared it even as "the only food worthy of man, the creature endowed with speech and Divine reason."[8]

But barley[9] was considered poor and common; it bore the epithet

---

*θος ἐστὶ καὶ κατάγνωσις καὶ ὑποψία πονηρά κτλ.*

1 *Rosenm.* on Levit. V. 11; Cahen; a. o.

2 Lev. VI. 14.

3 Lev. XXIII. 17.

4 Exod. XXX. 34—38; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 568—570.

5 Artificial is Bähr's explanation (Symb. II. 328).

6 Levissimum ex his hordeum . . . ponderosius far magisque etiamnum triticum (*Plin.* H. N. XVIII. 7 or 11).

7 Deut. XXXII. 14; Ps. LXXXI. 17; CXLVII. 14.

8 *Abarbanel*, Introd. to Lev. c. IV.

9 שְׂעֹרָה, from שער *to be rough* or *hairy*, in reference to the bristly ears, as the Latin *hordeum* from *horreo*.

*vile*;[10] it was deemed fit especially for beasts;[11] it had in Palestine about half the value of wheat;[12] and it was extensively and perhaps ordinarily employed for bread by the poorer, though occasionally also by the wealthier classes.[13] Barley-meal was, therefore, used for the offering of jealousy:[14] from a reason similar to that which suggested the exclusion of oil and frankincense, the costlier wheaten flour was eschewed in an oblation stern and sad in its character,[15] and presented when the dearest relations of domestic life and affection were disturbed or imperilled. We need go no farther in searching for a reason; and least of all should we be inclined to admit that because the adulteress "behaved like the beasts whose connections with one another are promiscuous and incessant", she had to offer flour of that grain "which is of an ambiguous character (ὑπαμφίβολος), and serves as food both for irrational animals and indigent men";[16] or that as she deserved contempt and degradation, her offering was stamped by inferiority and meanness: for when the ritual was performed her guilt was only to be tested; it was not yet proved.

But the presentation of a *barley*-sheaf on Passover was prompted by considerations entirely external; for barley ripens earlier; it was, therefore, more appropriate for a firstfruit-offering,[17] which marked the beginning of the corn-harvest, and which gratitude demanded not to delay beyond necessity.[18] All symbolical explanations of the command are, therefore, inevitably artificial.

### 7. Blood.

The blood of victims is, in the Pentateuch, invested with a meaning which cannot be mistaken. Probably starting from the simple observations that a considerable loss of blood causes death, and that the healthful action of the nerves and muscles depends on its free and normal circulation, the Hebrews held that the blood is "the soul" of the animal,[19] that is, the principle of its existence. It was a funda-

[10] *Phaedr*. II. vii. 9 (vile hordeum).

[11] 1 Ki. V. 8; comp. *Plin*. H. N. XVIII. 7 or 14 (panem ex hordeo antiquis usitatum vita damnavit quadrupedumque fere cibus est).

[12] 2 Ki. VII. 1, 16, 18.

[13] Judg. VII. 13; 2 Ki. IV. 42; Ezek. IV. 9, 12; John VI. 9.

[14] Num. V. 15, 16, 25, 26.

[15] *Philo*, De Spec. Legg. I. 10 (Opp. II. 309, *διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐπὶ χαρτοῖς, ἀλλ' ἄγαν ὀδυνηροῖς μέλλειν τὴν θυσίαν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι*).

[16] *Philo*, l. c.; so also *Mishn*. Sot. II. 1 (כשם שמעשיה מעשה בהמה כך קרבנה מאכל בהמה), and *Rashi* in loc.; *Targ. Jon*. on Num. V. 15 (קמחא דשערי דהינון מיכלא דבעירי); comp. also Hos. III. 2; *Lundius*, Jüd. Heiligthüm. III. lv. 21, p. 794.

[17] עמר ראשית קצירכם, Lev. XXIII. 10; comp. *Mishn*. l. c.

[18] Comp. Comm. on Exod. pp. 182, 459.

[19] נֶפֶשׁ, Gen. IX. 4.

mental axiom, "The life of the flesh is in the blood",[1] or "the blood is the soul";[2] soul and blood were correlative notions;[3] hence dying was expressed by "pouring out the soul";[4] to "shed blood" meant "to destroy life";[5] the blood and the soul of the murdered were said alike to cry to heaven for vengeance;[6] "pure blood" became synonymous with "a pure soul";[7] and even the combination "the soul of pure blood" was formed to denote a guiltless person.[8] "The blood is the libation of life", was a well-understood maxim;[9] for "the law-giver esteemed it to contain the soul and the spirit";[10] or "the breath is the essence of the soul, which has no place independently of the blood, but resembles it and is blended with it."[11] Blood was, therefore, considered most sacred; it seemed connected, by a mysterious bond, with the continuance of that breath, which God infuses in producing a *living creature.*[12] The Bible is so consistent in this conception that it indeed identifies blood with the principle of life or "the soul" (נפש), but never with the power of reason, or with mind, intellect, and "spirit" (רוח); the former is represented as animating the outward senses, the latter as a part of the Divine spirit itself.[13] Hence, as animals also were looked upon as endowed with "a soul", they were, in the period of man's inno-

---

[1] נפש הבשר בדם, Lev. XVII. 11; comp. ver. 14.

[2] הדם הוא הנפש, Deut. XII. 23.

[3] Comp. Ps. XCIV. 21; Matth. XXIII. 35.

[4] השתפך נפש or הערה נ׳ (Lament. II. 12; Is. LIII. 12); comp. *Virg.* Aen. IX. 349, purpuream vomit ille animam — a still bolder and more pregnant term.

[5] Comp. Gen. IX. 6; Lev. XVII. 4; 1 Ki. II. 31; 2 Ki. XXI. 16; XXIV. 4; 1 Chr. XXII. 8; etc.; comp. Prov. XXVIII. 17.

[6] Comp. Gen. IV. 10 and Job XXIV. 12; see also Hebr. XII. 24; Rev. VI. 9, 10.

[7] Ps. XCIV. 21 (דם נקי); comp. Matth. XXIII. 35 (*αἷμα δίκαιον*).

[8] נפש דם נקי, Deut. XXVII. 25; comp. Jer. II. 34; and דם נפש, Prov. XXVIII. 17.

[9] *Philo*, De Victim. c. 6, *ψυχῆς γὰρ κυρίως εἰπεῖν ἐστι σπονδὴ τὸ αἷμα.*

[10] *Joseph.* Antiqq. III. xi. 2, *ψυχὴν αὐτὸ καὶ πνεῦμα νομίζων.*

[11] *Phil.* Fragm. ex Joh. Monach. *περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ νοῦ*, Opp. II. 668 (Tauchn. VI. 259), *ὡς εἶναι ψυχῆς μὲν οὐσίαν πνεῦμα, μὴ καθ' ἑαυτὸ δὲ χωρὶς αἵματος τόπον ἐπέχειν, ἀλλ' ἐμφέρεσθαι καὶ συγκεκρᾶσθαι αἵματι*; comp. l. c. Tauchn. pp. 390, 391. The views that the blood was regarded as the *source* of life or of *generation*, and that it was supposed to contain virtually and potentially all the elements of organic life (*Delitzsch*, Bibl. Psych. p. 201—203), have no support in the O. T.

[12] נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, Gen. I. 24.

[13] Comp. Gen. II. 7; IX. 4; Deut. XII. 23. Therefore Philo observes correctly (Fragm. l. c.) *ψυχῆς οὐσία αἷμά ἐστιν ψυχῆς μέντοι τῆς αἰσθητικῆς, οὐχὶ τῆς κατ' ἐξοχὴν γενομένης, ἥτις ἐστὶ λογικὴ καὶ νοερά.* The blood was hardly conceived to be "the connecting link between mind and body, which unites both into a living person or נפש" (*Hamburger*, Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud, I. pp. 193, 194); for the רוח possesses higher attributes than the mere נפש.

cence, not designed to be killed for human food; and though, after the flood, their flesh was allowed, their blood was interdicted by a command meant to be binding for all times and in every clime, and enforced under the most fearful penalties, "Whatever man there is of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eats any manner of blood; I will set My face against that soul that eats blood, and will cut him off from among his people";[14] which almost vehement severity, directed alike against the native and the foreigner, seems to have been suggested by the opposite and deep-rooted practice of the Hebrews and the surrounding nations.[15] The same prohibition was, with singular unanimity, upheld by Jewish tradition;[16] it was by an apostolic decree enjoined upon the early Christians as a most solemn moral obligation;[17] and it was enforced in the Koran among the fundamental laws of Mohammed's creed.[18] The custom of abstaining from blood seems to go back to very primitive times;[19] and was probably suggested by some simple or cosmic reasons.[20] It has been conjectured, that the Israelites shunned blood as being dangerous to gentleness of temper, and fostering animal propensities and the sanguinary nature of beasts;[21] or as injuring health, and if copiously taken, even causing death, as is especially the case with ox-blood,[22] or because it was, in Asia, commonly drunk at the sacrifices of heathens, and particularly for the confirmation of oaths or compacts, from which customs the Hebrews were to be weaned.[23] It may be a matter of dispute whether such considerations influenced them in the earliest periods, as

[14] Lev. XVII. 10; comp. ver. 14; Gen. IX. 4; Lev. III. 17; VII. 26, 27; XIX. 26; Deut. XII. 16, 23—25; XV. 23.

[15] Comp. 1 Sam. XIV. 32, 33; Ezek. XXXIII. 25; *Philo*, De Concup. c. 10.

[16] It fixed the strictest regulations for removing the blood from the meat by soaking the latter in water and salting it. Comp. *Yor. Deah* §§ 69 *sqq.*

[17] Acts XV. 20, 29; XXI. 25; comp. *Joseph.* Antiqq. I. iii. 8; see Comm. on Gen. pp. 215, 216; and so the Fathers of the Church, comp. *Tertull.* Apologet. c. 9.

[18] *Koran* II. 168; V. 4; VI. 146; XVI. 116.

[19] Comp. Gen. IX. 4 (though, of course, this passage proves nothing but the *author's* view of the period of its introduction); 1 Sam. XIV. 32, 33.

[20] It is groundless to assert that it did not exist among the Jews before the time of the Babylonian exile; so *Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, pp. 605, 606; Ewald, in his admirable remarks on the subject (Alterth. pp. 38—42), more justly places it in very early times.

[21] *Maimon.* Mor. Neb. III. 48; *Nachman.* on Levit. XVII. 11 (p. 96*b*), חהיה עובי וגסות בנפש האדם; *Delitzsch*, Bibl. Psych. p. 201 (the command was to prevent "thierische Verrohung des Menschen"); Comm. zu Gen. p. 265.

[22] *Rosenmüll.* on Lev. III. 17; comp. *Val. Max.* V. vi. 3; on the blood-suckers in India see Transact. of As. Soc. III. p. 379 *sqq.*

[23] *Michael.* Mos. R. IV. § 206; *De Wette*, Beiträge, II. 56; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. p. 131; comp. *Hottinger*, Jur. Hebr. Legg. pp. 200—203; *Spencer*, De Legg. Ritt. I. x. 2.

they perhaps guided other nations; but they certainly find no echo in the Bible; this regards the blood as the seat of life, and forbids it for that reason exclusively.

And from this point of view alone can the significance of the blood in the Hebrew sacrifices be correctly estimated. As the victim gives up its life for him who offers it,[1] and thereby restores his harmony of mind or secures his atonement, the blood which represents that life is of paramount moment in the economy of the sacrificial ritual; it forms, in a certain respect, its very centre; and not unjustly has it been described as "the kernel of the offering."[2] So intimately was, in the course of time, the prohibition of blood connected with the system of sacrifice, that it was indeed extended to all quadrupeds and birds, but not applied to fishes, because the latter were never offered on the altar.[3] The old Jewish canon "there is no atonement except by blood",[4] accords with the spirit of the Law; the few exceptions judiciously admitted in the Pentateuch,[5] so far from disproving the supreme importance of the blood in sacrifices,[6] help to confirm the general rule.[7] Hence that blood only was efficacious for propitiation, which was shed in *killing* the animal, not that which flowed from a wound or any unhealthy organ.[8] The blood was not a mere symbol; it was not regarded, "in the hand of God and by His will, as the means of atonement",[9] a view that has been prompted by aversion to the doctrine of vicariousness: it was supposed actually to conciliate the deity as no other agency could have done, because it responds to the demand of "life for life." Nor was it employed in the public ceremonials because it was deemed the seat of desire, passion, and sin, and was, therefore, to be removed; if so, how could it be put on the most sacred parts of the Tabernacle and Temple, on the altars of the Court and of the Holy, the vail of the Holy of Holies, and the Mercy-seat with the Cherubim? Will it be seriously urged that "the misdeed itself which is engendered by the

---

1 See Sect. XVIII.

2 עִקַּר הַקָּרְבָּן.

3 Comp. Lev. VII. 26; XVII. 13; see *infra*, and notes on VII. 22—27. The blood of *unclean* fishes, however, was forbidden according to tradition, which established the general rule מאכל היוצא מן הטמא טמא.

4 אין כפרה אלא בדם, *Talm.* Yom 5*a*; Menach. 39; Zebach. 6*a*; comp. Hebr. IX. 22 (*χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις*); see also 1 Pet. I. 2; Hebr. IX. 12—14; XII. 24; Matth. XXVI. 28.

5 Lev. V. 11—13; comp. Exod. XXX. 12—16.

6 *Strauss*, Streitschriften, I. p. 163.

7 See Sect. XV.

8 The latter was by the Talmudists called דם האיברים, and it was, according to the same authorities, not punishable by excision (כרת), but as a simple prohibition (לאו) by flagellation only (מלקות; *Yor: Deah* § 67; comp. *Hottinger*, l. c. pp. 201, 202), though this distinction is hardly in harmony with the precepts of the Law.

9 *Bähr*, Symb. II. 203.

blood, is purified and ennobled in the presence of God"? Indeed the blood was by no means esteemed impure; it was not considered to have become so because the guilt of the sinner was transferred to the victim;[10] for the latter did not take upon itself the guilt, but the punishment of the offender. On the contrary, the blood had the power of purifying and sanctifying the dedicated implements on which it was sprinkled, as the brazen and the golden altar,[11] or the persons and garments of the High-priest and the common priests at their consecration,[12] the leper after his recovery,[13] and the contracting parties at the conclusion of treaties;[14] in certain cases, it hallowed even those objects which it touched by chance;[15] and the author of the epistle to the Hebrews could declare in general terms, "almost all things are by the Law purged with blood."[16] Had it been impure and not holy, it would not have been put by the Hebrews on the door-posts and lintels of their houses, on the night of the exodus, as a distinctive badge of safety and rescue.[17] It was, like the fat, "the food of God";[18] and the Law propounded the principle that a sin-offering of which any of the blood was brought into the Holy for atonement, was not to be eaten but entirely burnt; whereas the flesh of the other expiatory sacrifices was consumed by the priests.[19]

However, it would be erroneous to declare the blood as the principle and foundation to which every sacrificial law or rite is traceable;[20] such inference can at least not be derived from a passage prominent and notable indeed, but surely not so comprehensive in import, namely "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes an atonement for the soul" (Lev. XVII. 11). These words explain merely the signification of the sacrificial blood; they do not disclose the nature and meaning of the sacrifices themselves. If so, they would exclude all bloodless offerings. The sprinkling of blood formed indeed a part in all animal sacrifices, but it was not the principal act in all alike; it had this paramount significance in expiatory

[10] So *De Wette*, De Morte Jes. Chr. expiat. p. 16; a. o.; the view of the Persians who according to Strabo (XV. iii. 14, p. 733), "took care that none of the pure water was sprinkled with blood, and thus polluted" (*ὡς μιαινοῦντες*), proves nothing for the Hebrew conceptions.

[11] Lev. VIII. 15; XVI. 19.

[12] Lev. VIII. 23, 24, 30.

[13] Lev. XIV. 7, 14.

[14] Exod. XXIV. 8.

[15] Lev. VI. 20.

[16] *Καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν. αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον*, Hebr. IX. 22; comp. vers. 13, 14.

[17] Exod. XII. 7, 13.

[18] לחם יהוה, Ezek. XLIV. 7, 15; comp. Ps. L. 13.

[19] Lev. VII. 23; see Sect. XV; comp. also *Demosth* Adv. Conon. 39.

[20] This has been attempted by *Bähr*, Symb. II. 199 *sqq.*; comp. *Hengstenb.* Opfer p. 4; *Kurtz*, Opferc. p. 33.

offerings, but it was, in holocausts and in thank-offerings, subordinated to other and more characteristic rites.[1] All classes of animal sacrifice considered together, not the blood itself was most essential, but the shedding of the blood, or the killing of the victim, or its death.[2]

The eating of blood was properly interdicted because it was considered to be or to enclose the soul; but on this prohibition also the Levitical legislators desired to impress their stamp; they regarded such a reason as too mundane and too physical, and therefore strengthened it by urging that the blood ought lawfully to be appropriated, on the altar alone, to the ends of atonement.[3] But they were in this case, as in most others, unable to efface the lines of history. A clear trace of the primitive notion has been preserved in two laws: even the blood of cattle that was killed at home and for food was to be "poured out on the ground like water", and to be covered with earth;[4] and not only the blood of the sacrificial animals, of ox, sheep, and goat, was to be avoided, but also that of all other clean beasts, as stags, roes, and gazelles, and of all birds — evidence enough that the considerations of altar and sacrifice did not originally prompt the comprehensive prohibition;[5] and this becomes more evident still by a comparison of the corresponding ordinance regarding the abstinence from fat.[6]

The notions of the Israelites with regard to the blood were not isolated; they were shared, though with some significant modifications, by nearly every people and tribe which offered animal sacrifices. The Egyptians hieroglyphically expressed the soul by a hawk, because, they said, "the one like the other feeds on blood";[7] and they plainly taught that the soul and reason of animate creatures dwell in the blood.[8] The Chaldeans held that man was formed of earth and of the blood of the god Belus, the one constituting his body, the other his soul.[9] Early philosophers of Greece simply maintained, "the soul is blood";[10] some,

---

[1] See Sect. X. 13; XI—XV. So judges also *Hermann*, Gottesdienstl. Alterth. d. Griech. p. 122.

[2] See also notes on XVII. 11.

[3] It is, therefore, incorrect to place Lev. III. 17 and VI. 26 in the same period as XVII. 11, and still more so to assert that the last-named passage is repeated in Deut. XII. 16, 23, 24; XV. 23 (so, f. i., *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 39). The principle laid down in Lev. XVII. 11 is by far of the latest date; and is not, as it could not be, repeated at all in any of the passages mentioned.

[4] Deut. XII. 16, 24; comp. ver. 23; Lev. XVII. 13; see *Yor. Deah* § 28.

[5] This view, therefore, is clearly untenable; *Keil*, Archäol. II. 23, 24; comp. *Kurtz*, Opferc. pp. 13—15.

[6] See No 8 of this Section.

[7] *Horapoll.* I. 7, *ἱέραξ διὰ τὸ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν συμπαθεῖν, ὕδωρ οὐ πίνει τὸ καθόλου ἀλλ' αἷμα ᾧ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τρέφεται.*

[8] Comp. *Gladisch*, Empedocles und die Aegypter, p. 53 *sqq.*

[9] *Euseb.* Chron. Armen. I. p. 24 *sqq.*

[10] *Arist.* De Anim. I. 2; comp. *Tertullian.* De Anim. c. 15.

perhaps adopting Egyptian doctrines, limited this power to the blood of the heart;[11] the stoics defined the soul as "an exhalation from blood";[12] and others contended that the soul is nourished by the blood.[13] The Romans used *anima litare* as synonymous with *sanguine litare,* and both were the priestly terms commonly employed for sacrificing under favourable auspices.[14] In the old Teuton tongue, blood is equivalent with soul or life,[15] and the blood of Odin, falling on the ground, was believed, in the ensuing spring, to produce herbs and flowers. Again, the bloody offerings were everywhere the more important class;[16] they were considered to realise more completely the idea of sacrifice, not merely because for warlike tribes, requiring strong sensations, fire-offerings were more congenial than the simpler bloodless oblations;[17] but because blood was, at all times and under every zone, supposed to be pre-eminently fitted to work expiation and to appease the gods.[18] The Persians offered to the deity nothing of the flesh, but only the blood "or the soul."[19] Whenever the old Arabians implored a god for benefits, they besmeared his image with blood. The Chinese put blood on things connected with the object of the sacrifice, as for instance on the ship, in which a voyage was intended, thereby trusting to secure the good-will of the gods.[20] The Scythians poured the blood of captive enemies over an iron shield which represented the figure of the god of war.[21] In India, at the sacrifices of Shiva, the blood of the victim is solemnly carried before the image of the god; his wife Kali is entreated to drink of it; and the people, sprinkling with it their faces, prostrate themselves to the ground.[22] In fact, blood is in many instances synonymous with sacrifice itself. In Greek, to sacri-

---

[11] *Αἷμα περικάρδιον*; so Empedocles, τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν (ψυχή) ἐν τῇ τοῦ αἵματος συστάσει; "Empedocles animum esse censet cordi suffusum sanguinem", *Cic.* Tusc. Quaest. I. 9; comp. *Plut.* Plac. Philos. IV. 5; comp. *Gladisch,* l. c., and Anaxagoras und die Israeliten, p. 88.

[12] *Ἀναθυμίασις ἀφ' αἵματος*, *Marc. Aurel.* Medit. V. 33; VI. 15. Heraclitus also spoke of the soul as an *ἀναθυμίασις*; *Aristot.* l. c.

[13] *Τρέφεσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος*, *Diog. Laert.* VIII. i. 19.

[14] Comp. *Virg.* Aen. II. 118, and *Servius* in loc., and ad II. 532; IV. 2; V. 79; VI. 222, 885; IX. 348; X. 908; *Plaut.* Poen. II. i. 41, 42 (tum me Jupiter faciat ut semper sacrificem, nec unquam litem); *Macrob.* Saturn. III. 5 (litare, quod significat sacrificio facto placare numen); *Grotius* on Lev. XVII. 11. See our Comment. on Gen. IX. 5—7; Exod. XX. 13; XXI. 12—14.

[15] *Mone,* Geschichte des nord. Heidenth. I. 168. [16] See pp. 11—13.

[17] *Ewald,* Alterth. p. 30.

[18] Comp. *Meiners,* Krit. Gesch. II. 113; *Görres,* Mythengesch. p. 421; *Kleuker,* Anh. zum Zend-Avest. I. 2. p. 206; *Grimm,* Deutsche Myth. p. 35; *Bähr,* Symb. II. 263.

[19] *Strab.* XV. p. 732; *Herod.* II. 132.

[20] *Bähr,* Symb. II. 245.

[21] *Herod.* IV. 81.

[22] Asiat. Res. VIII. 51.

fice was expressed by *αἱμάσσειν τοὺς βωμούς*.[1] The ancient Germanic tribes, though presenting bloodless oblations also, called every offering blood (blot); to sacrifice or to worship was to bleed (blotan), and sacrificial service blood-service (blotinassus);[2] the priest was called a blood-man (blotmadur, blotgodar, or blutekirl); and among the ancient Prussians the high-priest *Crive* derived his name from *Krawia* which means blood.

Nor was the *sacredness* of blood less highly estimated by heathen nations than by the Hebrews. Blood was extensively employed for sealing compacts and treaties, and for ratifying solemn oaths and vows, as has been more fully specified in another place.[3] It was on such occasions sometimes mixed with wine,[4] and then drunk both by the contracting parties and those present who served as witnesses. The instance of Catiline will at once occur to every reader.[5] The boar-sacrifice offered by the northern nations to Freya, the goddess of fertility and peace, like Ceres, helped to renew the relations of loyalty between the king and his subjects and to confirm the oath of allegiance. Poured into pits or caverns the blood was believed to call up the gods and the spirits of the lower world and to elicit revelations.[6] The drinking of blood was believed to bestow higher powers or spiritual faculties, and especially the gift of prophecy, in a word, to effect a closer communion with the deity and the invisible world. The intact woman who gave oracles in the temple of Apollo Deiradiotes in Argos, killed by night every month a lamb, and drank of its blood whenever she wished to be prophetically inspired.[7] Though the Zabii ordinarily held blood in utter abhorrence and regarded it as the food of fiendish demons, they drank a part of the sacrificial blood, and devoted the rest to the gods; they thus hoped to conclude with them a holy friendship and to learn from them the future.[8] With a similar view, the priestesses of the Cimbri, who accompanied the armies, observed the blood of slain captives as it flowed into a brazen vessel.[9]

---

[1] *Porphyr.* II. 7; *Pollux*, I. i. 24.

[2] Comp. *Ulphilas* in Rom. XII. 1; Mark VII. 7; Luke II. 37; see Edda Saemundar. Kopenhag. 1787, 1818, I. 437—440; II. 587.

[3] See Comm. on Gen. p. 367, and on Exod. p. 472; comp. also Ps. XVI. 4; Zech. IX. 7; Ezek. XXXIII. 25.

[4] Comp. the *vinum assiratum* of the Romans, p. 118.

[5] Comp. *Sallust.* Cat. c. 22; *Dion Cass.* XXXVII. 30; Flor. IV. 1 (or II. 12); *Sil. Ital.* Pun. II. 426—428 (413—415).

[6] *Hom.* Od. XI. 23 *sqq.*; *Hor.* Sat. I. viii. 28, 29 (Cruor in fossam confusus, ut inde manes elicerent, animas responsa daturas); *Augustin.* De Civit. Dei VII. 35 (Genus divinationis ... a Persis ... allatum quo, adhibito sanguine, etiam inferos perhibet suscitari).

[7] *Pausan.* II. xxiv. 1, *γευσαμένη δὴ τοῦ αἵματος ἡ γυνὴ κάτοχος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γίνεται.*

[8] Comp. *Maimon.* Mor. Neb. III. 46; *Origen.* C. Cels. VIII. p. 396 ed. Spenc.

[9] *Strab.* VII. ii. 3, p. 294.

The old Germans believed that the blood of victims imparted life and consciousness to inanimate objects; they therefore sprinkled it on the images of their gods in the hope of endowing them with speech and sensation. They supposed that it secured prolongation of life; they attributed to it the power of magic and witchcraft, which no earthly effort could resist; and in their language to bleed (blotan) signified to deify or to impart supernatural faculties.[10]

We have faithfully recorded and unfolded the notions of Hebrews and pagans on blood: but it would be impossible to analyse them from an absolute or philosophical point of view. They belong inseparably to the whole circle of primitive conceptions; and in connection with these alone they can be understood and fairly estimated. They originated in those childlike times, when the entire living creation was joined together by a bond of relationship, when the animals, though inferior to men, were conceived, like them, as cosmic beings, and when, therefore, the blood of either was regarded with the same holy awe and unaccountable terror, because in either case revered as an emanation from the soul of the universe, and hence inherently possessing the power of purification and atonement. But so irresistible is the mystic hold of these conceits upon the human mind, that they linger and vibrate even in those religious systems which have risen above a worship of nature and her powers; they have, in such creeds, indeed been subordinated to the doctrine of a Divine Ruler who created man in His own image, and the beasts as clay animated by the breath of life; but they have been retained as spiritual emblems which, like all symbols, could not be preserved in purity and without an admixture of irrational and superstitious alloy.

## 8. Fat.

With the prohibition of the blood the interdiction of fat is more than once coupled in the Pentateuch, "You shall eat neither fat nor blood";[11] it is, like the law on blood, to be valid "as a perpetual statute for all generations";[12] and it is enjoined with almost equal severity, and under the same rigorous penalty, "You shall eat no manner of fat, of ox, or of sheep, or of goat...for whosoever eats the fat of the beasts, of which men offer an offering made by fire to the Lord, that soul that eats it shall be cut off from his people."[13] Moreover, fat is, like the blood, repeatedly called "the food of the Lord."[14] It cannot, therefore, be doubtful, that analogous reasons prompted the law in both cases.

---

[10] Comp. *Wachter* in Ersch and Gruber's Encycl. III. iv. 92, 101, 102.

[11] Lev. III. 17.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Lev. VII. 23, 25; comp. vers. 26, 27.

[14] Lev. III. 11, 16; Ezek. XLIV. 7, 15; comp. XXXIX. 19.

Nor is it difficult to discover the common principle. Like the blood, the fat is an index of the life and strength of the animal; and as man was to abstain from blood, because it was deemed the soul, so was he to avoid the fat, because it was supposed to express the health, vigour, and vitality of the animal. The Hebrew Scriptures allow us to trace the steps by which the fat gradually was endowed with such dignity. It was, from early times, naturally considered as "the richest part and that which guards the entrails; for it envelops them, and makes them flourish, and benefits them by the softness of its touch."[1] It became, therefore, a synonym of wealth and abundance;[2] it was the emblem of joy and cheerfulness;[3] it was employed for what is most valuable and most distinguished; "the fat of the land" denoted its wealth and its choicest fruits;[4] the "fat of wheat",[5] the "fat of oil", and "the fat of wine",[6] designated the richest kinds of these productions; "the fat of heroes"[7] described the bravest of the brave; "the fat of the people",[8] the wealthiest, noblest, and most powerful citizens, also called "cows of Bashan", because these were renowned for remarkable fatness.[9] Therefore, whenever the sacrifices were not entirely burnt on the altar, it was deemed right and appropriate to dedicate to the sacred flames those parts of the victim which have aptly been termed "the flower of the flesh",[10] and which, because the best, might well represent all, or the entire animal. As, therefore, most nations, and among them the Phoenicians,[11] burnt the fat to the deity, the rising smoke of which was deemed its most pleasing and most acceptable offering;[12] so the Hebrews, resembling the Phoenicians in many points, adopted the general rule, "All fat belongs to the Lord";[13] and they clearly understood that it was burnt "as a sweet odour to Him":[14] it was so burnt, from remote periods,[15] in thank-offerings to point to the prosperity and happiness of the worshipper; and in the expiatory offerings, to symbolise the supremacy and power

---

[1] *Philo*, De Victim. 7. The fat and fat parts are in the Talmudical writings called אימורים (comp. *Mishn.* Succ. V. 7; *Midr.* Esth. I. 9), which is in Aruch explained to mean "the prime and leading portions of the animal" (שהם מורים ואדונים וכ'); comp. *Buxt.* Lex. Rabb. p. 124.

[2] Ps. LXV. 12; Jer. XXXI. 14.

[3] Comp. Isai. LV. 2; Ps. LXIII. 6.

[4] Gen. XLV. 18.

[5] See p. 120.

[6] Num. XVIII. 12.

[7] 2 Sam. I. 22; comp. Judg. III. 29.

[8] Ps. XXII. 30; comp. XVII. 10; Isai. X. 16.

[9] Ps. LXVIII. 23; Ezek. XXXIX. 18; Am. IV. 1.

[10] Flos carnis.

[11] This is evident from the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles, line 14 (ועל חלב ועל חלב); comp. *Virg.* Aen. IV. 62 (*pingues* arae); *Movers*, Opferwes. p. 108.

[12] See p. 7 note 22; comp. Sect. X. 13; XX.

[13] כל־חלב ליהוה; Lev. III. 16.

[14] ריח ניחוח; Lev. III. 5, 11, 16; XVII. 6.

[15] Comp. 1 Sam. II. 15, 16.

of God. Now, when it was in this manner set apart for the purposes of the altar, then, and then only, it was forbidden for human consumption, and men were not to share what belonged to God. For it is impossible to suppose that a cattle-breeding people, like the Hebrews, surrendered one of the most valuable parts of their slaughtered animals willingly and primitively; the very severity with which it is prohibited in the Pentateuch proves how generally it was eaten. Nor is it easy to see how, among a simple-minded people, the use of fat could be made a religious crime; the idea that *fat* is life, is not so natural and manifest as the doctrine that *blood* is life; and it pre-supposes a longer course of observation and reflexion. The prohibition is, therefore, evidently a special development of the Levitical theories; it originated when these were worked out with unconditional consistency regardless of the exorbitant burdens they imposed upon the people. It was brought into the closest connection with the laws of sacrifice; it was at first not enjoined, like the blood, with the addition "in all your habitations";[16] it was, therefore, understood to apply to the time and place of the common offerings only; and it was restricted to the fat of ox, sheep, and goat, that is, of those beasts alone "of which men present an offering made by fire to the Lord";[17] it was therefore indeed meant to include *all* animals of these species, since even those intended for food were, according to the same exacting legislators, to be killed as sacrifices at the common Sanctuary;[18] but not even the hierarchical party could venture to extend it to all clean animals of whatever species; while the blood, not so valuable in itself and looked upon with awe from primitive times, could be generally prohibited, both that of all quadrupeds and that of all birds. Only with respect to time and place, the laws of both could gradually be equalised, and a subsequent ordinance declared, "It shall be an eternal statute for your generations throughout all your dwellings, You shall eat neither fat nor blood."[19] These conclusions are corroborated from another side also. That the holiness of fat was a later idea is manifest from the circumstance that it is not even enjoined in the Book of Deuteronomy.[20] In the last "song of Moses",[21] the author names, among other choice blessings granted by the bounty of God to the Israelites, also "the fat of lambs and rams;"[22] in the poet's time, therefore, that is, at a very late period of the Hebrew commonwealth,[23] the fat of sacrificial animals

---

16 Lev. VII. 26.

17 Lev. VII. 23, 25.

18 Lev. XVII. 3—5, see p. 39.

19 Lev. III. 17.

20 Comp. Deut. XII. 15, 16, 23—25; see p. 39.

21 Deut. XXXII. 14.

22 חלב כרים ואילים.

23 See Comm. on Gen. pp. 724, 725.

was still unscrupulously eaten and regarded as a special delicacy worthy of being coupled with honey and oil, wheat and wine.[1]

These seem to have been the reasons and the phases of the laws regarding fat. Some simply contend that the fat and fat parts, by being dedicated to God, become too holy for human consumption or use;[2] but this view does not explain what it professes to account for, namely, *why* the fat and fat parts were singled out to be devoted to the Deity. Philo[3] supposed that the prohibition of fat was intended to inculcate "temperance and zeal for an austere life"; but the Bible affords no evidence of this symbolical meaning. More untenable still are the various motives which some believe to have suggested the burning of the fat in animal sacrifices; and they require no more than a passing allusion. On the one hand, it has been fantastically maintained that it shadowed forth the purification of the nobler instincts of human nature by the sanctifying fire of Divine love; for the fat which was considered the seat of the finest and most secret of human emotions, typified the innermost kernel of man or the *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, whereas the flesh corresponded with the external man corrupted by sin and given over to death or the *σῶμα χοϊκόν*[4] — a view totally unsupported by the Scriptures, which nowhere represent the fat of animals as a type of the finest emotions of man,[5] nor place the victim at all in relation with the virtues or vices, but quite generally with the property or the life of the offerer, nor in any way countenance a subtle or mystic symbolism. On the other hand, it has been lightly conjectured that the fat was consumed on the altar in order to remove it effectually, as it is unhealthy food, especially in hot eastern climates, and among a race subject to diseases of the skin; or in order to make the fire burn more brightly; or to lead the Hebrews to the cultivation of the olive-oil, and thus help to change their character from a nomadic and pastoral to an agricultural people[6] — explanations more objectionable still, because either trivial and superficial, or foreign to the spirit of the Pentateuch,

---

[1] This parallelism and the context forbid us to understand the term "fat of lambs and rams" figuratively as the "fattest and best" flocks (see *supra*): the text evidently enumerates not the products of nature themselves, but their most valued and most excellent parts.

[2] Comp. *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. I. x. 2; *Knob*. Lev. p. 410; *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 42; *Keil*, Lev. p. 50.

[3] De Concupiscent. c. 11, Opp. II. 356.

[4] Comp. Rom. VII. 22—25. So *Keil*, Archaeologie, I. 231; comp. Comment. über Levit. p. 35.

[5] Though the entrails were, in the ancient world, extensively regarded as the organs of sentiment, thought, and intelligence, and were, therefore, frequently employed for auguries; comp. *Delitzsch*, Bibl. Psych. pp. 220—230; see Sect. XX.

[6] *Philo*, Concup. l. c. (*διότι πιότατον . . . ὡς ὕλη φλογὸς ἀντ' ἐλαίου*); *Maimon*. Mor. Neb. III. 48; *Outr*. De

which assigns to God not the obnoxious but the very choicest parts of the victim, and which makes the laws of sacrifice subservient solely to spiritual and not to practical or political ends.

It is in harmony with the tenor of the Biblical commands to limit their operation to that fat which, in solid masses, covers the bowels, the kidneys, and the flanks, and not to extend it to that involved in the flesh, which requires to be cut in order to expose it to the view.[7] But, naturally, the fat of *all* animals which died of themselves, or were torn by beasts,[8] was forbidden as food, because such animals were "unclean."[9]

## 9. Leaven.

The reason why leaven was rigorously kept aloof from the altar[10] is indisputable. It cannot be derived from the nature and properties of the prepared substance; for leaven was deemed to enhance the palatableness and nutritiousness of bread;[11] and as it possesses the power of raising and uplifting, it was occasionally compared even to the "kingdom of heaven."[12] But the cause must be traced to the mode in which leaven was usually obtained — namely, by allowing dough mixed with water to stand for some time till it passed into a state of fermentation or *corruption*. It is on these grounds that leaven was regarded incompatible with the innermost character of the altar and of the offerings there presented, which typify life and health, regeneration and purity.[13] It was used to symbolise sin and defilement. While, in the later Jewish literature, unleavened bread was an emblem of the virtuous instincts of the heart,[14] and the New Testament speaks of "the unleavened bread

---

Sacrif. p. 275; *Rosenm.* Schol. Lev. III. 17; comp. *Strabo,* XV. iii. 14; *Winer*, Real-Wört. II. 489; *Michael.*, Mos. R. IV. § 206, and on Lev. VII. 22—25.

[7] The latter kind of fat was later distinguished by the name שׁוּמָן; see notes on Lev. VII. 28—34; comp. *Yoreh Deah* § 64. 4—9, 14; מצות השם, p. 24. The Koran (VI. 142) inaccurately observes, that the Pentateuch did not prohibit the fat that is on the back of the quadrupeds, or their intestines, or between their legs.

[8] נבלה וטרפה.

[9] Lev. VII. 24; comp. XVII. 15; XXII. 8; see notes on VII. 22—27.

[10] Lev. II. 11; XXIII. 18; comp. Am. IV. 5.

[11] See p. 9.

[12] Matth. XIII. 33; Luke XIII. 21.

[13] Jerome renders, therefore, ζυμοῖ (1 Cor. V. 6; Gal. V. 9) by *corrumpit*. The objections raised against this view by Hofmann (Schriftbeweis, II. 1. p. 154) and Neumann (in Schneider's Zeitschr. 1853, pp. 333 *sqq.*) are unimportant. The etymology of שְׂאֹר leads to the idea of *effervescing* (comp. ζύμη and ζέω, fermentum and ferveo, etc.; and fermentum poetically for the ebullition of anger and passion; *Plaut.* Casin. II. v. 17; Merc. V. iii. 3; *Juven.* III. 188, and Ruperti in loc.). The remarks of Kurtz (Opferc. pp. 250, 251), starting from correct premises, stray into overrefined conclusions.

[14] יצר הטוב (or יצרא טבא).

of sincerity and truth";[1] leaven, or "the leaven in the dough",[2] became a very frequent metaphor for the evil propensities of man;[3] the New Testament familiarly alludes to "the leaven of malice and wickedness",[4] the "leaven of the Pharisees" which is "hypocrisy",[5] and the "leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees" which is their perverse "doctrine";[6] and it was a current maxim, that as "a little leaven leavens the whole lump",[7] one sinful thought that is harboured in the mind renders the sacrifice unavailing and unaccepted. Hence the ordinance scrupulously to remove from the houses and the whole land, under penalty of excision, all leaven on Passover,[8] and to eat unleavened bread exclusively during the seven days, though partly intended as a historical reminiscense,[9] and partly as a symbol of the "bread of affliction" which the Israelites ate in Egypt,[10] was also understood to prefigure that sanctity and purity which behove the people chosen to enter into a solemn covenant with God for the revelation and diffusion of His truth.[11] But the notion of absolutely removing from the altar which secures spiritual life all that recalls the condition of decay, this notion, complex and allegorising, belongs obviously not to an early, but to a very advanced stage of religious thought, and it accords fully with the whole edifice of the Levitical laws of sacrifice.

Several other reasons have been assigned for the exclusion of leaven — because this is an image of inflated haughtiness and insolence, arrogance and self-conceit;[12] or because it imparts to the bread a sensual stimulant antagonistic to offerings, whence the Hebrews were to be accustomed to the use of unleavened bread, as in primitive times;[13] or its absence in the vegetable oblations was to correspond with the quality of faultlessness in animal sacrifices:[14] to all which opinions nearly the same objections apply as have above been urged against many untenable explanations of the meaning of fat.

The views entertained by the Hebrews regarding leaven, were shared by the ancient nations. They are, in fact, plainly stated in

---

[1] 1 Cor. V. 8, *ἄζυμα εἰλικρινείας καὶ ἀληθείας*.

[2] שאור שבעיסה.

[3] יצר הרע (or יצרא בישא); Gen. VI. 5; VIII. 21; 1 Chr. XXIX. 18; comp. *Talm*. Succ. 52*a*; Sanhedr. 91*b*; Bab. Bathr. 58*a*; Berach. 17*a*. The verb החמיץ took, therefore, the meaning of *deteriorating*; see no. 10 of this Section; comp. also *Lightfoot*, on Matth. XVI. 6, Opp. II. p. 334.

[4] *Ζύμη κακίας καὶ πονηρίας*, 1 Cor. V. 8.

[5] Luke XII. 1; comp. Mark VIII. 15.

[6] Matth. XVI. 6, 11, 12.

[7] 1 Cor. V. 6; Gal. V. 9.

[8] Exod. XII. 15, 19; XIII. 7; Deut. XVI. 11.

[9] Exod. XII. 39.

[10] לֶחֶם עֹנִי, Deut. XVI. 3.

[11] Comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 197.

[12] *Philo*, De Victim. c. 6.

[13] *Bauer*, Tübing. Zeitsch. I. 68, 69; *Neumann*, l. c.; comp. also *Ewald* in Zeitschr. für d. Kund. d. Morgenl. III. 423.

[14] *Öhler*, l. c. p. 623.

the following remark of Plutarch: "Leaven itself comes from corruption, and corrupts the dough with which it is mixed, . . . and in general, fermentation seems to be a kind of putrefaction";[15] therefore the priest of Jupiter (flamen Dialis) was forbidden to touch leaven;[16] and so rigidly was he to be shielded from contact with everything that even remotely implied the idea of deterioration, that the same prohibition was extended to flour, which was regarded as corn "deadened as it were and destroyed by grinding",[17] because it lost the strength of a seed-grain without immediately obtaining the usefulness of food.[18]

It is not difficult to account for the two exceptional cases in which leavened bread was admitted in the sacrificial service of the Hebrews.[19] Pentecost was the "Feast of Conclusion",[20] because it marked the completion of the corn-harvest commenced on Passover. On that festival, therefore, which was made the occasion of thanks-giving for the sustenance and plenty graciously provided by God for His people, it was deemed appropriate to offer to Him, as a firstfruit-oblation, the daily and ordinary bread, or leavened wheaten loaves, while, on Passover, new barley was presented with equal fitness.[21]

A kindred reason seems to have suggested, in praise-offerings,[22] the permission of leavened bread as an accessory to unleavened cakes. The joy-offerings bore a homely and familiar character; the worshipper who, in convivial repast, partook of his own gift, felt that God stood to him in the relation of a *friend*;[23] the sacred act was devoted to the Dispenser of every blessing rather than to the King or Judge; on such occasions, the ordinary leavened bread, when eaten by the offerer at the sacrificial meal, was well suited to remind him not less of the benign than the awful attributes of the Deity.[24]

## 10. Honey.

The connection in which the prohibition of honey is introduced, is alone sufficient to guide us in determining the reason of the ordinance: "No bloodless offering which you shall bring to the Lord shall be made fermented;[25] for you shall burn no leaven, nor any honey, in any

---

15 Quaest. Rom. 109, *ἡ δὲ ζύμη γέγονεν ἐκ φθορᾶς αὐτὴ καὶ φθείρει τὸ φύραμα μιγνυμένη . . . καὶ ὅλως ἔοικε σῆψις ἡ ζύμωσις εἶναι.*

16 *Plut.* l. c.; *Gell.* Noct. Att. X. xv. 19 (farinam fermento imbutam adtingere ei fas non est).

17 *Μυλήφατον*; *Hom.* Od. II. 355; comp. *Apoll. Rhod.* I. 1073.

18 *Plut.* l. c. — In Latin *fermentum* occurs in the sense of *corruption*; *Persius*, Sat. I. 24 and Casaubon. in loc.

19 Lev. XXIII. 17; VII. 13; see p. 107.

20 חג העצרת (*Ἀσαρθά*, *Jos.* Ant. III. x. 6); see Comm. on Exod. pp. 453, 455, 459.

21 See p. 121.

22 זבח תודת שלמים, Lev. VII. 12.

23 See p. 2.

24 Comp. Comm. on VII. 11—21.

25 לֹא תֵעָשֶׂה חָמֵץ.

offering of the Lord made by fire."[1] From this combination of leaven and honey it is evident, that both alike were disallowed because they create fermentation,[2] and thus involve those notions of corruption and decay so utterly antagonistic to the nature of the life-giving altar.[3] It is needless to state, that honey was everywhere highly prized not only as a delicacy, and that therefore everything pleasant was commonly compared with the "sweetness of honey,"[4] but that, if eaten together with other food, it was considered extremely nutritious, conducive to a healthy complexion[5] and longevity;[6] that hence it was, and is, in the East extensively mixed with bread and pastry, and that honey-cakes were frequently offered to the gods.[7] But it is equally well known that honey easily turns sour;[8] therefore, vinegar was prepared by washing honey-pots and -combs with water which was then boiled;[9] and this circumstance gave rise to a corresponding usage in the Hebrew language.[10]

This being the simple and obvious meaning of the prohibition, it is surprising to notice the numerous reasons, often curious and fanciful, that have been assigned for it.

Some,[11] laying stress on the words, "they (the leaven and the honey) shall not come upon the altar as a sweet odour",[12] hold that honey was forbidden because, in being burnt, it emits an offensive

---

1 Lev. II. 11.

2 The term חָמֵץ not merely denotes food mixed with *leaven*, but also with any other fermenting matter; and hence the verb החמיץ means, generally, *to become acid* or *sour* (as יין), or figuratively *to become worse, to fall into corruption* (*Talm*. Rosh. Hash. 3*b*), or *to exasperate* (*Targ*. Prov. XXV. 8; XXVIII. 7), and חַמֵּץ *to afflict* (*Targ*. Prov. X. 1).

3 Therefore, some Rabbinical authorities, as Maimonides and Rabbi Levi of Barcelona, regarding the injunction concerning leaven and honey as one prohibition, count it so in the list of the 613 laws distinguished by the Talmud in the Pentateuch (comp. *Hirschfeld*, Halach. Exegese, § 182); while others, as Nachmanides and ס"מ"ג, divide it into two separate commands.

4 Judg. XIV. 18; Ezek. III. 3; Ps. XIX. 11; CXIX. 103; Prov. XIII. 14; Cant. IV. 11; Sir. XXIV. 20; XLIX. 1; Rev. X. 9, 10; comp. *Hom*. Il. I. 249; *Theocr*. VIII. 81, 82; XX. 25—27; *Mosch*. I. 9; etc., etc.; comp. *Bochart*, Hieroz. IV. 12 (II. 523, 524).

5 *Hippocr*. De Affect. cc. 50, 54.

6 *Plin*. XXII. 24 (53); *Diophan*. Geopon. XV.

7 Comp. *Hor*. Epist. I. x. 11 (mellitae placentae).

8 *Plin*. H. N. XI. 15 (mella vel minumo contactu roris acescentia).

9 *Plin*. H. N. XXI. 14 (48).

10 For הדביש means, in Talmudical writings, *to become sour* or *corrupted* (as Bab. Mets 38*a*; Sabb. 154*b*; Sanhed. 101*a*), that is, to be affected by the qualities of דְּבַשׁ. It is, therefore, unnecessary to take הדביש in the sense of *dulcedinem amittere*, implying the contrary meaning of דְּבַשׁ (so Buxtorf, Lex. Rabb. p. 500, a. o.), after the analogy of חָטָא *to sin* and חִטֵּא *to free from sin* (see Gramm. § 37. 3*b*).

11 As *Rosenm*. on Levit. II. 11.

12 לריח ניחוח, Lev. II. 12.

smell; but this opinion evidently attributes to the words "for a sweet odour" a material and external sense, which they do not possess in the Pentateuch.[13]

Philo[14] believes the honey to have been objectionable because the bee is not a "clean" animal; since "it derives its birth from the putrefaction and corruption of dead oxen, just as drones and wasps spring from the bodies of horses." This fiction, entertained by classical writers also,[15] is overthrown by the familiar fact that the bee has a natural aversion to lifeless bodies, to meat, blood, and fat, and eagerly shuns repulsive places.[16] "The bee", says Aristotle, "is the only insect that never touches anything putrid";[17] and the swarm carefully removes the dead bodies of its own species.[18] Its nature is clean.[19] It was hence extensively honoured with the epithets *pure* and *wise*. It was so regarded by the Pythagoraeans, because it does not settle on beans looked upon them with dislike.[20] The Pythian priestess was described as "the bee of Delphi."[21] It was called the *best* animal, and therefore sacred to Zeus *Aristaeus* (ἄριστος). Holy bees watched the grotto where Jupiter was born. *Melissa* was his nurse, and *Melitaeus* one of his sons;[22] the former was the earliest discoverer and preparer of pure and innocent human food, and especially introduced and taught the cultivation of fruit-trees.[23] Luna also, presiding over births, was called Melissa, and so every priestess of Ceres, as guardian of the mysteries of the earthly goddess.

---

[13] See p. 8.

[14] *Philo*, De Victim. c. 6.

[15] Comp. *Virg*. Georg. IV. 550—558 (Adspiciunt liquefacta boum per viscera toto Stridere apes utero, et ruptis effervere costis); IV. 168; *Servius* ad Virg. Aen. I. 435; *Ovid*, Metam. XV. 364—367; *Varro*, R. R. II. 3; III. 16; *Plin*. XI. 20 or 23 (comp. X. 66 or 86); *Plut*. Cleom. c. 39; *Aelian*. H. N. II. 57; *Porphyr*. De Antr. Nymph. 15 (ἃς, sc. μελίττας, βουγενεῖς εἶναι συμβέβηκεν); *Orig*. c. Cels. IV (ἐκ βοὸς γίγνεται μέλισσα καὶ ἐξ ἵππου σφήξ). The passage Judg. XIV. 8 does not prove that a similar notion was entertained by the Hebrews; for it says merely that a swarm of bees was *found*, not that it was *generated*, in the dry and inodorous skeleton of the carcase.

[16] *Varr*. R. R. III. 16, nulla harum assidit in loco inquinato, etc.

[17] *Aristot*. Hist. An. VIII. 13; comp. *Plin*. XI. 21 or 24 (omnes vespae carne vescuntur contra quam apes quae nullum corpus attingunt.)

[18] *Virg*. Georg. IV. 255, 256 (corpora luce carentum exportant tectis, etc.); *Plin*. H. N. XI. 18 or 20; *Ael*. H. N. V. 49; comp. *Boch*. l. c. IV. 10, 11; pp. 503, 504, 515.

[19] Quod sequuntur omnia pura, *Varro*, l. c.

[20] *Porphyr*. De Antro Nymph. c. 19; comp. *Plut*. De Amor. Prol. c. 2 (τὴν μέλιτταν ἡμεῖς σοφὴν καλοῦμεν καὶ νομίζομεν); *Phile*, De Ape, c. 28 (καὶ ζῇ μὲν ἁγνὸν ἡ σοφὴ σχεδὸν βίον); *Lucian*, Halcyon, c. 5 (σοφὴν θείου μέλιτος ἐργάτιν).

[21] *Pind*. Pyth. IV. 106 (60).

[22] *Antonin*. *Liber*. c. 13.

[23] Schol. Pindar. Pyth. IV. 106; comp. *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 585, 586.

The bee was the emblem of the Muses;[1] it was the symbol of the struggle between virtue and vice; of the mind which governs matter; of the soul which returns to its divine origin;[2] and among the Egyptians, of royal dignity.[3] The Hindoos frequently represented the god Krishnu with a bee hovering over his head.[4] Its wonderful habits and instincts were the types of domestic and social order, of the foundation of states and colonies, of blessings and plenty secured by judicious industry, and even of the manifest working of the divine spirit.[5] The very belief of the birth of the bee from the decaying body of the bull, was converted into a fine allegory of the soul emerging and rising from the depths of terrestrial matter, and soaring to its celestial home, where it rejoins the deity of which it is a part; for the bee is a "home-loving animal."[6] Bacchus, the dispenser of sustenance and joy, was termed "the father of the bees"[7] or Brisaeus.[8] From all these facts it will naturally appear that honey itself was not considered unclean; it was presented as a firstfruit-offering;[9] it could be mixed with those oblations which were permitted to be "leavened";[10] and it was freely allowed by Jewish tradition.[11] Leaven, though prepared from the very mass, of which the bloodless offering consisted, was forbidden to be burnt on the altar: it is therefore evident, that it was not the *origin* of leaven and honey which caused their exclusion. In fact,

---

[1] *Philostrat.* Icon. II. 8; *Varro*, l. c.; comp. *Creuzer*, l. c.

[2] Comp. *Creuzer*, l. c. IV. 351.

[3] *Ammian. Marcell.* XVII. iv. 11; *Creuzer*, l. c. II. 213. The Hebrew name דְּבֹרָה, however, is scarcely traceable to דבר in the sense of guiding and ruling (Ps. XVIII. 48; XLVII. 4; so *Boch.* Hieroz. II. 502), but if not to זבר *to flutter* (*Fürst*, Lex. I. 285), to דבר in the meaning of *leading* or being led, so that it properly means *swarm*; comp. *agmen* and *agere*, and the Arabic دبر.

[4] *W. Menzel*, Mythol. Forsch. I. 194 *sqq.*

[5] *Aristot.* Hist. Anim. IX. 27; *Virg.* Georg. IV. 219, 220 (esse apibus partem divinae mentis, et haustus Aetherios dixere); *Ovid*, Fast. III. 736; *Plin.* H. N. XI. 18, 20 (19) *sqq.*; *Aelian.* Hist. An. V. 12, 13; XVII. 35; *Varro*, R. R. III. 16; *Menzel*, l. c. I. 171—234.

[6] *Φιλόστροφον ζῶον*; comp. *Creuzer*, Symb. IV. 353; II. 586, 587.

[7] *Nonn.* Dionys. V. 215 *sqq.*, 265 *sqq.*; comp. *Ovid*, Fast. III. 735, 736; *Tibull.* I. vii. 53, 54.

[8] From *βλίττειν* (for *μελίττειν*) to cut out the comb of bees, to take the honey (*μέλι*); *Plat.* Rep. VIII. 15, p. 564 E. (comp. *Steph. Byz.* v. *βρίσαι*); hardly from the Chaldaean בריז *the flow of honey* from the comb (*Boch.* l. c. p. 520).

[9] Lev. II. 12. Therefore, not even the idea, harmonizing indeed with the sacrificial regulation that nothing was to be employed that was not the produce of human labour (so Theodoret; see pp. 78, 81), can have guided the legislator; nor would it apply to all honey, a large part of which was gained by cultivation.

[10] See p. 85.

[11] *Targ. Jon.* in Lev. XI. 20, ברם דובשא דיזבורא יתאכיל; *Talm.* Bechor.

some ancient philosophers and theologians ascribed to the honey itself purifying and preserving power capable of healing old wounds, removing dimness of sight,[12] and preventing putrefaction, whence it was used for embalming and instilled into the noses of the dead to shield the bodies from decomposition.[13] Accordingly, honey was understood as a symbol of rectitude and integrity of life.[14] It was supposed to have been the sole sustenance of the earliest men in their golden age of innocence and perfect virtue. Bread and honey were the ordinary food of the kings and priests of Persia; of Pythagoras and his followers,[15] of the rigid Jewish sect of the Essenes, and hence also of John the Baptist.[16] At the initiation in certain rites, the hands were washed with honey, not with water, to indicate that they ought to be clean from all wickedness and pollution. Honey was eaten to purify the tongue from sin.[17] The libations of honey[18] were described as *sober*,[19] in contradistinction to those of wine.[20] The Persians offered honey to Mithras, because it symbolised this god most clearly as the guardian and preserver of fruits. It was holy to the Naiades, because their element, the water, is purifying, not liable to putrefaction, and, as was considered, conducive to generation. Therefore, bees were believed to deposit their honey in bowls and jars, because these vessels typify fountains.

As if aware of the insufficiency of his first reason, Philo adds another one, hardly more convincing; the laws, he observes, interdicted honey in order to indicate that "all superfluous pleasure is unholy, making indeed the things that are eaten sweet to the taste, but later inflicting bitter and incurable pains, by which the soul must, of necessity, be agitated and thrown into confusion"; and this opinion, variously modified, recurs repeatedly. The Talmud commenting on those verses of the Proverbs which advise a moderate use of honey,[21] applies them figuratively to all kinds of intemperance, even to excesses in spiritual matters and in speculation.[22] Theodoret[23] deemed it unfit for the altar as a symbol of sensual enjoyment, since, in primitive times,

7*b*; comp. *Lewysohn*, Zoologie des Talmud §§ 89, 403.

[12] *Dioscor.* II. 101; *Plin.* XXIX. 6 (38).

[13] *Herod.* I. 198; *Lucret.* III. 904; *Plin.* VII. 3; XXII. 24 or 50 (mellis quidem ipsius natura talis est ut putrescere corpora non sinat).

[14] Comp. *Porphyr.* Ant. Nymph. c. 15.

[15] *Athen.* X. 13; *Diog. Laert.* Pyth. VIII. i. 18.

[16] *Matth.* III. 4; Mark I. 6; comp. *Creuz.* Symb. IV. 361.

[17] *Porph.* l. c. (*καθαίρουσι δὲ καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν τῷ μέλιτι ἀπὸ παντὸς ἁμαρτηλοῦ*).

[18] *Μελίσπονδα*, *Plut.* Symp. IV. vi. *fin.*

[19] *Νηφάλια*, *Plut.* Cohib. Ir. 16 *fin.*

[20] Comp. *Porph.* l. c. 16—19.

[21] Prov. XXV. 16, 27; comp. *Pind.* Nem. VII. 52 (77), *κόρον ἔχει καὶ μέλι.*

[22] *Talm.* Chag. 14*b*.

[23] Quaest. I. in Levit.

and before the cultivation of the vine, it was a luxury of the dissipated, was believed to lead to wild indulgences and carnal desires, to indolence and thoughtlessness, and being effervescent, symbolised haughtiness and contumacy;[1] it was, in fact, used as an emblem of death, or of secret corruption by sin,[2] "because the life of the soul perishes by pleasure":[3] it was designed to teach that whoever is intent upon good works, must shun sensuality and exercise rigid severity towards himself.[4] Hence Jerome[5] believes that nothing that is merely sweet, without having in it an element of pungent truth,[6] was to be offered in the sanctuary;[7] and Nachmanides declared that everything sweet must be tempered with bitterness, just as God, in creating the world, coupled mercy and judgment. These opinions disregard the unmistakeable hints of the Hebrew text, which forbids honey, not because it is sweet, but because it is "fermenting" (חָמֵץ), and which fixes for the exclusion no other reason than for the prohibition of leaven.

It may be curious to notice Plutarch's statements on the subject.[8] He is notorious for his inveterate tendency to compare the institutions of the Hebrews with the rites of the worship of Bacchus. Thus he contends, the name *Levites* was derived from *Lysius* (*Λύσιος*) or *Euius* (*Εὔιος*), and that of *Sabbath* from the *Sabbae*, or Bacchantes; the Feast of Tabernacles was a festival of Bacchus, when the people entered the temple with "thyrsi" in their hands;[9] the mitre of the High-priest[10] resembled the tiara worn by Bacchus; and the bells of his robe[11] were imitations of the timbrels and drums used at the nocturnal celebrations of the same god, to increase the mirthful noise. Pursuing his self-chosen path, Plutarch dogmatically asserts that the Jews originally employed honey for their drink-offerings; that later, however, they substituted wine, which had been presented to them by Bacchus; but they carefully avoided to mix it with honey, which would have spoiled the gift of the god; just as the Greeks honoured him with libations consisting of honey alone, without any wine, because both, if mixed, are absolutely opposed to each other. But this view has not even the support of history; for the ancients regarded the compound of wine and honey[12] as most delicious, as Plutarch himself remarks in the very

---

1 See *Porphyr.* l. c. 16, 17.

2 *Michael.* Typisch. Gottesgelahrtheit, p. 90.

3 *Porphyr.* l. c. 18.

4 *Hengstenb.* Auth. d. Pent. II. 650; comp. Christolog. III. 26, 120 (on Hos. III. 1); Opfer, p. 46.

5 Epist. 23 ad Eustoch; comp. Epist. 52 ad Gaudent.

6 Mordacis veritatis.

7 Comp. *Outram*, De Sacrif. I. viii. 9.

8 Sympos. IV. vi. 2.

9 Comp. Lev. XXIII. 40.

10 מִצְנֶפֶת, Exod. XXVIII. 4, 37—39.

11 פַּעֲמֹנִים, vers. 33—35.

12 *Οἰνόμελι*, or in Latin *mulsum*.

same work.[13] Besides, the prohibition of Leviticus relates to honey as a separate substance, not to its mixture with wine.

Maimonides[14] asserts that honey was forbidden to the Israelites, because it was commonly used at the sacrifices of the heathens. It is true that it was dedicated to nearly all gods,[15] among others to Janus, when he was implored to grant "a sweet" or happy year,[16] and especially to the evil deities and those of the lower world, to Pluto and Proserpine, Hecate and the Furies.[17] But the Pentateuch, though opposing pagan notions, left untouched innocuous pagan customs, which it readily employed if capable of embodying useful religious ideas.[18] If it had meant consistently to carry out the principle of opposition, it would have rejected the domestic animals for victims, flour, incense, oil, and salt, nay the sacrifices themselves, which yet Maimonides regards as an accommodation to deep-rooted pagan usages.[19]

Again, it has been supposed that honey was looked upon with disfavour, because it was largely employed at the libations for the dead,[20] which the Hebrews were to hold in abhorrence;[21] but such libations frequently consisted of oil and wine, which were not excluded from the offerings of the Hebrews.[22]

Some imagined that the bloodless oblations were to be pure and unmixed flour; others, that being pleasant to the taste, honey might mislead to the belief that offerings are agreeable to God in proportion to their palatableness; and others again,[23] that, being a later and artificial innovation, perhaps combined with idolatrous mysteries, it was banished by a legislator desirous to restore the old and patriarchal simplicity in the sacrificial service: but the bloodless offerings contained, besides flour, also salt, oil, and wine; and the Levitical rites, in point of simplicity, differed vastly from primeval practices.

---

13 Sympos. VIII. ix. 3 (*ἥδιστα νῦν γέγονεν ... οἰνόμελι*); comp. *Talm.* Abod. Zar. 30*a* (where אנומלין — *οἰνόμελι* — is explained יין ודבש ופילפלין); *Polyb.* XII. 2; *Dioscor.* V. 15, 16; *Plaut.* Pers. I. iii. 7; *Cic.* De Orat. II. 70; *Pallad.* VIII. 7; *Macrob.* Sat. VII. 12; *Plin.* XIV. 4 (6); XXII. 24 (53); see also *Hom.* Od. X. 234, 235; *Hor.* Sat. II. ii. 15, 16; iv. 24—27; *Mart.* IV. xiii. 3, 4.

14 Moreh Neboch. III. 46.

15 Comp. esp. *Paus.* V. xv. 6.

16 *Ovid*, Fast. I. 185—188 (ut res sapor ille sequatur, Et peragat coeptum dulcis ut annus iter).

17 *Apoll. Rhod.* III. 1034, 1035; comp. also *Virg.* VI. 417; etc. Proserpine herself bore the name *μελιτώδης* (*Theocr.* XV. 94).

18 See Comm. on Exod. pp. 184, 221.

19 See pp. 56, 57.

20 Comp. *Hom.* Il. XXIII. 170; Od. XXIV. 68; *Eurip.* Iphig. Taur. 165, 166 (*ἃ νεκροῖς θελκτήρια κεῖται*), 634, 635.

21 *Spencer*, De Legg. Ritt. II. ix. 2, so that the honey was "diabolo jure quasi peculiari vindicatum".

22 See Sect. XX.

23 As *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. II. ix. 2; III. ii. 2.

### 11. Typical Explanation.

From the preceding remarks on salt, oil, and frank-incense, on blood and fat, on leaven and honey, it will be manifest that the *symbolical* interpretation of the Hebrew sacrifices and their rituals is in accordance with the spirit of the Scriptures. It derives support from other commands of the Pentateuch, the tendency of which is evidently symbolical. Phylacteries are plainly ordained as a "sign" and a "memorial" for the Law and its observance.[1] The golden plate (ציץ) with the words "Holiness to the Lord", worn by the High-priest on his mitre, was clearly designed to lead the Hebrews to a consciousness of their sins, and thus to render their gifts and offerings acceptable.[2] The flesh of certain classes of sin-offerings was to be consumed by the priests, to indicate that they "removed the iniquity of the congregation and made atonement for them before the Lord."[3] The Hebrews were enjoined to sit in Tabernacles during seven days every year, that they might perpetually be reminded of the time, when their ancestors, rescued from Egyptian bondage, pitched their tents in the desert under Divine protection.[4] Moreover, the Hebrew prophets insisted with holy earnestness upon the moral and spiritual ends of all ceremonials; and they taught impressively by symbolical acts,[5] which indeed, natural in themselves, are peculiarly suitable and attractive to a childlike intelligence requiring to perceive the ideas in some outward embodiment.

But very different from the symbolical is the *typical* explanation: this regards the ceremonies and events of the Old Testament as the prefigurements of some corresponding doctrine or occurrence recorded in the New;[6] it, more especially, supposes the Hebrew sacrifices and their rituals to foreshadow the person and nature, the life and death of Christ.[7] As it has exercised a momentous influence upon the formation of religious dogmas, the enquiry is not uninteresting what value ought to be attached to it. But it cannot be justly estimated, as will presently be evident, without a direct reference to the Talmudical

---

1 Exod. XIII. 9, לאות . . . ולזכרון; comp. Deut. VI. 8; 9; Comm. on Exod. XIII. 9.

2 Exod. XXVIII. 36, 38; see Comm. on Exod. p. 548.

3 Lev. X. 17; comp. Sect. X. 14; XV.

4 Lev. XXIII. 43.

5 Comp. Isai. XX. 2—4; Jer. XIII. 1—11; XVIII. 1—6; XIX. 1—12; XXIV. 1—8; XXVII. 2—12; XXVIII. 10—14; XXXII. 7—14; Ezek. IV. 1—13; V. 1—4; Hos. II. 1—9; III. 1—5; etc.

6 "Typus est quum factum aliquod a V. T. accersitur, idque extenditur praesignificavisse atque adumbrasse aliquid gestum vel gerendum in N. T." (*Rivetus*, Praef. ad Ps. XLV); comp. *Gerhard*, Loci, II. 67.

7 "Omnia victimarum genera talibus ritibus et ceremoniis a Mose definita fuisse, quales eo maxime pertinebant ut sacrificia Judaeorum sacrificium Christi adumbrarent" (*Outram*, De Sacrif. I. 10, p. 107, 201—214); *Lightf.* Op. I. 701, 707.

and Rabbinical mode of exegesis; we therefore premise a short delineation of the latter, after which we shall compare it with that adopted in the New Testament.

As in nature, so in history, the same things are often repeated at different times and in different degrees of perfection; the development of nations and of mankind advances in rhythmic cycles, each complete in itself, and each analogous, but superior, to the preceding. The Hebrew mind had, in the period of the Old Canon, created for itself a certain system of religious thought and public devotion, compact and consistent, and for the time entirely satisfactory. But the Jews advanced; they unfolded the germs of the earlier literature, and they assimilated to their own views ideas borrowed from the creeds of other nations. Yet they had long learnt to look upon the Old Testament as the all-embracing code of wisdom and knowledge, which must contain — it may be in obscure allusions or hidden allegories — all truths that can ever be discovered by the human intellect to the end of time: they acted upon the conviction, "turn it and turn it, for everything is in it."[8] Therefore, they strove to corroborate any new conception or opinion by connecting it with some really or apparently kindred passage of the Scriptures, and they introduced that connection by the word "as it is written."[9] For instance, Ben Zoma said, "Who is wise? He who learns from every body; for it is written, 'I acquired knowledge from all who taught me'";[10] though the words employed have in the Psalms where they occur a very different meaning, viz. "I have more knowledge than all my teachers."

Such midrashic elements began to appear from very early times, in fact, not long after the completion of the second Temple; they are discernible in all, even the oldest translations of the Hebrew Bible, in those of the Septuagint, Symmachus and Theodotion, in Onkelos, Jonathan, and the other Targumim, in the Peshito, and even in the version of the Samaritans generally so reluctant to adopt anything from the rival sects;[11] they were recognised by the Essenes, of whom Philo clearly observes, "Engaged in the sacred Scriptures, they speculate on their national philosophy by allegorising; for they look upon the literal expressions as symbols of some secret meaning of nature, intended to be conveyed in those figurative expressions;"[12] and Philo

---

[8] *Mishn.* Aboth, V. 25, הפך בה והפך בה דכלא בה; comp. Ps. I. 2; Acts XVII. 11; John V. 39; *Jos.* Ap. I. 8.

[9] שנאמר or כשנאמר, or דכתיב or דאמר קרא.

[10] *Mishn.* Aboth. IV. 1; מִכָּל־מְלַמְּדַי הִשְׂכַּלְתִּי (Ps. CXIX. 99).

[11] Comp. *Zunz*, Gottesd. Vorträge, cc. 3, 4; *Frankel*, Vorstudien zur Septuaginta, pp. 179—191.

[12] De Vit. contempl. c. 3 ... *ἀλληγοροῦντες, ἐπειδὴ σύμβολα τὰ τῆς ῥητῆς ἑρμηνείας νομίζουσι φύσεως ἀποκεκρυμ-*

himself habitually indulging in kindred modes of elucidation, supposed every Biblical expression to imply a double sense, a physical and spiritual, that is, a literal and allegorical one.

At first, the Jewish doctors were cautious in this method: preserving the consciousness that the combinations were the work of their own judgment, they desired the Scriptural passage to be regarded as no more than a mere "support" of their own view, or as implying, at best, only "a hint" in reference to it,[1] and the Mishnah, still sparing in that process,[2] speaks of many new laws that "fly in the air and have no Biblical foundation",[3] and of others that are "like mountains suspended by a hair, as they are little alluded to in the Bible, yet developed into numerous ordinances."[4] But gradually, though not without opposition from some more sober sects, as the Sadducees and Baeothusians,[5] they pursued the same path with greater boldness and assurance; they considered no opinion safe against later fluctuations, unless guarded by Scriptural authority;[6] they deemed it, therefore, necessary to trace *all* the innumerable expansions of the Law to the Bible,[7] which they diligently searched and unscrupulously employed for that object; and they seriously and confidently pointed to their discoveries, no matter how strange soever, as "proofs" of the doctrines they were anxious to diffuse.[8] In this manner, that which at first was understood merely as a happy and welcome *parallel*, was imperceptibly converted into an irrefutable *argument*.[9]

It is obvious that the text of the Bible could not without being strained yield the desired results. How could the unlimited number of later laws, ideas, and ethical precepts be pressed into the small compass of the

---

*μένης, ἐν ὑπονοίας δηλουμένης*; comp. Sir. XXXIX. 1—3; *Talm*. Sanh. 34*a*, מה פטיש... מקרא אחד יוצא לכמה טעמים.

[1] אַסְמַכְתָּא or רֶמֶז; comp. *Mishn*. Sabb. VIII. 7; IX. 4; Sanh. VIII 2, אף על פי שאין ראיה לדבר זכר לדבר, or מיכן רמז or מיכן סמכו חכמים.

[2] It employs, like the Baraithas, the word דרש in the simple sense of *explaining*, not in the later one of *allegorising* (comp. *Mishn*. Yom. I. 6; Chagig. II. 1; Sanh. XI. 2); and the contradistinction between דרש or פשט did not yet exist, as the latter did not mean *to explain literally*, but merely to *explain* or *unfold*.

[3] *Mishn*. Chagig. I. 8, פורחין באויר ואין להם על מה שסמכו.

[4] Ibid. כהררים התלוין בשערה שהן מקרא מועט והלכות מרובות.

[5] Comp. *Mishn*. Par. III. 7; Men. X. 3.

[6] Comp. *Mishn*. Sot. V. 2; *Talm*. Sot. 27*b*.

[7] Always enquiring מנא הני מילי or מנלן or מנין.

[8] רְאָיָה; comp. *Talm*. Chagig. 10, 11 (in explanation of *Mishn*. Chagig. I. 8, above quoted); Yoma 76*b*; Niddah 32*a* (comp. *Mishn*. Sabb. IX. 4); Sotah 21*a*.

[9] Comp. *Wähner*, Antiq. sacrae; *Geiger*, Zeitschr. V. 53—81, 234—259; *Hirschfeld*, Geist der talmud. Auslegung der Bibel, I. 100—128, 151—168; 302 *sqq*.; II. 7 *sqq*. et passim.

Old Testament without the most hazardous and the most violent manipulations? Indeed, the expedients employed by the Talmudists to gain their object, form a most curious chapter in the history of human ingenuity and intellectual perversion; they are barely redeemed from reckless frivolity by the religious earnestness which prompted them, and the high aim which they were designed to serve — that of hallowing every thought and elevating every relation of life. It was supposed that the diction of the Bible, that is, the holy language of God, is superhumanly profound and significant, capable of involving all future progress and mental life, pregnant of marvellous and mysterious power; that it teaches many things at once;[10] hints by one word at many truths; conceals a lesson in every sign; is designedly obscure, and frequently renounces current expressions; that it may long baffle the efforts of human reflection and penetration, dimmed as these are by sorrow and suffering, but reveals itself at last to pious research; while the enigmas that remain unsolved, will one day be disclosed by the light of the Redeemer[11] — views which were encouraged by the peculiar and indefinite character of Hebrew phraseology, and by the indistinctness of many legal and ritual ordinances. Occasionally, a gleam of a better hermeneutical method broke through the chaotic confusion; it was declared, "In the whole Law, the text does not pass beyond the literal sense",[12] or "the Law speaks in the ordinary language of men",[13] or specific instances were judiciously generalised and referred to similar cases: but the actual application of these abstract principles was a rare and unavoidable exception; as a rule, they were absolutely ignored, and sometimes expressly disclaimed.[14] Ordinarily, letters of the Biblical text were transposed or read with different vowels and interpreted accordingly, combined with the preceding or following word, or permuted with letters of a similar form[15] or of an analogous position in the alphabet.[16] Words were interchanged with others of an approximate sound, or read in a different order, computed according to the numerical value of their letters, and then replaced by others making up the same sum; or they were pronounced superfluous, unusual, or anomalous, on purpose to render them available as supports of some fancied idea.

---

10 It is often said תרתי שמעית מנה.

11 Comp. *Talm.* Menach. 45*a*; etc.

12 *Talm.* Yevam. 24*a*; Shabb. 63*a*; בכל התורה אין מקרא יוצא מידי פשוטו.

13 דברה תורה כלשון בני אדם (*Talm.* Gitt. 41*b*; Kiddush. 17*b*; Kethub. 67*b*; Sanh. 64*b*; Nedar. 3*a*; Zevach. 108*b*; etc.); or דברה תורה לשונות, or לשי' כפולין, to account for pleonasms in the style of the Bible; or אידי דכתב רחמנא כך כתב כך.

14 *Talm.* Yevam. 11*b*; 24*a*.

15 As ה and ח, ר and ד.

16 E. g., according to the rule of א"ת ב"ש or א"ל ב"ם, so that שֵׁשַׁךְ in Jer. XXV. 26 was read בָּבֶל; comp. *Buxt.* Abbrev. Hebraic. p. 41.

Some particles[1] were supposed invariably to include something else, others,[2] always to exclude a notion. Verses were torn from their context, and invested with a meaning utterly foreign to it, or they were divided, cut asunder, and distorted with such a degree of arbitrary freedom, that sometimes even Talmudists expressed their disapproval,[3] and began to doubt whether the literal exposition (פשט) ought not to be admitted at least by the side of the allegorical.[4] Important analogies of religious law were founded upon a slight and accidental verbal resemblance; and inferences were drawn entirely unwarranted by the manifest tenour of the verse. The words of the Scriptures were compared to jewels set in silver plates, or to a string of pearls, beautiful as an entire ornament, but precious also individually; thus they were regarded as full of import both in their continuity and their isolation. The recurrence of the same word in different passages was deemed sufficient ground for explaining the passages themselves as identical or kindred;[5] and it was believed that every verse could be interpreted from multifarious points of view. Such rules were necessarily fraught with the most singular and most deplorable results. No conceit was too fanciful or grotesque, no construction too incongruous and artificial, too illogical and capricious, if insinuating by adroitness or wit, or evolving a novel idea from familiar terms. Every trace of sound comment vanished, and the Bible was overgrown with the weeds of eccentric paradox. All the conclusions so obtained were endowed with the same authority and holiness as the clear utterances of the Bible.[6] They were regarded not only as justified, but as so exclusively genuine and infallible, that Talmudists could propound the surprising rule, "he who renders a verse according to its plain form (that is, literally) is a falsifier"; although they had the boldness to add, "he who makes any addition is a blasphemer."[7]

The history of the Christian or typical interpretation of the Bible was in many respects analogous to that of the Jewish schools just sketched, and the stages of advance were nearly identical. The earlier phases are visible in the Books of the New Testament. The apostolic writers, Jews by birth and education, followed in the exposition of the Bible the taste and usage of their time and people; nay, they would probably, for practical ends, have accommodated themselves to the

---

1 As אם, אף, את.

2 As רק, אך.

3 Comp. *Talm.* Bab. Bathr. 119*a*.

4 It was asked פשטיה דקרא במאי כתיב.

5 By גזירה שוה.

6 Comp. *Mishnah* Aboth II. 15 (הוי מתחמם כנגד אורן של חכמים והוי זהיר בגחלתן וכ׳); the principle prevailed כל דתקין רבנן כעין דאוריתא תקין.

7 *Talm.* Kiddush. 49*a*, המתרגם פסוק כצורתו הרי זה בדאי והמוסיף עליו הרי זה מחרף ומגדף.

current manner, had it even, as is not apparent, been uncongenial to them.[8] In fact, the New Testament offers numerous instances both of "the support" and "the proof": the former is, as in the Mishnah and Talmud, introduced by "as it is written" or "spoken";[9] the latter usually by "that it might be fulfilled, what was spoken or written."[10] One instance of each will suffice. When Christ intended to enter Jerusalem, it is related, "when he had found a young ass, he sat thereon; as it is written, Fear not, daughter of Sion: behold, the king comes, sitting on an ass's colt."[11] Joseph returning with the child Jesus from Egypt, went into Galilee, and "he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled, what was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene."[12] Let us briefly examine the two passages. The second Zechariah prophesied of a time when peace would unite the nations of the world, when God would "cut off every chariot and every horse, and cut off every battle-bow, and He would speak peace to the nations"; when, therefore, the ideal king, "just, and victorious, and lowly" (עָנִי), would not ride on a horse, used in war and loving the tumult of battle,[13] but on an ass, the peaceful, harmless, and patient animal,[14] which would alone be employed in those days of perfect harmony. How then can the riding of Christ on an ass at a time, when the horses were not "cut off" and warfare had not ceased, in any sense be called a parallel to Zechariah's description! how much less can it be considered a fulfilment! The picture which the prophet draws of the future monarch is not that of humiliation, but of humility,[15] and every one knows that the ass is, in the East, by no means looked upon with contempt.[16] More

[8] Comp. *Semler* on 1 Cor. X. 4, haec talia, ingenio Judaico propria, a christiana vero mente plane aliena, non miramur Paulum isto tempore non refutare, quia illis utendum erat *κατ' ἄνθρωπον*; comp. also *Schoettgen* on Matth. I. 16.

[9] *Καθὼς γέγραπται*, John XII. 14; or *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ εἰρημένον*, Acts II. 16; comp. Matth. XXI. 13, 42, 44; XXVI. 31 (Zech. XIII. 7); 1 Cor. I. 19, 31; II. 9; IX. 9; 2 Cor. VI. 2; VIII. 15; Rom. II. 24; III. 4, 10, 18; V. 17; VIII. 36; IX. 13, 33; XV. 3, 21; Hebr. V. 6 (*καθὼς λέγει*); or *τί λέγει ἡ γραφή;* Rom. IV. 3; X. 8; XI. 2, 4; Gal. IV. 30.

[10] *Ἵνα* or *ὅπως πληρωθῇ*; Matth. I. 22; II. 15, 23; VIII. 17; XIII. 35; John XIII. 18; XV. 25; XVII. 12; XVIII. 9; XIX. 36; comp. Matth. II. 17; XXVI. 54, 56; Luke (IV. 17) XXII. 22 (*κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον*), 37; XXIV. (15) 27, 44; Mark IX. 13; John V. 40, 46; 1 Cor. XV. 54, 55.

[11] John XII. 14, 15; comp. Zech. IX. 9.

[12] Matth. II. 23, *ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται*.

[13] Comp. esp. Job XXXIX. 19—25; see also Isai. II. 7; XXX. 16; *Propert.* IV. iii. 39, 40.

[14] Comp. Gen. XLIX. 14; 2 Sam. XIX. 27; etc.

[15] עָנִי is here not *poor*, but like עָנָו, *lowly*, in the sense of humble and gentle; so Sept. *πρᾳῦς*, Jonath. ענוותן, Kimchi, Gesen., Winer, De Wette, a. o.

[16] See Comm. on Gen. pp. 748, 755. Comp. the tortuous, and as usual specious and dialectic explanation of

characteristic still is the second passage. Isaiah speaks of the Messianic king in the following words, "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch (נֵצֶר) shall grow out of its roots",[1] that is, the Messiah shall be a *netser* (נֵצֶר) of the house of Jesse: therefore, concludes the Evangelist, Christ settled in *Nazareth* (*Ναζαρέτ*), that he might, in fulfilment of such prophotic expressions,[2] be called a *Nazarene* (*Ναζωραῖος*);[3] the Hebrew word *netser* for the appellative noun *branch* was thus taken as the type of the *town* Nazareth in Galilee — a combination preposterous in the extreme, and exactly in the spirit of the Jewish Midrash.[4]

But it seems expedient to insert a few specimens of the general interpretation of the New Testament, which will help to form a well-balanced judgment.

Christ endeavoured to prove the resurrection of the dead by the words which God spoke to Moses at the burning bush, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob", that is, manifestly, I am the God that was acknowledged by, or revealed to the patriarchs; but Christ interprets, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living";[5] therefore the patriarchs cannot cease to exist, they must be immortal: can this most casuistic deduction really be deemed a support of the doctrine of immortality? and has it the least reference to that of resurrection?[6] — The apostle Paul thus annotates or explains

the passage by *Hengstenberg*, Christol. II. 120—153: the objections that "the dominion of Christ does not extend over the whole earth, and that wars have not ceased since his advent", are not so "trivial" as an over-confident dogmatism believes or professes to believe.

[1] Isai. XI. 1.

[2] Hence the plural *διὰ τῶν προφητῶν*, because the writer had several similar terms in his mind; comp. also צֶמַח in Zech. VI. 12; Jer. XXIII. 5.

[3] The Aramaean modification of *Ναζαραῖος* for *Ναζαρηνός*; see also Acts XXIV. 5; comp. Mark X. 47; Luke XVIII. 37; etc.

[4] Comp. *Hieronym.* ad Isai. XI. 1; *Baur*, Bibl. Theol. I. 163; *Gieseler*, in Stud. und Krit. 1831. III. pp. 591 *sqq.*; *De Wette* on Matth. II. 23, a. o.—The word *Ναζωραῖος* has no connection with *Ναζιραῖος* Nazirite, for Christ did not live in the manner of Nazirites, nor is the Messiah in the O. T. described as one; nor does it allude to נצורי ישראל (Isai. XLIX. 6, so Hitzig), against which view the plural (נצורי) militates; nor with any probability to נֵצֶר in Ps. XXXI. 24; Ex. XXXIV. 7 (Riggenbach, a. o.); and it is fanciful to explain that Nazareth, supposed to have originally borne the name נֵצֶר, and to have been so called from its insignificance, is typical of that contempt and humiliation which were to characterise the life of Christ (so *Hengstenb.* Christol. II. 1—8; comp. *Tholuck*, l. c. p. 44; *Riggenb.* Stud. u. Kr. 1855, pp. 585 *sqq.*

[5] Matth. XXII. 32; comp. Exod. III. 6.

[6] The judgment of Strauss (Leb. Jes. I. 646 *sqq.*), Hase (Leb. Jes. p. 184), a. o. who call this ratiocination "rabbinische Dialektik", is not shaken by the remarks of De Wette (in loc.), who calls it "tiefsinniges Schriftverständniss", because it involves the idea that

some verses in Deuteronomy declaring that all enjoy ready access to the Law, and need make no perilous effort for its discovery, "Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? — that is, bring Christ down from above; or who shall descend into the deep? — that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead":[7] in the latter part, the Hebrew text is even inaccurately quoted or rendered, evidently for the sake of the application;[8] for the correct words in Deuteronomy are, "Who shall go *over the sea* for us, and bring it to us?"[9] — God said to Abraham, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed",[10] that is, evidently, in thy descendents, since immediately before God had promised, "I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven";[11] yet St. Paul, urging the *singular* of the collective noun seed, argues, "To Abraham and his seed were the promises made: he says not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."[12] — In one passage, the same apostle introduces an elaborate comparison of husband and wife with Christ and the Church, which he describes as "a great mystery";[13] and in another, he declares the verse of Deuteronomy, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treads out the corn", a command undeniably suggested by motives of humanity,[14] not at all to be meant literally—for "does God take care for oxen?"—but to teach that the minister ought to be maintained by the congregation and to gain his sustenance by the preaching of the gospel.[15] — Of Abraham's two sons Ishmael and Isaac, the former was born of the bondmaid Hagar "after the flesh", the latter of the free woman Sarah "by promise" or "after the spirit": this is by the apostle taken as an "allegory"[16] and interpreted to point to the old and the new covenant; for, says he, "Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answers to the actual Jerusalem which is in bondage with her children";[17] while Sarah is

---

God, the Eternal, cannot be brought into relation to the dead: did indeed the author of the passage in Exodus mean to teach by it, even implicitly and indirectly, the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body? if not, an interpretation, which finds these doctrines in the words, cannot be characterised as "tiefsinniges Schriftverständniss", but as "rabbinische Dialektik."

[7] Rom. X. 6, 7 (*τουτέστι χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν . . . τουτέστι χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν*. comp. Hebr. XIII. 20).

[8] Comp. Ps. CXXXIX. 8; Am. IX. 2.

[9] אֶל־עֵבֶר הַיָּם וגו׳; Sept. *τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης*.

[10] Gen. XXII. 18, והתברכו בזרעך.

[11] Ver. 17; comp. Gen. XIII. 15; XVII. 8.

[12] Gal. III. 16.

[13] Eph. V. 22—33, *τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν* (ver. 32).

[14] Comp. *Phil.* De Human. c. 19 (Opp. II. 399, 400).

[15] 1 Cor. IX. 9, 10; comp. Deut. XXV. 4.

[16] Galat. IV. 22—31, *Ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα*.

[17] *Τὸ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν . . . συστοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλὴμ κτλ.*

"the Jerusalem above which is free and which is the mother of us all",[1] since to her apply the words of the prophet, "rejoice thou barren that bearest not etc.";[2] now as Ishmael persecuted his younger brother,[3] so must the followers of Christ, who, like Isaac, are the children of promise, be persecuted by their older kinsmen, to be, however, ultimately victorious and to inherit alone the kingdom of heaven. Irrespective of the taste in which this exposition is conceived,[4] it is wholly inappropriate with regard to the types and antitypes; for the *first* covenant or that of Mount Sinai was also concluded with the descendants of *Isaac*, while Ishmael stands in no relation whatsoever to that "testament" or the Mosaic Law: therefore even Luther was forced to the confession that the allegory of Sarah and Hagar is untenable because it disregards the historical truth.[5]

The author of the hundred and tenth Psalm, in language no less obscure and abrupt than fervid and devoted, congratulates a contemporary king of Judah upon achieved or expected victories, "Jehovah speaks to my lord, Sit down at my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool ... rule thou in the midst of thy enemies;" and in rising veneration and enthusiasm the poet exclaims, "Jehovah has sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek,"[6] that is, he declares him worthy to unite, like Melchizedek in Abraham's time,[7] the crown of royalty with the crown of priesthood, and wishes or predicts the "eternal" preservation of the double dignity in his house. This Psalm received from an early date a Messianic interpretation, which was favoured both by its soaring elevation and pregnant brevity; it was evidently so understood by the Jews in the time of Christ; and Christ and the apostles applied it in this manner with the assent of their hearers.[8] It is, therefore, but natural that

---

[1] *Ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν κτλ.*, comp. *Ἱερ. ἐπουρανίων* (Hebr. XII. 22) or *ἡ καινὴ Ἱερ.* (Rev. III. 12; XXI. 2), and the Rabbinical ירושלים של מעלה.

[2] Isai. LIV. 1, quoted from the Sept.

[3] Comp. Gen. XXI. 9, "Sarah saw the son of Hagar mocking" (מצחק), which allusion was much enlarged by tradition; for inst. "Ishmael shot arrows at Isaac, and did as if he sported" (מצחק; *Midr. Rabb.* Beresh. LIII. 8), and many similar fancies.

[4] Comp. lso *Philo*, Legg. Allegor. III. 87 (I. p. 136 ed. Mang.).

[5] Die Allegorie ... ist zum Stich zu schwach, denn sie weichet ab vom historischen Verstand (Ausleg. des 1 B. Mos., Werke I. 1731). "Es muss anerkannt werden" observes de Wette (in loc.), "dass der Apostel ganz willkürlich verfahren ist ... Seine Willkür aber ist eine unbewusste; was ihm der allegorische Witz an die Hand gab, hielt er für objective Wahrheit."

[6] Ver. 4, אתה־כהן לעולם על־דברתי מלכי־צדק.

[7] Gen. XIV. 18; *Philo*, De Abrah. c. 40 (II. 34), *ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ*.

[8] Comp. Ps. CX. 1 and Matth. XXII. 42—46 (Mark XII. 35—37; Luke XX.

**Melchizedek "king of Salem, a priest of the most high God," expressly named in the ode, should have been taken as the type of Christ — "a priest or High-priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek."[9] But the expedients which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews[10] adopted to carry out the parallel, are indeed highly curious. He explained the *name* of the Canaanite monarch, which is simply "righteous king",[11] as "the king of righteousness",[12] the fountain of wisdom, sanctification, and redemption;[13] and he interpreted the *town* Salem (שָׁלֵם) or Jerusalem[14] as peace, so that Melchizedek was the "king of peace";[15] but more strangely still, he described him as "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually."[16] What are the supports that justify the assumption of that marvellous nature of Melchizedek, to whom the Old Testament makes absolutely no other allusion except in the history of Abraham — "king of Salem, a priest of the most high God" — and in the Psalm above analysed, where he is but incidentally named both king and priest? But it is the silence of the Hebrew Scriptures which seems to have been eagerly seized by the author of the Epistle: they do not mention his father and his mother — therefore he had none; they do not mention his descent — therefore he was unconnected with human generations; they do not mention his birth nor his death — therefore he was neither born nor did he die; and all this was evidently assumed that he might be "like unto the Son of God", with whom, as was supposed, that Psalm compared him.[17]**

41—44); Acts II. 30—36; 1 Cor. XV. 25—28; Hebr. I. 3, 13; X. 12, 13; esp. the sitting of Christ "on the right hand of God" (שב לימיני, meaning "be thou My stadtholder or co-regent"; see De Wette on Ps. CX. 1); comp. also Matth. XXVI. 63, 64; Mark XIV. 61, 62; Luke XXII. 69; Acts VII. 55, 56; Rom. VIII. 34; Eph. I. 20—22; Col. III. 1; 1 Pet. III. 22; Hebr. VIII. 1; Rev. III. 21; V. 1, 7.

[9] Hebr. V. 6, 10; VI. 20; VII. 17, 21.

[10] Hebr. VII. 1—3.

[11] מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק; see Gram. § 88. 1, 2; thus Josephus (Ant. I. x. 2) and Philo (Legg. Alleg. III. 25; Op. I. p. 103) explain *βασιλεὺς δίκαιος*; comp. also אֲדֹנִי צֶדֶק, a king of Jerusalem, in Josh. X. 1.

[12] *Βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης.*

[13] 1 Cor. I. 30; comp. Jer. XXIII. 6.

[14] Comp. Ps. LXXVI. 3, where שָׁלֵם stands in parallelism with צִיּוֹן; comp. *Jos.* B. J. VI. x.; see Hengstenb., Hupfeld, a. o. in loc.; comp. Comm. on Gen. pp. 359—362.

[15] *Βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης*; Rom. V. 1; Eph. II. 14, 15, 17; comp. Isai. IX. 5 (שר שלום), 6; Zech. IX. 9, 10; *Philo*, l. c.

[16] Ver. 3, *Ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος* (or *μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν*, ver. 6), *μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων, ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* (or *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, VI. 20; comp. X. 12, 14).

[17] Comp. Matth. I. 18, 20; Luke I. 35 (see, however, *De Wette*, Dogm. I. § 281). For this reason, it cannot be admitted that the author meant nothing more by the terms *ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ κτλ.* than "one of whom the Bible records nei-

But is this surprising *argumentum ex silentio*, unparalleled as it is, efficacious after all? does it not prove even too much? Was indeed the Christ of the New Testament "without mother"? was he indeed "without descent"? he whose indispensable attribute it was to descend from the house of David?[1] Can the proof that he was neither, be attempted without the most wanton distortions? But it must be observed that the idea of the possibility of a birth either without father or without mother seems to have been familiarly entertained about the time of Christ: thus Philo calls Sarah "without mother" (ἀμήτωρ), because "she had no share in the female race" and its weakness, and "was not formed of the materials accessible to outward perception, which are always in a state of formation and dissolution", but "had emerged out of the whole corporeal world."[2] It is certainly possible that the writer did not wish to press the analogies too closely, conscious that they would either lead to an unscriptural identification of Melchizedek and Christ,[3] or to a supernatural paradox,[4] or to a grave Biblical perplexity, since, if Melchizedek "abideth a priest continually," there would be neither room nor occasion for the priesthood of Levi and of Christ: but if so, the whole of that typical explanation collapses and falls to the ground. Indeed, how can Melchizedek, who was not even permitted to use the sacred

---

ther parents nor genealogy" (so many commentators); this would be a trivial truism (the instance in Livy IV. 3 that Serv. Tullius was born *patre nullo*, of an *unknown* father, is not analogous, as the addition *matre serva* together with the context sufficiently explains the sense); and where would be the resemblance with Christ? besides, ἀπάτωρ signifies clearly, as Pollux explains, ὁ μὴ πατέρα ἔχων ὡς Ἥφαιστος (comp. *Lucian*, De Sacrif. c. 6), and ἀμήτωρ ὁ μὴ ἔχων μητέρα ὥςπερ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ. Those terms are no less to be taken literally than the following μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν κτλ., and they are intended to apply as well to the type as to the antitype.

[1] Comp. John VII. 42, "Hath not the Scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David"? see also Matth. IX. 27; XV. 22; XXI. 15; etc.

[2] *Philo*, De Ebriet. c. 14 (Op. I. 365, 366), λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἀμήτωρ γενέσθαι ... θήλεος γενεᾶς ἀμέτοχος ... οὐχὶ γὰρ ἐξ ὕλης τῆς αἰσθητοῦ συνισταμένης ἀεὶ καὶ λυομένης ... ὑπερκύψασα τὸν σωματοειδῆ πάντα κόσμον; comp. also Quis Rer. Div. Her. c. 12 (Op. I. 481), ἐκ πατρὸς τοῦ πάντων θεοῦ μόνου γεννηθεῖσα ἡ ἀμήτωρ ἀρχή.

[3] The former was indeed regarded as an ἐνσάρκωσις of the latter, or of the λόγος, by Epiphan., Ambros., a. o.; and, by the "Melchizedekites", esp. their chief. the younger Theodotus, as the incarnation of a Divine power superior to Christ (against the New T., Rom. IX. 5; Col. I. 15; 2 Cor. IV. 4; 1 John V. 20; Hebr. I. 2, 3, 8, 10; Matth. III. 17; XI. 27; etc.), who was himself but the reflex of Melch. and the intercessor for men (Append. ad *Tertull.* De praescr. haer. c. 53; *Theod.* Haer. sal. II. 5, 6); *Epiphan.* Haer. 35; etc.

[4] Some, as Origen and Didymus, considered Melchizedek an angel (*Hieronymus* Epistol. ad Evag.; comp. *Fabric.* Cod. Pseudep. Veter. Testam. II. 329; III. 72).

name of Jehovah, because, not belonging to the race of Abraham, he had not fathomed His attributes,[5] and was merely a priest "of the most high God," how can he be the type of the "Son of God," the embodiment of Divine wisdom and holiness? how can he at all point to the future unfolding of God's kingdom? The comparison between the two lies in the blending of the regal and pontifical power, and in nothing else; and as the former was to remain "for ever" in David's house, so also the latter.[6] We are, therefore, happily released from following the writer of the Epistle into his remaining and over-subtle inferences, all designed to glorify Christ by means of Melchizedek — that the latter received the tithes from Abraham himself, and through him, as it were, from the Levites also, while these could exact them from their fellow-Hebrews only; that he blessed the patriarch and must therefore have surpassed him in exalted dignity; that he is immortal, while the Levites were perishable beings; that he, therefore, installed with the confirmation of an oath, absorbs and annuls the Levitical priesthood;[7] and we pass over the numerous and incredible reveries that have been ventured on the nature, the life, and the office of the priest-king so briefly and so imperfectly alluded to in the Old Testament.[8]

If, therefore, the speculative expositions of Talmudists and Rabbins must, in principle, be denounced as playful and futile, the same epithets apply with equal force to the typical expositions of the New Testament; both belong to the same class and the same mental bias, and fall at the slightest touch of criticism.[9]

Perceiving the questionable value of interpretations which might well tend to discredit the whole canon, great Christian divines alleged,

---

[5] Gen. XIV. 19, 20. See Comm. on Gen. p. 359. [6] Comp. Ps. CVI. 31 (לדור ודור עד־עולם); 1 Sam. II. 30 (עד־עולם), 35 (כל־הימים).

[7] Hebr. VII. 4—21; this can hardly be called with Hupfeld (Psalmen, IV. p. 175) "durchgeführte tiefsinnige Allegorie üb. die Stellung Christi zum levitischen Priesterthum und Gesetz"; although we fully agree with his excellent remarks on the impossibility of the Messianic interpretation of the 110th Psalm (ibid. pp. 175—177); comp., on the other hand, the uncritical expositions of *Hengstenb.* Christol. I. pp. 139—153; Psalm. IV. pp. 223—258; *Delitzsch*, Psalmen, II. pp. 138—143; 148—150; a. o.

[8] Comp., f. i., *Michael.* Typ. Gottesgel. Introd. pp. 9—86, and in the body of the work pp. 122—126; *Heidegger*, Hist. patriarch. II. 38 *sqq.*; *L. Borger*, Hist. crit. Melchisedeci; *Carpzov*, Apparatus, p. 52—55; *Deyling*, Observ. II. 58 *sqq.*; *Nägelsbach*, in Herz. Real-Enc. IX. 300—304.

[9] Compare also the strange interpretations in Gal. II. 20; III. 13; VI. 14; etc.; see also *De Wette*, Dogmat. I. § 261. Apologetic attempts are not only unavailing, but exhibit the faults of argumentation still more strikingly; see, f. i. *Thol.* l. c. pp. 24, 25, 37—40, 45, 46, 61—76; *Lechler*, Das A. T. in den Reden Jesu, St. u. Kr. 1854, pp. 787 *sqq.*

that the allusions made in the New Testament to the Old, have no argumentative weight, but are merely introduced as suitable and memorable similes,[1] "to illustrate the subject treated of."[2] But the express and unequivocal declarations of the New Testament do not permit such evasion. It is true that in a few passages, words are inserted from the Old Testament as no more than familiar or convenient expressions,[3] even without being marked as quotations;[4] and it may be that in some others, the "type" is represented as consisting simply in an accidental and illustrative analogy, and not in a designed and intended pre-figuration. Thus the disobedience of the Hebrews in the desert and their consequent punishment are described as "our examples to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted",[5] which only implies the warning to expect similar disasters from similar offences.[6] As the brazen, and therefore poisonless, serpent was lifted in the desert, and gave health to those who looked up to it, so Christ, sinless and nailed to the cross, saves those who turn to him in faith.[7] Jonah remaining three days and three nights in the whale's belly, was a "sign" (*σημεῖον*) that Christ would be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.[8] But other passages entirely exclude such conception; they were unmistakeably meant to involve the idea of real types. Thus Adam is called the "figure of him who was to come",[9] or "the first man of earth, earthy", while Christ is "the second man, the Lord from heaven."[10] The Deluge in which Noah was saved is a "figure" of baptism and its power of salvation.[11] The history of Hagar and Sarah is an "allegory", the former of the old Jerusâlem, the latter of the new, or of the covenant

---

1 *Ὡς ἁρμόζοντα τῇ ὑποθέσει*, so Kosmas Indicopl. (Montfauc. II. 227).

2 Ad ornandam praesentem causam, so Calvin (ad Hebr. II. 6; comp. also ad Matth. II. 18); the Antiochian school, Diodor of Tharsus and Theod. of Mopsuesta; the Arminians (comp. *Grotius* and *Wettstein* on Matth. I. 22; *Episcop.* on Matth. II. 15; *Hammond* on Matth. II. 23), Ernesti, Griesbach, a. o.; comp. *Tholuck*, l. c. pp. 5—47.

3 1 Cor. II. 9; III. 19, 20; XIV. 21; 2 Cor. IV. 13; VI. 16—18; VIII. 15; IX. 9; Matth. XXI. 13; Rom. III. 4; IV. 10—18; VIII. 36; IX. 25, 26, 33; XV. 3, 21; Hebr. III. 15; X. 5, 38; XI. 13; 1 Pet. II. 4—8 (comp. *Luther* on Isai. VIII. 14.).

4 Rom. X. 6, 7, 13, 18; Hebr. II. 12, 13; 1 Cor. XV. 25, 27; Eph. IV. 26.

5 1 Cor. X. 6, *ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς κἀκεῖνοι ἐπεθύμησαν.*

6 Comp. 1 Cor. IX. 9, 10.

7 Num. XXI. 8, 9; John III. 14.

8 Matth. XII. 39, 40; but this is not accurate. Comp. Matth. IV, 4—6, 7, 10.

9 Rom. V. 14, *τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος.*

10 1 Cor. XV. 47, *ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος (ὁ κύριος) ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.* Therefore, the terms Rom V. 14 can hardly be classed in the former category (so Tholuck, l. c. p. 44).

11 1 Pet. III. 21, *ὃ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα.*

through Christ.[12] The earthly Sanctuary made by human hands on celestial patterns and guarded by human priests, is the "figure of the true one" in heaven presided over by Christ.[13] And with a more comprehensive scope, "the holy ghost" signified the incomplete service in the Temple as a "figure" of the time when through Christ worship will be perfect.[14] The Jewish priests are affirmed "to serve unto the *example* and *shadow* of heavenly things",[15] while the Law has merely "the shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things", and could therefore not render those perfect who sacrificed under that dispensation,[16] since the ceremonial precepts, as those on food, the sabbath, and the holidays, were "a shadow of things to come", or "the weak and beggarly elements", whereas "the body is Christ."[17]

In narrating the life of Jesus, the Evangelists introduce a series of events which, though they had happened in previous times, occurred again in the history of Christ, but in a manner so much more real that they were considered as the "fulfilment" of the former. Jesus was born by the Virgin Mary, that a corresponding promise given to Isaiah more than 700 years before and at that time literally realised, might be "fulfilled."[18] He was taken to Egypt as a child and brought back to Palestine, that he might "fulfill" in a deeper sense the words of the prophet Hosea, originally applied to the Hebrews, "Out of Egypt have I called my son."[19] The child-murder at Bethlehem which he occasioned, was the "fulfilment" of the carnage perpetrated by the Babylonians in Jerusalem at the time of its destruction about six centuries before;[20] although the former was utterly insignificant compared with the fearful bloodshed of the latter.[21] He cast out the devils and healed the sick, that the utterances of Isaiah with regard to the servant of God who "took our infirmities upon himself and bore our sicknesses", might be realised in a profounder meaning.[22] He always spoke to the people in parables, that the intention of Asaph, who declared at the beginning of one of his Psalms, "I will open my mouth in a parable, I will utter dark sayings of old", should be carried out in a manner as

---

[12] Gal. IV. 22—31; see pp. 149, 150.

[13] Hebr. IX. 23, 24, *τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ... χειροποίητα ἅγια ... ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν*; comp. IX. *11*; VIII. 5 and Exod. XXV. 9, 40.

[14] Hebr. IX. 9, *ἥτις παραβολή κτλ.*

[15] Hebr. VIII. 5, *οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσιν τῶν ἐπουρανίων.*

[16] Rom. X. 1, *σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, κτλ.*

[17] Col. II. 17, *ὅ ἐστιν σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ χριστοῦ*; Gal. IV. 9, *ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα.*

[18] Matth. I. 23; comp. Isai. VII. 14.

[19] Matth. II. 15; Hos. XI. 1.

[20] Matth. II. 17, 18 (*τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν, κτλ*); comp. Jerem. XXXI. 15, 16.

[21] Comp. *Michael.* Typ. Gottesgel. pp. 198—201.

[22] Matth. VIII. 16, 17; Isai. LIII. 4.

it could never be done by Asaph himself.[1] He declared that Judas must betray him, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled, "He that eats bread with me, has lifted up his heel against me", words used many ages before by a poet groaning under misery, persecution and disease.[2] The money received by the traitor and then returned by him in the Temple, was employed for buying "the potter's field" as a burial place, in order that a corresponding purchase actually made by Jeremiah in the Babylonian period might be "fulfilled";[3] although the same transaction is, in another place, very differently related, so that evidently various traditions and legends existed on the subject.[4] Who does not see that these and similar "fulfilments",[5] founded neither upon human design and co-operation, nor upon internal necessity, nor the remotest causal connection, are nothing but self-discovered adaptations not always happy and invariably deceptive, in the Rabbinical taste above characterised?

But the New Testament proceeded even farther in this direction. The principle of fulfilment was applied not only to events, but to laws. The command to roast the paschal lamb entire, so that no bone of it is broken — to symbolise the unity of the families and the nation — found its true fulfilment, when the legs of Christ were not broken after the crucifixion.[6] But this latter accommodation was only a part of a larger conception. Starting from the notion of the Old Testament that leaven is corruption and decay, and that, therefore, Passover or "the feast of unleavened bread", is the emblem of purity and sinlessness,[7] and moreover considering that Jesus died on the day before that festival, evangelists and apostles took the paschal lamb for the type of Christ, and set forth the doctrine, "Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us"[8] — manifestly as a sin-offering, in harmony with the character

---

1 Matth. XIII. 35; see Ps. LXXVIII. 2.

2 John XIII. 18; comp. Ps. XLI. 10.

3 Matth. XXVII. 9; comp. Jerem. XXXII. 8 *sqq.*; comp. Zechar. XI. 13.

4 Acts I. 18—20; comp. Ps. LXIX. 29; CIX. 8, 10; see *De Wette* on Acts I. 18, 19.

5 Comp. Matth. IV. 15, 16 and Isai. VIII. 23; IX. 1; Matth. XII. 18—21 and Isai. XLII. 1—4; Matth. XIII. 14, 15 and Isai. VI. 9, 10; Matth. XXVII. 35 (John XIX. 24) and Ps. XXII. 19; John XV. 25 and Ps. LXIX. 5; John XII. 37—41 and Isai. VI. 10; LIII. 1; Acts XIII. 35—37 and Ps. XVI. 10; see also Matth. XXVI. 24, 54; XVII. 12 and XVIII. 9; XIX. 28, 37; XX. 9; Luke XXIV. 25, 27, 44, 46; Mark IX. 13. Sometimes the quotations from the O. T. are incorrect, whether unconsciously or intentionally, in order to effect the desired fulfilment or to make it more striking; comp. Matth. II. 6 and Mic. V. 1; 1 Cor. II. 9 and Isai. LXIV. 3; while sometimes various passages are mixed or blended; comp. Rom. XI. 26, 27 and Is. LIX. 20, 21; XXVII. 9.

6 John XIX. 36; comp. Exod. XII. 9, 46; and *supra* p. 21.

7 See p. 134.

8 1 Cor. V. 7, καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐθύθη χριστός.

of the *first* or Egyptian paschal celebration.[9] Applying these notions to the sacrificial code in general, they maintained that Christ is the great sin-and purification-offering, by whose blood the transgressions of the world are for ever forgiven and eternal redemption is wrought;[10] and advancing a step farther, they arrived at the idea that he was the universal and true sacrifice, which had been foreshadowed by all the defective offerings of the Old Testament, and thenceforth rendered them for ever superfluous;[11] so that the Hebrew sacrifices, once acts of daily and perpetual necessity,[12] "were manifestly evangelical sermons on the suffering, death, and justification of Christ."[13] For he gave himself up as a sacrifice, not like all other victims, but self-consciously and spontaneously; and, possessing an inner affinity both with the human and the Divine nature,[14] he alone was able to effect a true intercourse between God and men, and to create a communion between mankind and God. And as every sacrifice was designed as a *covenant* with the Deity, from which reason each was to be accompanied by the "salt of the covenant of God",[15] so were the death and the blood of Christ the means of a new covenant between God and the human race, involving the everlasting remission of sins.[16] These ideas were, with eager zest, worked out into minute parallels: the lamb was in the Old Testament ordained as the most usual victim, because it is, like Christ, the emblem of innocence and of patience under sufferings;[17] the sacrificial animals were to be faultless, because Christ was without defect and free from all disease of guilt;[18] the sin-offering was burnt without the camp, as Christ suffered without the gates of Jerusalem;[19] the flesh of the victims was

---

9 See Sect. XVII.

10 Matth. XX. 28; XXVI. 28; Mark XIV. 24; Luke XXII. 20; John I. 29; III. 16; VI. 51; X. 15; Rom. III. 24, 25; IV. 25; V. 2, 6—9, 11, 15, 19; VIII. 31—39; 1 Cor. VI. 20; XV. 3; 2 Cor. V. 18, 19, 21; Gal. I. 4; Eph. I. 7; V. 25, 26; Col. I. 14, 20—22; II. 14; 1 John I. 7; II. 1, 2; III. 16; IV. 10; Hebr. II. 9; VII. 25; IX. 14, 15, 18—22, 26; X. 12; 1 Petr. I. 18, 19; II. 24; Tit. II. 14; Revel. I. 7; comp. also Eph. V. 2 and 1 Cor. V. 7. "Der Versöhnungstod Jesu", observes De Wette (Dogmat. II. § 73a), "ist ein Gegenstand des frommen Glaubens oder der Ahnung, nicht des Wissens."

11 Hebr. IX. 25—28; X. 10, 12, 14.

12 Hebr. X. 1—3, 11, 12.

13 *Lundius*, Jüd. Heiligth. pp. 727, 728; comp. *Semler*, Antiquitäten der Heiligen Schrift, pp. 127, 128.

14 See p. 60; comp. 2 Cor. V. 18, 19; 1 Tim. II. 6; Eph. V. 2; see Matth. XX. 28; John X. 18; Rom. V. 19; 1 Pet. II. 22, 23; Hebr. IX. 14; X. 5, 6; *Irenaeus*, Adv. Haeret. III. xviii. 7.

15 See p. 110; comp. Ps. L. 5.

16 Matth. XXVI. 28; Mark XIV. 24; Luke XXII. 20; Hebr. IX. 14—22; XIII. 20; 1 Cor. XI. 25.

17 Comp. Revel., where alone Christ is called lamb more than 30 times; comp. 1 Pet. I. 19, etc.

18 Ἄμωμος, ἄσπιλος, etc.; Hebr. IX. 14; 1 Pet. I. 19; II. 22; 2 Cor. V, 21; John VIII. 46.

19 Hebr. XIII. 1—13.

consumed, because the flesh of Christ was to be eaten by the believers, and his blood drunk to acquire eternal life.[1] But Christ was regarded not only as the *victim*, but also as the *priest*,[2] that is, as the *mediator* between God and men,[3] in fact, as the true High-priest,[4] appointed by an oath of God,[5] eternally occupying the dignity, without follower,[6] and alone completely realising the idea of an intercessor, because in order to atone for others, he does not require first to atone for himself.[7]

Unbiassed readers might suppose that these views of the New Testament approach the very boundary even of fantastical adaptation. They might consider that most of them obviously include their own refutation. The faultlessness of the victim was a requirement even in heathen sacrifices.[8] The holiest kind of sin-offerings was neither consumed by the priests nor the offerers, but burnt entirely; the less holy class was indeed partially eaten, but by the priests alone; while the worshippers were permitted to partake of the thank-offerings only, which involve the idea of atonement in the least degree;[9] and when Christ declared, "I say to you, Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you",[10] he amazed his own disciples, many of whom left him thenceforth for ever.[11] The Hebrew prophets never expected or wished the sacrifices to be abrogated in the time of the Messiah.[12] There lived indeed in the better minds of the nation the hope that God would, in due time, conclude with Israel "a new covenant"; but this covenant was not meant to consist in a new Law, but that the old one should become a truth and a reality in the lives of men, after a complete remission of their sins. "This shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: in those days, says the Lord, I will put My Law into their minds, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more:"[13] "A new heart will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh";[14] and in that time, it was anticipated,

---

1 John VI. 53—58.

2 Hebr. VII. 15; VIII. 4; etc.

3 *Μεσίτης*, Gal. III. 20; 1 Tim. II. 5; Hebr. VIII. 6; IX. 15; XII. 24; comp. VII. 25; IX. 24; or *surety*, *ἔγγυος*, Hebr. VII. 22; comp. 2 Macc. X. 28.

4 Hebr. III. 1; IV. 14; V. 5, 10; VI. 20; VIII. 1; IX. 11; X. 21; XIII. 11.

5 Hebr. VII. 21; comp. Ps. CX. 4.

6 Hebr. VII. 23, 24; comp. Ps. l. c. (לעולם); see pp. 152, 153.

7 Hebr. V. 3; VII. 26, 27, 28; IX. 7.

8 See pp. 94, 95.

9 Comp. Hebr. XIII. 10, 11.

10 John VI. 53; comp. vers. 32, 33, 54—58.

11 Vers. 60, 61, 66.

12 See p. 62.

13 Jer. XXXI. 33, 34 (Hebr. VIII. 7—13; X. 15—18); comp. XXIV. 7 (ונתתי לכם לב לדעת אתי וכ').

14 Ezek. XXXVI. 26—28.

sacrifices would be performed not alone at the place of the Ark of the Covenant, but everywhere in Jerusalem, in which town, as at the throne of God, all nations would, in purity of heart, assemble with their offerings.[15]

But neither difficulties nor improbabilities deterred prepossessed minds from the dangerous path. With increasing exaggeration and arbitrariness, the typical method was pursued in subsequent ages. Degrees of deterioration are distinguishable in the New Testament itself. While the allegorical applications attributed to Christ are comparatively simple and intelligible, those of St. Paul are considerably bolder, though always ingenious and original, fresh and spontaneous, and often surprising by admirable and important deductions; but the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, basing his conclusions not upon the original Hebrew text, but upon the Greek translation, even where it is manifestly erroneous, is subtle, studied, and laborious, yet versatile, able, and dexterous.[16] However, even he was immeasurably surpassed by those who followed his track, by Barnabas, Justinus Martyr, and Origen, by Ambrosius and Hilarius, whose typical elucidations are often flimsy, poor, and trivial. In vain the voice of warning was raised by thoughtful and discerning men; in vain did St. Augustin advise the utmost caution and moderation; he observed that details of the Old and New Testament are often very ingeniously compared with each other, but that this is not done by Divine suggestion, but by conjectures of the human mind, which indeed sometimes discovers the truth, but is as frequently in error.[17] But so strong was the propensity of the time, and so powerful the temptation to yield to it, that St. Augustin himself propunded the theory of a fourfold interpretation of the Scriptures — according to history, causality, analogy, and allegory,[18] a theory which, in the Middle Ages, produced no less mischievous effects among Christian theologians, than the corresponding Talmudical canon of the four modes of exposition — according to the literary meaning, the occult or underlying sense, the allegory, and mystery[19] — called forth

---

15 Jer. III. 16, 17; see pp. 53, 54.

16 Comp. Hebr. I. 6 and Ps. XCVII. 7 Sept.; Hebr. II. 10—12 and Ps. XXII. 23; Hebr. III. 7—IV. 9 and Ps. XCV. 8—11; Hebr. VII. 17, 21 and Ps. CX. 4; Hebr. II. 7; X. 5; XII. 26, 27 and Hagg. II. 6.

17 *Augustin*. De Civitate, Dei XVIII. 52, Exquisite et ingeniose illa singula his singulis comparata videantur, non prophetico spiritu, sed conjectura mentis humanae, quae aliquando ad verum pervenit, aliquando fallitur.

18 Secundum historiam, secundum aitiologiam (*why* the events happened), secundum analogiam (harmony of the Old T. and the New), et secundum allegoriam (*August.* De Utilit. Cred. c. 3; De vera Relig. c. 50).

19 פְּשַׁט, רֶמֶז (*ὑπόνοια*), דְּרַשׁ, and סוֹד, the initials of which words form the vox memorialis פַּרְדֵּס.

among Jewish scholars; the former gave rise to the mystic and theosophic, the latter to the cabalistic and chasidic schools, the luxuriant extravagance of which totally overspread and buried the plain sense of the Bible. The typical method knew no bounds; and it went astray into the most arid wastes of fanciful speculation.

The broad doctrine was set forth, that even the actual events recorded in the Old Testament happened but figuratively, and were images to be realised and truly accomplished in Christ.[1] It would be unprofitable to recount all the typical inferences that have been ventured on such premises; let it suffice to mention some of the more moderate views and explanations. Rachel, long praying for issue, and at last giving birth to Benjamin under pain and death, was understood as the Jewish Synagogue, for ages expecting the Messiah and then killing him. The blooming rod of Aaron was the Divine appointment of Christ and his work through the resurrection.[2] The manna that fell from heaven in the night, is Christ, the heavenly, who was born in the night, the food of the soul; it was white in colour, because he was innocent and spotless; it was at first unfamiliar to the Hebrews, because he is not understood by ungraced men of nature; a part of it was preserved in a vessel as a memorial, to point to the Lord's supper that would in due time be instituted.[3] Nearly all the prominent persons of the Old Testament — as Isaac and Jacob, Joseph and Moses, David and Solomon[4] — were taken for types of Jesus, his life, and his sufferings; and Elisha with his twelve yokes of oxen for the emblems of Christ and his twelve apostles,[5] who, however, were also prefigured by the twelve wells of water at Elim, the twelve gems in the High-priest's breast-plate, the twelve stones selected from the Jordan by the command of God through Joshua,[6] and by the twelve cakes of shew-bread, pure and unleavened, since Christ is the bread of life.[7] The priest laid the incense of the people on the altar, because Christ alone can bring human supplications before God; and the incense was burnt with the fire taken from the brazen altar, because any prayer unconnected with the sacrifice of

---

[1] Zwingli on Matth. II. 18, omnia quae in V. T. etiam vere sunt gesta, in figura tamen contigerunt, et figurae fuerunt, in Christo omnia consummantur et vere implentur.

[2] Num. XVII. 23; comp. Hebr. IX. 4.

[3] See *Semler*, Antiq. der heil. Sch. pp. 24, 25; comp. also pp. 103, 108, 113.

[4] Comp. Hebr. I. 5 and Ps. II. 7; 2 Sam. VII. 4.

[5] Comp. 1 Ki. XIX. 19.

[6] Ex. XV. 27; XXVIII. 17—21; Josh. IV. 2—8; Matth. XIX. 28; comp. *Tertull.* c. Marc. IV. 24, totidem apostoli ut fontes irrigaturi vallem aridam, ut gemmae illuminaturae sacram ecclesiae vestem, ut lapides fidei quos de Jordanis lavacro elegit.

[7] Comp. John VI. 35, 53, 54, 57, 58; see *supra*.

Christ is illegitimate and cannot approach the throne of God. All sacrifices were to be offered in Jerusalem, because Christ was there crucified;[8] yet the ashes were to be removed without the camp to a clean place, because Christ was buried at a spot that had not been rendered levitically impure by bones of the dead. The paschal lamb was to be selected five days before the festival, because Christ came to Jerusalem to suffer death a similar time before Passover;[9] and the former was to be killed "between the two evenings", because the latter was nailed to the cross at the same time of the day.[10] The victim was to be neither too old nor too young, because Christ took upon himself the punishment of human sin in the bloom of his life, when he was most able to feel the agony and to ponder over it. The offerer killed the victim himself, because Christ was slain by the people whom he redeemed. The fat and the fat parts, that is, the choicest portions of the animal, were to be burnt on the altar, because God gave for the salvation of the world His most precious treasure, His own son. Yet the burning of the animal symbolised both the tortures of hell that await the sinner, and the death of Christ which saves him. One goat was slain on the Day of Atonement, and another sent out free into the wilderness, because Christ was kil ed for mankind, which by his death became free from sin and its direful retribution. Certain pieces of the sacrifices were "heaved" and "waved", because Christ, when nailed to the cross, was lifted up, and as it were waved to the four winds.[11]

A number of objections against these and all typical views must at once crowd upon the reader's attention. He will first of all be struck by the uncertainty and indistinctness of the interpretations. Can Christ be at the same time the victim and the mediating priest? If the victim, how can he intercede? if the High-priest, how can his blood be shed for atonement? Yet he is represented both as the one and the other; in either case the parallels are worked out into microscopic details; and the inevitable result is a most perplexing confusion both in the sacrificial rites and in the attributes of Christ.[12] The author of the

[8] Comp. Matth. XX. 18; Mark X. 33; Luke XVIII. 31.

[9] Comp. John XII. 1.

[10] Comp. Exod. XII. 6 and notes *in loc.*

[11] Comp. *Michaelis*, Entwurf der typischen Gottesgelahrtheit; *Lundius*, Jüdische Heiligthümer, III. xlvi. 15—41; *Deyling*, Observ. Sacr. V. 32, de typis proprie dictis et innatis; *Ph. Hiller*, Neues System aller Vorbilder Christi im A. T. 1758 (1858); *Semler*, l. c. pp. 124—128; *Blasche*, System. Comment. zum Hebräerbr., 1782; Neue Aufklärung über die mos. Typol. 1789; *B. W. Newton*, Thoughts on parts of the Book of Leviticus, 2nd ed. 1857; *Hengstenberg*, Opfer, pp. 17, 18, 27 *sqq.*; *Küper*, Das Priesterthum des alten Bundes, 1866; etc. etc.

[12] It has been observed "In as much as priests expiate by victims, priests and victims are but two sides of the

Epistle to the Hebrews seems indeed to have felt this difficulty; for he represents Christ as the victim on earth, but as the High-priest after his crucifixion, in heaven, which is the Holy of Holies where he performs his ministrations;[1] but if so, where is the analogy between the ordinary sacrifices and that of Christ? That one and chief inaccuracy led naturally to unlimited and almost universal identifications; Christ was contended to be, in his own and sole person, "victim, sacrifice, priest, altar, God, man, king, High-priest, sheep, lamb, in fact, all in all, that he may be our life in every respect";[2] till in this maze of entanglement every landmark disappeared, and all connection with the Old Testament was utterly lost. Occasional similarities may be discoverable, because, as we have above remarked, historical events repeat themselves within certain conditions; but even a cursory examination will generally prove the decided preponderance of the divergences. If Christ is the "Passover", how can his life, even by the remotest allegories, be harmonised with the requirements of the paschal lamb, which was to be *roasted*, consumed *entirely*, without the least portion being left, eaten with *bitter herbs*, and killed *annually?* Typical explanations cannot be consistently followed out without leading to absurdities, of which a treatise entitled "How Christ — the altar — was square"?[3] is but one specimen in a large class. If their adherents gave due weight to this consideration, they would attempt to test their religious tenets by their own intrinsic merits, rather than by unnaturally grafting them upon the Old Testament. As many theologians, therefore, had not the courage, typically to interpret all details, they selected some as adapted for that method, while they understood the rest literally;[4] but a principle which is not generally applicable is no principle at all, and reveals its fatal weakness. Some distinguished between *inherent* and *transferred* types,[5] the former being marked as such in the Scriptures, the latter formed by analogy; others explained every point in a twofold manner, once as a mystery of Christ, and once as a mystery of the Church, or as "a memorial" of

---

same idea" (*Tholuck*, l. c. p. 106): but fundamental doctrines of religion ought not to be supported by such sophisms.

1 Hebr. V. 9, 10; VI. 19, 20; VII. 26; VIII. 4; comp. *Tholuck*, l. c. p. 107.

2 *Epiphan.* Haer. 55; *αὐτὸς ἱερεῖον, αὐτὸς θῦμα, αὐτὸς ἱερεὺς, αὐτὸς θυσιαστήριον, αὐτὸς θεὸς, αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπος, αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς, αὐτὸς ἀρχιερεὺς, αὐτὸς πρόβατον, αὐτὸς ἀρνίον, τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν κτλ.* Comp. even De Wette (Dogm. II. § 68), "Christus, als Vollender der alttestamentl. Theokratie, hat alles in sich vereinigt, was Propheten, Priester und Könige in derselben geleistet und vorgebildet haben."

3 Quadratus quomodo Christus fuerit, by *J. J. Cramer* in his work De ara exteriori, XII. 1; comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 496.

4 Comp. *Michael.* l. c. pp. 26, 33, 39—42.

5 Typi innati et illati.

a past, and as "a type" of a future event,[6] so that the Old Testament was supposed frequently to interrupt itself in the historical context, in order to speak typically of the coming events of the New;[7] or an idea of the Hebrew Scriptures might be fulfilled at different times and in different degrees of distinctness and comprehensiveness,[8] so that, for instance, the prophet Elijah, promised to precede the Messiah, is not only John the Baptist, but "the impersonation of the preacher of repentance";[9] and the pouring out of the spirit of God upon all flesh announced by Joel, was by no means entirely realised by the inspiration of the apostles,[10] but continues to be fulfilled till it has indeed literally pervaded all mankind.[11] Some maintained that the Levitical institutions refer to Christ and to him alone; others averred, that they prefigure many necessary truths besides.[12] Some were of opinion that the Bible contains the whole sum of typical expositions, and others held that it includes but a fragmentary portion of them, while the rest, having lived for a time in oral tradition, were later forgotten and lost.[13] Thus the basis was found for the most contradictory views; one sect proved as a dogma what another rejected as heresy; and interpretations were continually propounded to be soon renounced as impossible by their own framers.[14] So understood, the Hebrew text would be more ambiguous and indefinite than any Egyptian hieroglyphic; it would be bereft of every practical value; ideas and institutions would he exposed to typical abuses just in proportion to their profundity and significance; and in the same measure would they cease to be intelligible or available.

Again, according to theories like those described, the sacrifices would, from the time of Moses to that of Christ, that is, during the whole period of their performance under the Law, have been devoid of all sense, of all meaning, of all tangible purpose whatever for the Hebrews. *Were* they understood by them as types? *could* they possibly be recognised as such? If the former alternative be supposed, all individual Israelites were prophetically inspired; if the latter, the typical

[6] Comp. *Nitzsch*, System der christl. Lehre p. 88; such double sense was supposed by many Fathers of the Church, as Origen, Eusebius and Basilius, Gregorius of Nyssa and of Nazianz, Ephraim, Hilarius and Ambrosius; by most of the reformed divines as Zwingli, Pellicanus, Calvin, Bucerus, a. o.

[7] So *Chrysostom*. ad Ps. CIX.

[8] Comp. *Hengstenb*. Kirchenzeit. 1833, No. 23, 24; *Gerlach*, on Matth. II. 16; *Teichler*, Ausleg. des N. T.

[9] Mal. III. 1, 23; comp. Mark I. 2; Matth. XI. 10, 11.

[10] Acts II. 16—21; comp. Joel III. 1—5.

[11] Comp. *Hengstenb*. Christol. III. 190, 441.

[12] *Mich*. l. c. p. 56.

[13] *Mich*. l. c. p. 57.

[14] Comp. *Mich*. l. c. pp. 107, 196, 197, etc.

relation must so clearly, so organically and inherently lie in the sacrificial laws, that it occurs spontaneously to every mind. But the one assumption is a paradox, though it has been asserted by some extreme champions of the method;[1] the other a palpable fallacy overthrown by experience, for even after the diffusion of Christianity and of the writings of the New Testament, the typical applications were neither discovered nor acknowledged by large numbers of Jews and Christians. Needs it to be seriously proved, that an ancient Israelite, in offering a sacrifice, hoped for expiation through the blood of the animal he was then killing, and through no other blood? Where does the Old Testament give the slightest hint or allusion to the contrary? Indeed, the early Hebrews were total strangers to the doctrine of a suffering and dying Messiah, as will be demonstrated in another place;[2] they could not possibly, therefore, in presenting a sacrifice, have had in their minds a redeemer at once God and man (θεάνθρωπος),[3] at once victim and High-priest. The Old Testament describes the sacrificial enactments as eternal, the best and most advanced among the Hebrews deemed them so, and Jesus himself acted accordingly;[4] but after the death of Christ all oblations would have been superfluous for those who believed in him, since he is to them the great antitype, by whose brilliancy all the pale types of by-gone ages are eclipsed: thus the New Testament, instead of being a fulfilment of the Old, would be in embarrassing contradiction with its spirit.

It has been argued that God cannot delight in sacrifices, which in themselves are inexpressive; if He yet commanded them, they must have possessed some hidden object; and what better and deeper meaning could they involve than an internal affinity to Christ and his work? But for the ancient Hebrews the sacrifices were *not* inexpressive or meaningless; they were to them a momentous reality; they were deemed well-pleasing in the eyes of God if presented in the right spirit. The Cherubim, the shew-bread, the Tabernacle and its utensils, the offerings and their rituals, had certainly a symbolical significance; they were to impress and to familiarise certain ideas and truths held essential for devotion and moral improvement; this end was sufficiently important — and it was the only one that was aimed at.

It has often been asserted that the words of the prophets were, in the time of the latter, indeed to be understood far more in reference

---

[1] As Coccejus, and with certain limitations, by his learned pupil Vitringa, and others; see, however, *Taylor*, l. c. p. 129, "It was not necessary the Jewish worshipper should understand all this", etc.; comp. p. 74. [2] See Sect. XIX. [3] See *De Wette*, Dogmat. I. §§ 282—284. [4] See pp. 58—60.

to current events; but "the Divine intention looking far into the future, formed the speech so that it suits more properly the time of the Messiah";[5] and on such grounds, the Psalms in which the poet speaks in the first person, and which are quoted in the New Testament,[6] were supposed to be written in the name of Christ.[7] This irrational opinion is so entirely bound up with an antiquated and exploded or "mechanical" form of the doctrine of inspiration, that it vanishes before the light of historical criticism and philosophical analysis.[8]

And finally, the typical view is only compatible with false and inadmissible notions regarding the composition of the Biblical canon. It starts from the theory that "the same necessary connection subsists between the words of God as between His works in nature."[9] "The Bible", it is supposed, "is based upon an organic coherence, according to which the Old Covenant bears the same relation to the New, as the embryonic germ to the perfect development";[10] and on these or similar principles, the typical explanation is still defended by some writers.[11] That opinion contains indeed a certain general truth; but the truth is blended with deluding error which cannot be redeemed by its insinuating speciousness. It lay in the natural progress of development that ceremonials should gradually be superseded by a more spiritual worship, as they were partially renounced by sects anterior to the Christian era, like the Essenes and the Sadducees; it was equally natural that the ceremonial service, as ordained in the Hebrew Scriptures, should be made the foundation of the reformed faith: thus in a certain

---

[5] *Bengel*, Gnom. ad Matth. I. 22, eadem vero intentio Divina longius prospiciens, sic formavit orationem, ut magis proprie deinceps ea conveniret in tempora Messiae.

[6] Ps. V. (comp. Rom. III. 13); XVI. (comp. Acts II. 25; XIII. 35); XVIII. (comp. Rom. XV. 9); XXII. (comp. Matth. XXVII. 43, 46; John XIX. 24; Hebr. II. 12); XXXIV. (comp. 1 Pet. III. 10—12); XL. (comp. Hebr. X. 5—7); XLV. (comp. Hebr. I. 8, 9); LI (comp. Rom. III. 4); LXIX. (comp. John II. 17; XV. 25; Rom. XV. 3); LXXVIII. (comp. Matth. XIII. 35; John VI. 31); CII. (comp. Hebr. I. 10); CIX. (comp. Acts I. 20); CXVI. (comp. 2 Chron. IV. 13); CXL. (comp. Rom. III. 13).

[7] So Dereser, Kaiser, Claus, Hengstenberg, a. o.

[8] See Sect. XXVI.

[9] *Bengel*, Gnomon, Pref., § 13; comp. Ordo Temporum, IX. 13.

[10] *Beck*, Pneumat. hermen. Entwick. des neunten Capitels im Briefe an die Römer, p. 105; comp. also *De Wette*, Dogm. II. § 22.

[11] As Bähr (Symb. I. 15—21; comp. pp. 111—113; II. 156—160), Hofmann, Delitzsch, Kurtz, Auberlen, W. Böhmer, a. o.; comp. also *De Wette*, Dogm. II. § 63 note c; *G. Baur*, Gesch. der alttestamentl. Weissag. I. 4 ("as a riddle is best appreciated through its solution, so the Old T. through the New"); *Nitzsch*, System der christlichen Lehre, p. 78; *W. Hoffmann*, Die göttliche Stufenordnung im Alten Testament p. 7; *Hävernick*, Vorlesungen über die Theologie des Alten Testaments p. 18.

sense, the earlier phase points to the later, and the later is derived from the earlier; and the apostle Peter might not unjustly say, that "the spirit of Christ" was in the old prophets.[1] But though the writers of the New Testament, following the bent of their age as has been shown, could represent their creed and dispensation as a "fulfilment" or more real manifestation of past doctrines and events; it must be absolutely denied that the authors of the Old Testament, and especially of the Pentateuch, regarded their laws and institutions as the transitory germ of some higher form to be unfolded in the lapse of ages, or as parts of a preparatory economy to be ultimately merged in some more perfect system; on the contrary, they looked upon them as final and immutable for all times, because embodying the sum of all truth and Divine wisdom. This is a cardinal point decisive on the question: the Old Testament repudiates all change as ungodly innovation; therefore, it can never be employed for sanctioning the important and often radical modifications adopted in the New; the one cannot be regarded as the "shadow" or "figure" of the other; in spite of many points of contact, both are two distinct designs separated from each other by numerous and heterogeneous influences.

Indeed the typical theories, after having been upheld for a time in the Reformed Church with tenacious and even vehement zeal, by Coccejus and his school, by Bengel and his followers, began to lose ground towards the end of the last century, and are at present virtually abandoned by Protestant critics and scholars. "We have no hesitation", wrote G. L. Bauer as early as 1805, "in acceding to the opinion at present all but generally entertained that typical exposition is not founded in the holy Scriptures, and that the types are pious plays of imagination and of wit."[2]

Now returning to the symbols, we shall describe and explain the sacrificial *acts*.

---

[1] 1 Pet. I. 11; the reading *τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα χριστοῦ* is confirmed by the Cod. Sinait.; comp. also Gal. III. 24, *ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῖν γέγονεν εἰς χριστόν*; see also 2 Cor. III. 6; Rom. II. 29; VII. 6; Acts III. 18—26; and comp. Deut. XVIII. 18 with John VI. 14.

[2] *Bauer*, Gottesdienstl. Verf. der Hebr. I. 250; comp. pp. 224—250; *Rau*, Freimüthige Untersuchungen über die Typologie, 1784; *Eichhorn*, Bibliothek, V, 420 *sqq.*; *Kanne*, Christus im A. T., Untersuch. über die Vorbilder etc. 1789; *Döpke*, Hermeneutik der neutestamentl. Schriftsteller, I. 1829; *Olshausen*, Ueber tieferen Schriftsinn, 1829; *De Wette*, in Theolog. Zeitschr. von Schleiermacher a. o. Heft III; *Bleek*, Stud. und Krit. 1835, Heft II; *Tholuck*, Das A. T. im N. T., Beilagen zum Commentar des Hebräerbriefs, pp. 1—56, 99—112; and in *Herzog's* Real-Encycl. XVII. 389—397; *Hupfeld*, Die heutige theosophische oder mythologische Theologie und Schrifterklärung, 1861.

## X. SACRIFICIAL CEREMONIES AND THEIR MEANING.

### 1. Preparation.

The presentation of an offering was naturally, and therefore probably, preceded by suitable preparations in consonance with the nature of the sacred ceremony. Outward and inward purity — the former the ritual prototype of the latter — was the primary condition of man's approach to God; it was enjoined before great festivals, and when some special Divine manifestation was expected or hoped for; it was, no doubt, after the diffusion of the Levitical spirit and law, rigorously enforced; it was under the specific name of "sanctification" made an indispensable preliminary to public assemblies and fasts, national works and enterprises;[3] and it was expressed by the removal and renunciation of every emblem of heathen superstition, by bathing, and washing or change of garments, and frequently by conjugal abstinence, extended on remarkable occasions to three and more days.[4] When Samuel arrived at Bethlehem, he addressed the elders, "Sanctify yourselves and come with me to the sacrifice: and he sanctified Jesse and his sons, and called him to the sacrifice."[5] The laws of purification were enlarged and intensified with respect to officiating priests.[6] The Mishnah propounded the principle that no one, even if he were pure, was permitted to enter the Court and to take part in the service unless he had bathed beforehand.[7] In the period of the second Temple,[8] when, corresponding to the 24 orders of priests,[9] the nation was divided into 24 sections[10] for the sake of representing the people, by weekly rotation, at the daily public sacrifices,[11] those who thus acted as national delegates had to fast during their week, except on Sabbath and the day that preceded and followed it;[12] the residents of Jerusalem and the neighbouring

---

[3] Comp. Joel I. 14; II. 15, 16; IV. 9; Mic. III. 5; Neh. III. 1; comp. Ps. XX.

[4] Comp. Genes. XXXV. 2—4; Exod. XIX. 10, 14, 15; XXXIII. 5, 6; Josh. III. 5; VII. 13; see Comm. on Gen. p. 585; on Exod. p. 334; comp. also Zeph. I. 7; Jer. XII. 3.

[5] 1 Sam. XVI. 5; comp. also Job I. 5.

[6] Exod. XXX. 17—21; XL. 30—32; comp. Treatise on Priesthood, ch. I.

[7] *Mishn.* Yom. III. 3, אין אדם נכנס לעזרה לעבודה אפילו טהור עד שיטבול; comp. Tamid I. 2; see also Berach. IX. 5, לא יכנס להר הבית במקלו ובמנעלו ובפונדתו ובאבק שעל רגליו; see also *Lightfoot*, Opp. I. 723—725.

[8] Though the Mishnah (Taan. IV. 2) refers the arrangements to the "early prophets" (נביאים ראשנים), to Samuel and David (Rashi, quoting 1 Chron. IX. 22).

[9] משמרות, ἐφημερίαι.

[10] מעמדות or אנשי מעמד, viri stationarii.

[11] For the offerer must be present at the oblation (*Mishnah*, l. c.; היאך קרבנו של אדם קרב והוא אינו עומד על גביו; see also *Maimon.* Kele Hamm. VI. 1). Hence women, otherwise forbidden to enter the holy precincts, were admitted, if presenting a sacrifice.

[12] "Not on the sixth day of the week in honour of the sabbath, and not on

**towns were obliged to attend at the Temple, while the inhabitants of more distant places had to perform particular prayers[1] and devotions in the Synagogues of their districts.[2]**

**Similar views pervaded all ancient creeds. The Hindoos were commanded to begin the sacrifice by a "bath of purification."[3] The Egyptians inaugurated the great festival of Isis and its solemn sacrifice by a fast[4] and matrimonial abstinence during nine days.[5] For some time, varying from 7 to 42 days, previous to important religious observances, they were scrupulous in chastity and lustrations, avoided animal food and certain kinds of vegetables.[6] Prior to killing any victim, the Persians addressed prayers to the fire, the pure element.[7] Those who came from whatever distance to worship in the temple of Hierapolis, were prescribed to abstain from any drink but water and from sleeping in a bed, till they had returned to their homes.[8] The Chinese emperor prepares himself for the grand procession and sacrifice, which take place at the commencement of spring, by severe religious exercises during three preceding days.[9] The Greeks, considering purity of body an indispensable requisite, appeared, with their offerings, not only in clean, generally white garments, but also, except in times of mourning,[10] festively decked with wreaths or**

---

the first lest the people pass suddenly from rest and pleasure to toil and fasting and die" (*Mishn.* l. c.).

1 Reading especially the history of creation (Gen. I. 1—II. 3), divided into 7 portions for the days of the week, "to indicate that the world stands by the service in the Temple" (see *Bartenur.* in loc.).

2 See *Mishn.* Taan. IV. 2, 3; Bikkur. III. 3; *Talm.* Taan. 26 *sqq.*; *Maimon.* Kele Hammikd. VI. 3; Hilch. Bikkur. IV. 16; comp. *Cunaeus*, De Republ. Hebr. II. c. 10; *Selden*, De Synedr. III. xiii. 3; *Othon.* Lexic. Talm. pp. 705—707; *Lightfoot*, Opp. I. 700, 701. This custom of fasting on the part of the "sacrificial assistants" (מעמדות), was by Theophrastus, in perhaps the oldest classical account of the Jews and their religious rites, erroneously extended to all the sacrifices of the Hebrews (*Porph.* De Abst. II. 26, *καὶ τοῦτο δρῶσι νηστεύοντες τὰς ἀνὰ μέσον τούτων ἡμέρας*). By another faulty generalisation, Theophrastus represents all sacrifices of the Hebrews as holocausts; comp. *Bernays*, Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit, pp. 113, 114, 187. The אנשי מעמד aided, moreover, in certain parts of the service (comp. *Mishn.* Tam. V. 6, וראש המעמד היה מעמיד את הטמאים בשער המזרח); but it is not likely that they imposed their hands on the animals killed as public and daily holocausts (comp. *Maimon.* Maas. Hakkorb. c. 3), since these were offered by the priests alone.

3 *Manu*, III. 208. 4 *Herod.* II. 40.

5 *Juven.* Sat. VI. 535 *sqq.* Ille petit veniam, quoties non abstinet uxor Concubitu sacris observandisque diebus etc. 6 *Porph.* Abst. IV. 7.

7 *Strab.* XV. iii. 13, 16.

8 *Lucian*, Dea Syr. 55.

9 *Barrow*, Reise durch China, II. p. 125. 10 Though only in posthomeric times.

garlands, which were made of appropriate leaves and flowers,[11] and which, by placing the wearer under the protection of the deity,[12] rendered him inviolable: and before the sacrificial acts were begun, a direct exhortation warded off all "profane" or unclean persons, and admonished those present to reverential silence.[13] An ancient writer comprehensively stated the requirements in the following words: "The worshipper must approach the gods cleansed, purified, bright, sprinkled with water, washed, stainless, chaste, unspotted, hallowed, sanctified, with a pure mind, with fresh and washed garments."[14] The women who took part in the processions of the festival of the Thesmophoria in honour of Ceres, shunned conjugal embrace for nine days before.[15] Washing of hands, facilitated by basins with holy water kept at the entrance of temples, commenced the sacrifice;[16] "to be excluded from the holy water",[17] was equivalent to being debarred from sacred rites, especially sacrifices, on account of guilt of blood; while "to allow the holy water",[18] expressed admission to religious privileges.[19] Hector, requested by his mother Hecuba during a battle to offer a libation, deprecated it with the words, "I dread to pour out the sparkling wine to Zeus with unwashed hands."[20] "Never venture", writes Hesiod, "to offer a libation of dark wine to Jupiter or the other immortals with unwashed hands; for they do not listen, and spurn thy prayers."[21] The Platonists, when intending to offer supplications to the gods, were

[11] For instance of ivy at the sacrifices of Dionysos, while that plant was strictly avoided at those of the Olympian gods, of Juno at Athens, and of Venus at Thebes; comp. *Plut.* Quaest. Rom. 112. The Persians also usually sacrificed with a wreath round the turban, most commonly of myrtle (*Herod.* I. 132); while the Indians refrained from this practice (*Strab.* XV. i. 54, p. 710).

[12] *Aristoph.* Plut. 21, 22.

[13] *Aeschin.* Ctes. c. 23 (§ 77, *στεφανωσάμενος καὶ λευκὴν ἐσθῆτα λαβὼν ἐβουθύτει*); *Plut.* Nigrin. c. 14 (it was criminal to attend the festival of Athene in a coloured garment); *Athen.* XV. 16; *Diog. Laert.* II. x. 54 (comp., however, *Apollod.* III. xv. 7, *χωρὶς αὐλῶν καὶ στεφάνων ἐν Πάρῳ*—in Crete—*θύουσι ταῖς χάρισι*); *Lucian*, De Sacrif. 12—14 (*θύρας δ' ἐπίθεσθε βέβηλοι*); *Hom.* Il. IX. 171; *Aristoph.* Thesmoph. 295; Acharn. 237; Av. 958 (*εὐφημία ἔστω, εὐφημεῖτε*).

[14] *Pollux*, Onom. I. i. 24, *τὸ δὲ προςιέναι πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κατηραμένον, καθαρεύσαντα, φαιδρυνάμενον, περιῤῥανάμενον, ἀποῤῥυψάμενον, ἀπονιψάμενον, ἁγνισάμενον, ἁγνεύσαντα, ἡγνευμένον, ὡσιωμένον, καθαρῷ νῷ, ὑπὸ νεουργῷ στολῇ, ὑπὸ νεοπλυνεῖ ἐσθῆτι*; comp. also 28.

[15] *Ovid*, Metam. X. 434, 435.

[16] *Hom.* Il. I. 449; *Dion. Hal.* VII. 72.

[17] *Χερνίβων εἴργεσθαι*; *Demosth.* Leptin. 158 (505. 13).

[18] *Χέρνιβος νέμειν*: *Soph.* Oed. Tyr. 240.

[19] Comp. *Eurip.* Or. 1602 (*εὖ γοῦν θίγοις ἂν χερνίβων*); Iphig. Aul. 675; etc.

[20] *Hom.* Il. VI. 266; comp. XVI. 228—230; Od. IV. 750; *Porphyr.* Abst. II. 46.

[21] *Hesiod.* Op. 722—724; comp. vers. 735—739.

**recommended to fast, or at least to abstain from meat.[1] In certain cases, offering in a state of moral impurity was, by Plato's advice, to be punished with death.[2] The Romans combined nearly all the introductory ceremonies — they bathed in spring water, arrayed themselves in fresh, white garments, washed their hands, adorned their heads with wreaths,[3] warded off unclean persons,[4] and in some instances refrained from sexual intercommunion in the preceding night or nights. "Worshippers shall approach to the gods with purity", observes Cicero, "that is to say with purity of mind, which is everything; not that the law dispenses with purity of body; but this must be understood in as much as the mind is superior to the body";[5] terms almost identical with those employed by Philo on the same subject, "It is necessary for intending sacrificers to be cleansed as to their bodies, and as to their souls before their bodies; for the soul is the mistress and the queen, and superior in everything, being endowed with a more divine nature";[6] and both utterances are perhaps an echo of the beautiful admonitions attributed to the Pythian priestess:**

"Enter the pure god's temple sanctified
"In soul, with virgin water purified:
"One drop will cleanse the good; the ocean wave
"Suffices not the guilty soul to lave."[7]

**The broad rule was established, "Whoever wishes properly to perform a sacred act in honour of the gods, must first thoroughly purify himself";[8] and Virgil was praised for strictly conforming his narrative to that law.[9] Inviting the peasants to the lustration-offering**

---

[1] *Porph.* De Abst. II. 44.

[2] Comp. *Plat.* Legg. X. 16 (p. 910 *E*, *ὡς οὐ καθαρὸς ὢν θύων θανάτῳ ζημιούσθω*).

[3] *Tibull.* El. II. i. 16. (vinctaque post olea candida turba comas).

[4] *Virg.* Aen. VI. 258 (procul o procul este profani); comp. *Plin.* H. N. XXVIII. 2 (3); *Tibull.* El. II. i. 1 (quisquis ades faveas); ii. 1, 2; *Ovid*, Trist. V. v. 5, 6 (lingua favens assit).

[5] *Cic.* Legg. II. 10, caste jubet lex adire ad deos, animo videlicet in quo sunt omnia; nec tollit castimoniam corporis, etc.; see pp. 68, 69.

[6] *Philo*, De Sacrif. c. 3, *ἀναγκαῖον ... τό τε σῶμα φαιδρύνεσθαι, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν πρὸ τοῦ σώματος*; comp. also c. 1, *βούλεται τὸν ἄγοντα τὰς θυσίας ὁ νόμος καθαρὸν εἶναι σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ κτλ.*; De Victim. c. 5, *ἔπειτα δὲ ἀπονιψάμενος ὁ προσάγων κτλ.*

[7] *Ἁγνὸς εἰς τέμενος καθαροῦ, ξένε, δαίμονος ἔρχου Ψυχὴν, νυμφαίου νάματος ἁψάμενος κτλ.*, Anth. Pal. XIV. 71; comp. the fine lines of a similar import, *Ἱρὰ θεῶν ἀγαθοῖς ἀναπέπταται, οὐδὲ καθαρμῶν Χρειώ· τῆς ἀρετῆς ἥψατο οὐδὲν ἄγος. Ὅστις δ' οὐλοὸν ἦτορ, ἀπόστιχε· οὔποτε γὰρ σὴν Ψυχὴν ἐκνίψει σῶμα διαινύμενον*, ibid. 74; see *Shakesp.* Macb. V. i. 56 ("all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand").

[8] Quis diis superis rem sacram recte perficiat, prius eum rite purificari oportere; *Macrob.* Sat. III. 1.

[9] Comp. *Virg.* Aen. II. 718—720; IV. 635, 636; VI. 229—231, 635, 636; etc.

of the rural festival of the Ambarvalia, Tibullus demands, "You also I order to stand aloof — approach not the altar — you who the preceding night enjoyed the pleasures of Venus: chastity delights the gods; come in clean garments, and cleanse your hands with water from the spring."[10] And opponents of animal sacrifices pointed to the strange anomaly that, while the burning of flesh and fat, of skins and feathers, produced an intolerable stench, the worshippers were earnestly exhorted, "whenever they prepared to visit the temples, to preserve themselves pure from every stain, clean, and above all chaste."[11]

Numa ordained that previous to religious processions, heralds were to pass through the streets and order general cessation from labour. For, observes Plutarch, "as the Pythagoraeans were known not to suffer casual devotion or worship, but demanded that people should undertake it well prepared in mind from the beginning, thus Numa believed that his citizens ought neither to hear nor to see anything appertaining to divine service at random or carelessly, but putting aside everything else to direct their whole minds to the pious act as to their most important business; wherefore he wished, during the sacred ceremonies, the streets to be kept clear of all din and noise and turmoil inseparable from everyday work." Hence it remained a Roman custom up to the latest time, that before the beginning of public sacrifices a herald proclaimed with loud voice the words "hoc age", thereby inviting all present to absorbed attention and silent devotion.[12]

## 2. The Time.

The Law contains no enactments with respect to the time of the day when the offerings were to be presented; except that it orders the daily holocausts to be killed "in the morning",[13] and "between the two evenings",[14] that is, between the later part of the afternoon or about 3 o'clock and sunset,[15] which hours are also fixed for the killing of the

---

[10] *Tibull*, El. II. i. 11—14, casta placent superis; pura cum veste venite, etc.

[11] *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 16, quorum templa cum adire disponitis, ab omni vos labe puros, lautos castissimosque praestatis; *Just. Mart.* Apol. 2.

[12] *Plut.* Num. 14; comp. Coriol. 25. When among the ancient Prussians, their priest (Waidelotte) intended to sacrifice to the god Potrimpos, he had to fast during three preceding days, and to sleep in that interval on the bare ground (*Wachter*, l. c. p. 113).

[13] According to the Mishnah, at the earliest break of day: the preparations began when the appointed official said ברקאי, that is, האיר והבריק השחר or האיר פני כל המזרח עד שהוא בחברון (*Mishn.* Tam. III. 2; comp. Yom. III. 1, 2; see also Tam. I. 2).

[14] בין־הערבים, Exod. XVI. 12; XXIX. 39, 41; XXX. 8; Num. XXVIII. 4.

[15] See Comm. on Exod. pp. 193, 194; comp. 1 Ki. XVIII. 36; Ezra IX. 4. According to *Mishn.* Pesach. V. 1, the evening holocaust, whether on week

paschal lamb,[1] and were later selected for the afternoon prayer.[2] As regards all other offerings, they were probably deemed suitable at any time during the day between the morning- and the evening-holocaust; for the former marked the commencement, and the latter the conclusion of the diurnal public worship; therefore, sacrifices were hardly offered either before the one or after the other;[3] though those that had been slain in the day could be burnt in the subsequent night.[4] Many nations selected the earlier part of the day for their offerings, in order to make the repast that followed the sacrifice coincide with their principal meal; but the Hebrews could not possibly sanction the distinction adopted by the Greeks and Romans, who sacrificed to the upper gods who give the light or enjoy its exhilarating rays, by day, and to those of the lower world who pass a cheerless existence in sombre darkness, by night.[5]

### 3. The Place.

Prepared in the manner described, the offerer, whether man or woman,[6] brought[7] the gift to the place where alone it could be lawfully presented, namely "before the Lord",[8] or as it is more accurately qualified, "to the door of the Tent of Meeting",[9] that is, into the Court, where the altar of burnt-offering stood;[10] for rites designed to effect or to preserve the communion between men and God could fitly be performed nowhere except at the spot specially dedicated to Divine presence and revelation.[11] With such severity was this rule enforced that an

---

days or Sabbaths, was killed half an hour after the eighth, and offered half an hour after the ninth hour of the day; if the day before Passover happened to be Friday, the holocaust was killed and offered two hours earlier, after which the paschal lambs were slain.

1 Ex. XII. 6.

2 Dan. IX. 21; Ezr. IX. 5; Acts III. 1; comp. 2 Chron. XXIX. 27—30.

3 Comp. *Maimon.* Tamid, I. 3; Maas. Hakk. IV. 1.

4 Comp. Lev. VI. 2; and Ebn Ezra in loc. בכען רמז שלא יעלו עולה בלילה. Theophrastus remarks incorrectly that the Jews burnt *all* their sacrifices in the night, because as either he or Porphyry who quotes him believed, they were aware of the iniquity of animal sacrifices, and did not wish the all-seeing Sun to be a witness of the crime (*ἵνα τοῦ δεινοῦ μὴ Ἥλιος ὁ πανόπτης γένοιτο θεατής*, *Porph.* Abst. II. 26).

5 Comp. *Aeschyl.* Eum. 108 (*καὶ νυκτίσεμνα δεῖπν' ἐπ' ἐσχάρᾳ πυρὸς Ἔθυον, ὥραν οὐδενὸς κοινὴν θεῶν*); *Virg.* Aen. VI. 252 (tum Stygio regi nocturnas inchoat aras); *Lucan*, Pharsal. V. 402; *Pausan.* II. xi. 7; etc.; comp. Schol. Pind. Isthm. IV. 110; Schol. Apollon. I. 587; Procl. ad Hesiod. Op. 763; see Sect. XX.

6 Comp. *Talm. Jer.* Sot. c. 1; Tosepht. in Erachin c. 2; see *supra* p. 167 n. 11.

7 הביא, *παραστῆσαι, προσάγειν τῷ βωμῷ*; comp. Lev. IV. 4, 14; XII. 6; XIV. 23; XV. 29; XVII. 4, 5, 9; also Rom. XII. 1.

8 לפני יהוה, Lev. I. 3, 11; III. 1, 7, 12; IV. 4; IX. 2, 4, 5; comp. Exod. XXIX. 42; Lev. IV. 4; XV. 14; XVI. 7.

9 פתח אהל מועד.

10 Exod. XL. 6.

11 Talmudists considered "the bringing to the altar" as a distinct ceremony, and adopted the three successive acts of הקרבה, הגשה, and הפרשה,

Israelite or stranger who slaughtered a victim at any other place, was not considered as one who had presented a sacrifice, but as one who had committed a murder, "Blood shall be imputed to that man; he has shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people."[12] The injunction was therefore expressly repeated with regard to every individual class of sacrifice, to holocausts,[13] eucharistic[14] and expiatory offerings,[15] and offerings of purification.[16] It was evidently designed as a means of securing among the Hebrews the unity of public worship, of banishing by a rigorous control all idolatrous rites, and of permanently strengthening the faith in the undivided authority of God. But it was no more than a consistent consequence of Levitical principles; we have above pointed out the difficulties which operated against even its approximate observance, and have tried to prove its all but total disregard during long epochs of Hebrew history.[17]

In some other polities, analogues practices were observed or advocated. An enactment of the Roman Twelve Tables enjoined, "No one shall have gods privately."[18] Plato strongly recommended the following law, "Let no one perform sacred rites in private dwellings; but if any one desires to sacrifice, let him go to the public buildings, and there sacrifice; and let him place his offerings in the hands of the priests and priestesses to whom the holy ritual is entrusted"; if a person is convicted of special orgies in private temples, he is to be warned, and punished by a fine or a heavier penalty.[19] His reasons are, in some respects, kindred to those which guided the Hebrew legislators; he saw the danger of extravagant aberration if sacrifices and the erection of private temples or statues were permitted to the caprice, ignorance, or superstition of every individual; but he was, in other respects, influenced by fanciful considerations; he feared that impious men, putting up altars in their private dwellings, might think they rendered the gods propitious by sacrifices and prayers in secret, and thus be encouraged in their iniquitous path, they might call down the anger of the gods upon the whole community — as if the wicked could not offer blasphemous gifts and prayers at public as well as private altars.

---

that is, of *bringing in*, *bringing near*, and *setting apart* or *hallowing* the oblation (comp. *Mishn.* Menach. V. 5; *Siphra* 76*b*); but this view is hardly tenable; for the sacrifice was necessarily brought to the altar where it was to be presented, and the words הביא, הקריב, and הגיש in connection with offerings are used promiscuously and as synonyms (comp. Lev. II. 8).

[12] Lev. XVII. 3—5, 8, 9.

[13] Lev. I. 3. [14] III. 2, 8, 12.

[15] IV. 4, 14; VI. 18; XIX. 21.

[16] XII. 6; XV. 29.

[17] See pp. 20—24.

[18] Separatim nemo habessit deos; *Cic.* Legg. II. 8.

[19] *Ἱερὰ μηδὲ εἷς ἐν ἰδίαις οἰκίαις ἐκτήσθω ... πρὸς τὰ δημόσια ἴτω θύσων*, *Plat.* Legg. X. 16, p. 909 D.

The Law ordains to kill the victim "on the side of the altar of burnt-offering northward."[1] As all the passages relate to holocausts and expiatory offerings, it has been concluded that the thank-offerings were slain at a different side of the altar, namely the eastern;[2] it is impossible to accept an opinion derived chiefly from the silence of the Scriptures; but it gains some support from the fact that the Law expressly commands to kill the expiatory offerings, which were of later date, at the place were the holocausts were slain,[3] as if to intimate that they should not be slaughtered at the place of the thank-offerings, the origin of which falls chronologically between the holocausts and the expiatory sacrifices.[4] According to a rule laid down in the Mishnah,[5] the "most holy" offerings were killed on the north-side of the altar, the "less holy"[6] in any part of the Court;[7] which distinction was extended to the act of receiving the blood.[8] However, the northern side of the altar was manifestly the most convenient locality for killing the victims; for to the west of it was the brazen laver and the access to the Holy; in the east, it would have obstructed the entrance of the Court, especially as the place for depositing the ashes was also on the same side;[9] and in the south, there was, at least in the later Temple, the gently sloping dam of earth, which led up to the top of the altar.[10] Thus the custom of sacrificing on the north-side of the altar, probably prompted by practical reasons, was hardly suggested by the analogy of the shew-bread table[11] which, in the Holy, occupied likewise a northern position;[12] but it is fanciful to suppose that it was adopted because the north is the cheerless, dark, hidden, and ominous region,[13] which applies to no part of the Sanctuary, the abode of light and life; and it is gratuitous to conjecture that it originated in the belief of a residence of God in the *north*,[14] since such view, though common to many eastern nations, cannot be proved or traced among the Hebrews.[15]

---

1 על ירך המזבח צפנה; Lev. I. 11; IV. 24; comp. 29, 33; VI. 18; VII. 2; XIV. 13; comp. *Ugolini* Thes. X. 518.

2 Comp. Lev. III. 2, 8; לפני אהל מועד.

3 Lev. IV. 24, 29, 33; VI. 18; VII. 2.

4 See pp. 1—3.

5 Zevach. V. 1—8.

6 קדשים קלים, in contradistinction to קדשי קדשים, see p. 76.

7 בכל מקום בעזרה, l. c. 6, 7, 8.

8 See no. 6 of this Section.

9 Lev. I. 16.

10 See Comm. on Exod. p. 484; *Joseph*. Bell. Jud. V. v. 6 (ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας ἐπ' αὐτὸν — τὸν βωμόν — ἄνοδος ἠρέμα προςάντης ὑπτίαστο); comp. Lev. IX. 22 (וירד).

11 *Knob*. Comm. p. 361.

12 Exod. XL. 22; comp. Comm. on Exod. pp. 481—483.

13 *Tholuck*, Das A. T. im N. T. p. 91.

14 *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 46.

15 Comp. Comm. on Gen. p. 21. The passages Isai. XIV. 13; Ezek. I. 4; Ps. XLVIII. 3, are inconclusive.

The Greeks and Romans offered to the upper gods on high, to the terrestrial deities on low altars, and to the infernal powers on grates or in pits,[16] a custom which naturally grew from their mythological systems, and which corresponded with the practice of touching the ground with the hands while praying to Demeter or Terra, of stretching them forward while imploring the deities of the sea, and of lifting them to the skies while invoking Jupiter.[17]

### 4. Imposition of the Hand (סְמִיכָה).

When the offering had been brought within the precincts of the Sanctuary, and an appointed priest, after a searching examination, had declared it to possess all legal requirements and to be duly qualified for the altar, then only the proper rites of sacrifice commenced. If it consisted of a quadruped, whether an ox, a sheep, or a goat, the offerer, first of all, laid his hand upon the head of the victim. This act was identical in manner, whether the sacrifice was a holocaust, a eucharistic or an expiatory offering.[18] It matters little whether the hand was laid slightly upon the head, or as Jewish tradition contends with the full force of the body, though the latter view is supported by the etymology of the term.[19] As a rule, one hand was imposed,[20] probably

---

16 Hence in Latin the distinction between *altaria*, *arae* and *foci* or *scrobi* (comp. *βωμοὶ* and *ἐσχάραι*; see p. 16); comp. *Macrob.* Sat. III. 2 (diis danto in altaria aramve focumve); *Serv.* ad Virg. Ecl. V. 63; *Athen.* IX. 78 (*ὄρυξαι βόθυνον πρὸς ἑσπέραν τοῦ σήματος κτλ.*); *Herod.* V. 92 fin.; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 9 (*τοῖς μὲν ἐπιχθονίοις σφάζειν ἐπὶ βωμῶν, τοῖς δ' ὑποχθονίοις ἐπὶ βόθρων παρακελεύεται*); *Lucian*, Char. c. 22. At the purification-offering *taurobolium* dedicated to Cybele, the sacrificer sat in a pit and allowed the blood of the victim to drip down upon his body from a wooden scaffolding on which the animal had been killed (see *Creuz.* Symb. II. 386, 387). 17 Comp. *Macrob.* Sat. III. 9 (cum Tellurem dicit, manibus terram tangit; cum Jovem dicit, manus ad coelum tollit); *Hom.* Il. I. 351 (*χεῖρας ὀρεγνύς*); *Virg.* Aen. V. 233 (palmas ponto tendens utrasque).

18 Lev. I. 4; III. 2, 8, 13; IV. 5, 15, etc. Though it is not expressly mentioned in the summary account of the trespass-offerings (Lev. VII. 1—7), it took undoubtedly place in these also, as in the sin-offerings to which that account makes reference (ver. 7; see Sect. XV). — According to tradition, the victim was so placed that the offerer, while laying his hand between its horns, looked eastward.

19 From סמך *to lean* or *press upon*; comp. *Talm.* Zevach. 33*a*; Chagig. 16*b* (סמיכה בכל כחו בעינן).

20 וסמך את ידו; Lev. I. 4; III. 2; etc.; so also, no doubt, VIII. 14, 18; hence Philo (De Victim. c. 5), in speaking of the burnt-offerings, says incorrectly, *ὁ προσάγων τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιφερέτω τῇ τοῦ ἱερείου κεφαλῇ*; and so the Talmudists (*Mishn.* Menach. IX. 8, על הראש בשתי ידים; *Talm.* Menach. 63; *Maimon.* De Sacrif. III. 9; etc.), Saalschütz (Mos. R. I. 318), a. o., wrongly quoting Lev. XVI. 21; comp. however, Num. XXVII. 18 and 23.

**the right one,[1] since the right hand was considered stronger, more privileged, and more auspicious;[2] on the scape-goat alone, which was properly no sacrifice, but was under peculiar ceremonies sent alive into the wilderness on the Day of Atonement, the High-priest laid both his hands,[3] evidently because the head of the animal was to be marked, in the most signal manner, as laden with the sins of the people.[4] The act was performed, within the precincts of the Sanctuary,[5] by the offerer himself;[6] it could not be transferred or entrusted to any one else, not even a priest, except when the sacrifice was presented in the name or on behalf of the sacerdotal order.[7] It was hence confided to the elders of the people, if the sacrifice was presented for the whole community.[8] But on the Day of Atonement, it was, like all the other functions connected with the exceptional service of the day, performed by the High-priest who acted as mediator between God and the nation. From these facts it appears easy to determine its meaning and significance. It was manifestly designed to indicate the *personal and intimate relation* between the worshipper and the victim. Thus, when Moses consecrated Aaron and his sons as priests, he caused them to lay their hands on the head of the sin- and burnt-offerings,[9] to signify that the victims were killed on their behalf. Those who heard a man blaspheme the name of God, imposed their hands on his head to testify that both as Israelites and witnesses they were closely concerned in**

---

1 So distinctly *Targ. Jonath.* (Lev. I. 4; III. 2, etc.), יד ימיניה.

2 Comp. Gen. XLVIII. 14, 17—19; Exod. XV. 6, 12; XXIX. 20, 22; Lev. VIII. 23, 24; XIII. 14, 17, 25, 27; 1 Ki. II. 19; Isai. LXII. 8; Zech. XI. 17; Ps. XLV. 10; CX. 1, 5; CXVIII. 15, 16; Job XL. 14; and especially Eccles. X. 2, "A wise man's heart is at his right hand, but a fool's heart at his left"; comp. *Plat.* Legg. IV. 8; *Plut.* Num. c. 25; De Garrul. c. 7. To begin at the right hand was by the Greeks looked upon as a happy presage (*Hom.* Il. VII. 184; Od. XVII. 365; XXI. 141); and *δέξιος* means lucky or happy (*Hom.* Od. XXIV. 310, 311), like ימין in Hebrew (comp. Gen. XXXV. 18) and Arabic; comp. Comm. on Gen. p. 717. If the horse employed by some northern tribes as an oracle, stepped first forward with the left foot, the gods were supposed to be unpropitious, and so also if the dying victim fell on the left side (*Wachter*, l. c. p. 109).

3 וסמך אהרן את שתי ידיו, Lev. XVI. 21.

4 Ebn Ezra (on Lev. I. 14) remarks justly, "the nature of the scape-goat is different from the nature of any sacrifice; therefore the Law makes a distinction with regard to the ceremonies."

5 If it had been done elsewhere, it had to be repeated in the Court: thus ordained tradition, and no doubt correctly.

6 Lev. I. 4; III. 2, 8, 13; IV. 15, 24, 29, 33; 2 Chron. XXIX. 23.

7 Exod. XXIX. 10, 15, 19; Lev. IV. 4; VIII. 22; Num. VIII. 12. If several persons joined to offer one sacrifice, all imposed the hand in succession.

8 Lev. IV. 5; comp. 2 Chr. XXIX. 23.

9 Lev. VIII. 14, 18.

his fate.[10] When Moses was to appoint Joshua as his successor, and to confer upon him a part of his own spiritual glory,[11] he was commanded to place his hand upon Joshua's head before the eyes of the congregation;[12] and similarly, in the New Testament, imposition of the hand is employed as an emblem of imparting the spirit of holiness.[13] The Israelites imposed their hands on the Levites, when the latter were initiated to serve in the Sanctuary in their stead,[14] in order to express the closeness and directness of their mutual relation. This was evidently the general character of the ceremony; but its nicer and more exact purport was qualified by the special nature of the sacrifice at which it was performed. In holocausts and thank-offerings it implied the confession of reverential submission and gratitude; while in expiatory offerings it conveyed, besides, the ideas of penitence and atonement. But in all cases it pointed to the vicarious nature of the animal, and its power of mediation between God and the suppliant.[15] More than this it was hardly intended to symbolise. It cannot have been designed to invest the animal with a higher sanctity or power,[16] in which case it would have been performed by the priest, the representative of God, and not by the offerer who himself required or solicited purification. Nor could it indicate that "the spark of life was conveyed through the hands and fingers, full of vital warmth, into the recipient; as if magnetically to communicate the spirit and will of the Israelite who offered the victim";[17] an explanation which would be curious if applied to the installation of the Levites by the Hebrews, as indeed to most instances. Other views are indistinct: it is contended that the imposition of the hand was an "emblem of dedication";[18] or was meant to express that

---

[10] Comp. also *Susanna* ver. 14, "then the two elders stood up in the midst of the people, and laid their hands upon her head." In Greece it was customary at the sacrifice connected with an oath, that he who swore laid his hand upon the victim, or dipped it in its blood, to express that he was prepared for the same fate, if he were guilty of perjury (comp. *Hermann*, Gottesd. Alterth. § 22, note 11).

[11] ונתתה מהודך עליו.

[12] Num. XXVII. 18—20; comp. Deut. XXXIV. 9; "als wolle der höherstehende", observes Ewald somewhat fantastically, "in einem solchen ausserordentlichen Augenblicke durch der Hände glühende Nerven seinen ganzen Geist auf den überströmen lassen, den er seines Segens und seiner Aufträge würdigt" (Alterth. p. 44; comp. p. 45).

[13] Comp. Acts VI. 6; VIII. 17; XIX. 6; 1 Tim. IV. 14; etc.

[14] Num. VIII. 10.

[15] See Sect. XVIII.

[16] Baader, Kanne, a. o.

[17] *Stanley*, Jewish Church, II. 416, after *Ewald*, Alterth. pp. 44, 45; and similarly *Kurtz*, Opferc. § 36; *Öhler* in Herz. R. E. X. 627.

[18] *Kurtz*, l. c. §§ 36 (where the notion of dedication is very artificially employed and extended), 43, 48 ("die Weihung des Thieres zum Sühnmittel für die Sünden des Opfernden mittelst einer substitutiven Uebertragung der

"the offerer must be pure from acts of violence or deceit, and in fact must have striven for an irreproachable life as the primary condition of an acceptable sacrifice";[1] or that as the animal rises to God as a sweet odour, so the soul of the offerer will rise to Him, and enjoy bliss in the future world;[2] interpretations in which the connection between the victim and the hand of the offerer is not at all apparent. Other opinions again are too wide, for instance, that the rite signified the giving up unto death of the offerer's own self to God, and therefore, his dedication to the Divine spirit;[3] which would almost coincide with the idea of sacrifice itself, or at least with the acts of killing and burning, and render the minor and subordinate ceremony superfluous or powerless; while the notion that its object was "to put upon the victim the guilt of sinful man",[4] is too narrow, and applies to expiatory offerings only.[5] It is indeed so natural that we need not trace its origin to that criminal law above alluded to, concerning witnesses who proffered depositions:[6] thus among the Persians who devoted to the deity the blood or the soul of the animal alone, the priest held his hand on the head of the victim till the blood had completely flowed out.[7] Some have inappropriately compared the act with that of manumission among the Romans,[8] when the master laid his hand upon the servant's head or any other part of his body, saying, "Hunc hominem liberum esse volo"; and dismissed him from his hand; here the symbol centred in the idea of separation, while the Hebrew emblem pre-eminently implied affinity and connection.

The rite was omitted if the animal sacrifice consisted of a fowl —

---

Verpflichtungen"); *Roskoff*, Hebr. Alterthümer, p. 47; comp. also *Hofmann*, Schriftbew. II. 1. p. 153 (1 ed.), p. 247 (2 ed.).

[1] *Philo*, De Victim. c. 5.

[2] *Abarbanel* on Lev. I. 1—9.

[3] *Bähr*, Symb. II. pp. 341, 342.

[4] *B. Bauer*, Die Handauflegung, in Stud. und Kritik. 1865, p. 350; comp., in general, pp. 343—369. Various views of modern writers on the subject are stated and analysed by Kurtz (Opferc. §§ 38—47): but his criticisms are based upon the opinion, derived from an exaggerated interpretation of Lev. I. 4, that the imposition of the hand implies in all instances, not as he formerly believed, the imputation of sin, but the idea of atonement — in which case the sprinkling of the blood would be an act of mere supererogation.

[5] The act had a different meaning and tendency, if it accompanied blessings (Gen. XLVIII. 13—15; Matth. XIX. 13, 15) and miraculous cures (Matth. IX. 18; Mark VI. 5; Luke XIII. 13; Acts IX. 12, 17), when it symbolised the fulness of powers hoped for or conferred; and, therefore, in such cases *both* hands were imposed; see also *Delitzsch*, Bibl. Psychol. p. 336.

[6] Lev. XXIV. 14; so *Michaelis* on Lev. I. 4; Ewald (l. c.), on the other hand, considers the sacrificial custom as the earlier prototype, and so Kurtz (l. c. p. 78).

[7] *Kleuker*, Zend-avesta, II. 172.

[8] Rosenmüller a. o.

a pigeon or a turtle-dove. But according to the Mishnah it was, as a rule, only performed in private offerings, but suppressed in public sacrifices; though in either case exceptions are specified; for, on the one hand, it is said not to have taken place in the offerings of the firstborn animals and those presented as tithes, because they were sacred from the mother's womb, nor in the paschal sacrifice, because it was more particularly important for the sake of the repast which followed; and on the other hand, it was permitted in the scape-goat and the sin-offering of the whole community.[9] But these distinctions and exceptions are not in harmony with the precepts of the Pentateuch, which relate to all quadruped sacrifices alike. Jewish tradition further declared that the ceremony could not be performed by the "deaf and blind, by idiots and minors, by women and heathens, by slaves and delegates."[10] As the act naturally required consciousness of its meaning, the prohibition of it was justified with respect to idiots and minors; and as it devolved necessarily upon the offerer himself, it could not, according to the spirit of the Law, be entrusted to a servant or a delegate, since it was not even assigned to the priest; but the other restrictions are unwarranted, and are indeed in Jewish writings supported by very frivolous and futile reasons.[11]

Rabbinical writers maintain, moreover, that the imposition of the hand was accompanied by verbal utterances, in harmony with the nature of the sacrifice; namely by a confession of sins at expiatory offerings,

---

[9] Lev. IV. 13—21; XVI. 21; see *Mishn.* Menach. IX. 7, כל קרבנות הצבור אין בהם סמיכה וכ׳; comp. also V. 7; Temur. III. 4; Pesach. VII. 4.

[10] *Mishn.* Menach. IX. 8, הכל סומכין חוץ מחרש שוטה וקטן סומא ונכרי והעבד והשליח והאשה.

[11] For instance, the elders of the congregation were commanded to lay their hands upon the bullock presented as a sin-offering of the whole nation (Lev. IV. 15); and as the elders formed the synhedrium, to which no blind person could belong, individuals so afflicted were incapacitated for imposition of the hand; see *Bartenurah* in loc. It is, however, admitted that women were not debarred from it, when presenting a thank-offering (*Talm.* Chagig. 16*b*); and the heir, if offering a sacrifice vowed by his departed father or relative, was entitled to it (*Mishn.* l. c.). We may here at once remark, that according to the Mishnah (Kiddush. I. 8) the following rites were permitted to men but not to women, "imposition of the hand, waving, presentation (הגשה) of the bloodless offering at the south-western corner of the altar, taking off a handful (קמיצה), fumigation, wringing off of the head of a pigeon or turtle-dove (מליקה), receiving and sprinkling of the blood; except that in the offering of jealousy and that of female Nazirites, women could perform the "waving"; how far these regulations are in accordance with or against the sacrificial precepts of Leviticus, requires no specification, but how slender the support is on which they rest, is evident from the playful arguments offered in *Talm.* Kiddush. 36.

by a declaration of offences committed against positive injunctions of the Law at holocausts, and by a recital of the praises of God at thank-offerings.[1] Some oral expression of the feelings and cravings of the offerer is indeed not improbable. Even the patriarchs, after building altars, are generally reported to have "invoked the name of the Lord";[2] and this is certainly in accordance with the spirit of the ceremony under consideration. Expiatory offerings are repeatedly stated to require confession of sins;[3] and the Deuteronomist sets down an elaborate address to be spoken at the oblation of firstfruits and tithes.[4] In fact, sacrifices are, in a remarkable passage, used as an equivalent for mentioning the name of God: "An altar of earth shalt thou make to Me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings...; in all places where I shall let My name be mentioned[5] I will come to thee and bless thee."[6] The Psalmist entreats, "Let my prayer be set forth before Thee as incense!"[7] Jonah promises, "I will sacrifice to Thee with the voice of thanks-giving."[8] The Temple is indifferently called "house of sacrifice"[9] and "house of prayer."[10] The later Isaiah declares, that the sacrifices of both Hebrews and strangers will, in a happier age, be offered in the Temple, because this will then be called "a house of prayer for all nations."[11] In the long address of Solomon, at the consecration of the newly-built Temple, he often and emphatically mentions the prayers,[12] but only once and obscurely hints at the sacrifices of the worshippers,[13] a proof that the former must have constituted a common and ordinary mode of devotion. Strangers even came to pour out their supplications, and entered the sacred precincts, certain of being graciously accepted by God.[14] On some occasions, the sacrifices are distinctly recorded to have been attended with prayers or invocations,[15]

[1] Comp. *Maimon*. Maas. Hakkorb. III. 9; similarly Ebn Ezra, Nachmanides, Abarbanel, a. o.; see also *Outram*, De Sacrif. I. xv. 8, 9, 10—12.

[2] See p. 15 note 12.

[3] Lev. V. 5; Num. V. 7; comp. Lev. XVI. 21.

[4] Deut. XXVI. 3—10; 13—15.

[5] אזכיר את־שמי.

[6] Exod. XX. 21 (comp. p. 17); see 1 Sam. XIII. 12; Prov. XV. 8. The Mishnah (Tam. IV. 3; V. 1) observes that after the killed victim had been prepared for the altar, the priests were invited by the presiding official first to recite a prayer or blessing (ברכו ברכה אחת), then the ten commandments, next the portion of the Pentateuch "Hear o Israel" (Deut. VI. 4—9), and lastly the section "And it will come to pass if you listen (Deut. XI. 13—21); comp. also *Lightf.* Opp. I. 720—722.

[7] Ps. CXLI. 2; comp. XXVI. 6, 7.

[8] Jon. II. 9.

[9] בית זבח, 2 Chron. VII. 12.

[10] בית תפלה, Isai. LVI. 7.

[11] Isai. LVI. 7.

[12] Comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 28—30, 33, 35, 38, 42, 44, 45, 47—50, 52; see also 2 Chr. VI. 12—42.

[13] Comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 31.

[14] 1 Ki. VIII. 41—43; 2 Chr. VI. 32, 33.

[15] 1 Sam. VII. 9; Job XLII. 8; Ezra VI. 10; 1 Chr. XXI. 26; XXIX. 10—21;

on others with songs, music, and psalms of praise.[16] Among the ordinary functions of the Levites is enumerated "standing every morning to praise and to extol the Lord, and so also in the evening."[17] After the exile, the Israelites were in the habit of offering up prayers while the fumigations with the sacred incense took place in the Holy;[18] and they performed their daily devotions in the Synagogues at the times fixed for the regular sacrifices in the Temple.[19] Josephus sets it down as a common duty incumbent upon all sacrificers to pray not only for their own, but for the general welfare.[20] However, it is more than probable that prayers were, for many ages, left to the option and impulse of the worshipper. It was certainly very long before they were fixed in formulas such as have been handed down by tradition. One of them, asserted to have been uttered by the offerer of an expiatory sacrifice during the act of imposition, runs thus: "O Lord, I have sinned, I have offended, I have transgressed, I have done this and that; but now I return to Thee in repentance, and may this victim be my expiation."[21] Another and similar prayer is attributed to the High-priest on the Day of Atonement, before he sent away the scape-goat, and one before he slaughtered the bullock for the expiation of himself and his house.[22] While the Israelites killed their paschal lambs in the Temple, the priests are said to have chanted the great praise (הַלֵּל) consisting of Psalms CXIII to CXVIII.[23] But independently of other arguments, the language of those

---

2 Chr. XXX. 22; Ps. LXVI. 13—20; CXVI. 13, 17; CXVIII. 1—29 (see ver. 27); Bar. I. 10, 11.

16 2 Chr. XXIX. 26—30; comp. Judg. XXI. 21; 1 Sam. I. 15; Am. V. 22, 23; Ps. XXVI. 6, 7; XXVII. 6; L. 14, 15; LXIX. 31; C. 4; Sir. L. 17—19; see also the strict ordinances on the music of the Temple in *Mishn.* Erach. II. 3 (אין פוחתין מעשרים ואחת תקיעות במקדש וכ׳); Tam. VII. 3, 4 (where the Psalms chanted by the Levites on each of the seven days of the week are stated, viz. Ps. XXIV; XLVIII; LXXXII; XCIV; LXXXI; XCIII; and XCI. respectively; see also *Talm.* Rosh Hash. 31*a*); *Talm.* Erach. 11*a* (עיקר שירה בפה); but the music does not seem to have commenced before the libation of the wine (*Talm.* l. c. אין אומרים שירה אלא על היין; comp. *Mishn.* Tam. VII. 3; *Lightfoot*, Opp. I. pp. 695—700).

17 1 Chr. XXIII. 30; comp. XVI. 4—6, 8—36.

18 Luke I. 10; comp. Revel. VIII. 3, 4; V. 8; see p. 118.

19 See p. 119.

20 *Joseph.* Contr. Apion. II. 23, *καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς εὔχεσθαι δεῖ πρῶτον σωτηρίας, εἶθ' ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν*; comp. Bell. Jud. VII. v. 6, *ἤρχοντο τῶν θυσιῶν, ἃς ἐπὶ ταῖς νομιζομέναις καλλιερήσαντες εὐχαῖς.*

21 אנא השם חטאתי עויתי פשעתי עשיתי כך וכך וחזרתי בתשובה לפניך וזו כפרתי; comp. *Maimon.* Maas. Hakkorb. III. 8, 9, 14, 15.

22 *Mishn.* Yom. IV. 2, אנא השם עויתי פשעתי חטאתי לפניך אני וביתי ובני אהרן עם קדשך אנא השם כפר נא לעונות... שעויתי... לפניך אני וביתי ובני אהרן עם קדשך וכ׳; and VI. 2, אנא השם עוו פשעו חטאו לפניך עמך בית ישראל וכ׳; comp. III. 8.

23 *Maimon.* De Sacrif. Pasch. I. 11.

formulas alone suffices to prove their post-Biblical origin. Indeed, supplication formed, up to the time of the exile, no indispensable part of public worship,[1] though, of course, prayers were addressed to God by individuals both for themselves and others, as necessity or impulse prompted,[2] till they became a regular, if not mechanical practice with fixed hours, generally three times a day, and appointed forms of supplication, pronounced with the face turned towards Jerusalem, and accompanied by prostration, bending of knees, stretching out and uplifting of hands, and were, together with fasting, sometimes extended to the domestic animals, the chief exercise of piety.[3] It seems to have been usual for the officiating priest to pronounce a blessing upon the offerer;[4] but that blessing was

---

[1] Comp. *Vitringa*, De Syn. Vet. pp. 50—52; the opposite assertion of Ewald (l. c. p. 48) cannot be substantiated.

[2] "Das alte Volk Israel kannte kein einmal feststehendes Gebet, keine indische Gâjatrî, kein Vaterunser, keine erste Sure" (*Ew.* l. c. p. 12). Comp. Gen. XX. 7, 17; XXIV. 12, 27; XXVIII. 22; XXXII. 10—13 (comprising in a brief compass nearly all the elements of prayer — thanksgiving, contrition, and entreaty); Exod. VIII. 4, 5, 24, 25; IX. 28, 33; X. 17, 18; XV. 1—18; XXXII. 11—13; Lev. XVI. 21; Num. X. 35, 36; XVI. 22; Deut. IX. 26—29; X. 10; XXI. 7, 8; Josh. VII. 6—9; Judg. VI. 36—40; XVI. 28; 1 Sam. I. 10, 12, 15; VIII. 6; XII. 19, 23; 2 Sam. VII. 18—29; 1 Ki. VIII. 22—54, esp. vers. 30, 35, 38; XVII. 20; XVIII. 36, 37; 2 Ki. IV. 33; VI. 17, 18, 20; XIII. 4; XIX. 4, 15—19; XX. 2, 3; Isai. I. 15; Jer. XXIX. 7; XXXII. 16—25; Hos. XIV. 3; Jon. II. 2—10; Hab. III. 1—19; many Psalms (as III—X, XII, XIII, XVI—XVIII, etc. etc.), esp. XXII. 1—26; XXXV. 13; LV. 18; LXIII. 2—12; C. 1—5; CII. 1, 2; CXIX. 58, 164; CXLII. 1—8; CXLIII. 1—12; Job XLII. 8; 1 Chr. XXIII. 30; 2 Chr. XX. 6—13; and so among the Greeks and other nations (comp. *Hom.* Il. I. 472—474 (*Οἱ δὲ πανήμεριοι μολπῇ θεὸν ἱλάσκοντο Καλὸν ἀείδοντες παιήονα κτλ.*); *Plat.* Tim. c. 5 (p. 27 C, *τοῦτό γε δὴ πάντες, ὅσοι καὶ κατὰ βραχὺ σωφροσύνης μετέχουσιν, ἐπὶ παντὸς ὁρμῇ καὶ σμικροῦ καὶ μεγάλου πράγματος θεὸν ἀεί που καλοῦσιν*); *Thucyd.* VIII. 70; *Lucian*, Dea Syr. 57; *Curt.* IV. xiii. 15; *Plin.* H. N. XXVIII. 2 or 3 (praeterea alia sunt verba impetritis, alia depulsoriis, alia commendatoriis); etc.; comp. *Hermann*, l. c. § 21; *Wachsmuth*, Hellen. Alterth. § 126 (Gebet und Musik gehörten meistentheils zur Einleitung oder Begleitung der Feier); *Döllinger*, Jew and Gent. I. 221—225, 398, 403; II. 75—77, 187 *sqq.* But it is too much to assert that "the sacrifice is the complement and consummation of prayer" (*Tholuck*, Das A. T. im N. T. p. 81), which is contrary to he natural laws of development (see p. 61).

[3] See Ezra VIII. 21; IX. 5—15; Neh. I. 4—11; IX. 1—37; XI. 17; Dan. VI. 11 (comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 48; Ps. LV. 18); IX. 3—21; Esth. IV. 1, 2, 15, 16; 2 Chr. XX. 3, 4 (comp. *Gramb.* Rel. Id. I. 430, 431); Tob. III. 11—15; XII. 8; Judith IV. 9—13; VIII. 6; XIII. 7; 1 Macc. IV. 30—33; V. 33; VII. 40—42; XI. 71; 2 Macc. VIII. 29; XV. 26; Acts III. 1; X. 9, 30; XXVII. 35; Matth. VI. 5—13; X. 14; Luke II. 37; XVIII. 12; 1 Tim. II. 1—8; comp. *Orach Chayim* §§ 89—127; see also *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 357—372, 378—380.

[4] Comp. 1 Sam. II. 20; 2 Sam. VI. 18; 1 Ki. VIII. 14, 55—61; see also Lev. IX. 22, 23; Num. VI. 23—27;

no necessary or essential part of the sacrificial ritual.[5] Similar accompaniments of sacrifices were usual among most ancient nations. The Scythians offered up a prayer while felling the victim to the ground,[6] the Egyptians either before killing or after flaying it; the latter, at the burning of the body beat themselves, as a mark of humiliation, while the Carian settlers in Egypt went so far as to express their submission by cutting their faces with knives.[7] In Persia, the sacrificer, before the act of immolation, invoked the name of the deity, and prayed both for his welfare and that of the king and the nation; while after the animal had been slain and duly laid upon myrtle and laurel bunches, the Magi, holding in their hands a bundle of slender tamarisk rods with which they touched the flesh, chanted long hymns supposed to recount the origin of the gods:[8] indeed the Persians seem to have considered prayer the chief part of the sacrifice, and in itself the most acceptable oblation.[9] The Greeks accompanied their offerings frequently with hymns of praise and with religious dances (ὑπορχήματα) round the altar and the sacrificial fire;[10] the invocation was generally pronounced at the killing of the victim;[11] a sacrificial prayer from a work of Menander has been preserved to us: "Now let us pray to the Olympian gods, and now to all the Olympian goddesses, to give us safety, health, and all good things in future and full enjoyment of all present happiness."[12] Pliny observes, with regard to the Romans, "It is a general belief that without

---

1 Sam. II. 20; 1 Chr. XVI. 1, 2; 2 Chron. XXX. 27; Sir. L. 17—19.

[5] Later, however, this element of the ceremonial was also fixed, and according to the Mishnah (Tam. V. 1), the officiating priests had to pronounce a threefold blessing, first that commencing אמת ויציב (comp. *Mishn.* Berach. II. 2; *Talm.* Berach. 13*a*; and the Jewish Prayer-Book, edit. by H. Edelmann — סדור הגיון לב — p. 50, and notes in loc.; see also *Lightf.* l. c. p. 721), next that of the service (עבודה), and then the sacerdotal benediction (Num. VI. 24—26), to which a fourth was added on Sabbath (see *Barten.* in loc.)

[6] *Herod.* IV. 60 (πίπτοντος δὲ τοῦ ἱρηίου, ἐπικαλέει τὸν θεὸν τῷ ἂν θύῃ).

[7] *Herod.* II. 39 (καὶ ἐπικαλέσαντες τὸν θεὸν σφάζουσιν), 40, 61; comp. Sect. XXI.

[8] *Herod.* I. 132; *Strab.* XV. iii. 14 (τὰς δ' ἐπῳδὰς ποιοῦνται πολὺν χρόνον); comp. *Lucian*, Dea Syr. c. 57.

[9] See Zend-avesta I. 111 (Kleuker, "I offer a prayer for the pure milk of the animals on the sacrificial table", etc.); II. 172; comp. *supra* p. 70; *Völcker* in Ersch und Gruber's Encycl. III. iv. 80; *Flügel*, ibid. p. 126.

[10] *Lucian*, De Saltu, c. 16; *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 26.

[11] Comp. *Hom.* Il. I. 451—457; II. 412—418; Od. III. 445, 446; XI. 34, 35; XIV. 423, 424 (καὶ ἐπεύχετο πᾶσι θεοῖσιν); *Sophocl.* Antig. 1019 (θυστάδες λιταί); *Virg.* Aen. V. 235—238; *Ovid*, Metam. VII. 246—254; *Apoll. Rhod.* I. 410—424; *Dion. Hal.* VII. 72; *Tacit.* Hist. II. 3 (precibus et igne puro altaria — of Venus in Paphos — adolentur); *Lucian*, Dea Syr. c. 55; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 9.

[12] *Athen.* XIV. 78, διδόναι σωτηρίαν,

a certain form of prayer, it would be unavailing to immolate a victim, and that without it the gods would be consulted to no purpose";[1] nay the omission or improper performance of the prayer was supposed to be most ominous and often portentous.[2] Therefore, in order to prevent hesitation or faultiness in the recital, a priest read from a book the prayer, which the sacrificer repeated after him word by word.[3] And both among the Greeks and Romans, the sacrificial act was occasionally accomplished with the shrill sounds of the Phrygian pipe, partly to add solemnity or cheerfulness to the ceremony, and partly to prevent any irrelevant or inauspicious words being heard during the sacred rites;[4] just as men veiled their heads during prayers, lest they beheld anything unlucky.

### 5. Killing the Animal (שְׁחִיטָה).

The offerer, after having signified by imposition of the hand his intimate relation to the victim and his readiness to surrender it to God in his stead, forthwith proved and sealed this readiness by at once killing the animal at the sacred altar.[5] The worshipper was designedly permitted to perform the act of immolation, that the offering might clearly be marked as his own; and it was therefore entrusted to one of the elders of the people, if the sacrifice was presented in the name of the community.[6] This privilege alone was left to the Israelites to remind them that they were designed to be "a kingdom of priests and a holy

---

*Ὑγίειαν, ἀγαθὰ πολλά, τῶν ὄντων τε νῦν Ἀγαθῶν ὄνησιν πᾶσι.*

1 *Plin.* H. N. XXVIII. 2 (3), quippe victimam caedi sine precatione non videtur referre aut deos rite consuli; comp. *Cato*, R. R. 132, 134; *Liv.* XXIX. 27; *Hor.* Ep. I. xvi. 58—62; *Macrob.* III. 9 (in eadem verba hostias fieri oportet); *Senec.* Thyest. 691, 692 (Ipse est sacerdos, ipse funesta prece Letale carmen ore violento canit).

2 *Plin.* l. c., memoria insigni, quotiens ipsae dirae obstrepentes nocuerint quotiensve precatio erraverit, sic repente extis adimi capita vel corda aut geminari victima stante.

3 *Plin.* l. c. videmusque ... ne quid verborum praetereatur aut praeposterum dicatur, de scripto praeire aliquem; *Juven.* Sat. VI. 391, 392, dictataque verba pertulit, Ut mos est.

4 Comp. Herod. I. 132; *Dion Chrysost.* Or. XXXII. 57; *Tibull.* El. II. i. 86 (and Heyne in loc.); *Plin.* l. c. (tibicinem canere, ne quid aliud exaudiatur).

5 ותיכף לסמיכה שחיטה, says the Mishnah (in Menach. IX. 8; comp. *Talm.* Berach. 42*a*), and it adds, in harmony with the meaning of the precept, that the killing must be performed at the same place as the imposition of the hand (ובמקום שסומכין שוחטין). But it certainly errs in denying to it all significance, and therefore permitting it to any one, even to unclean persons (*Mishn.* Zevach. III. 1; comp. *Talm.* Zevach. 32; see *infra*).

6 Lev. IV. 15. At the consecration of Aaron and his sons, *Moses* killed the victims (Lev. VIII. 15, 19, 23), because he acted throughout that ceremony as the direct instrument of God (see Comm in loc.). — Every Moslem in Turkey is bound to slaughter his

nation."[7] It would scarcely have been prudent on the part of the compilers of the Pentateuch wholly to exclude the people from all participation in the sacrificial ceremonies which they had so long performed as of natural right; such immoderate ambition would probably have provoked a dangerous reaction, which not even the growing power of the tribe of Levi would have been able to resist. The Law is therefore in harmony with the Talmudical canon that the duties of the priests commenced with the act of receiving the victim's blood; and that, therefore, the killing might be lawfully performed by any one.[8] With this rule corresponded, in bloodless offerings, the law that the sacerdotal functions began with the act of taking off a handful to be burnt on the altar as a memorial,[9] while the Israelite poured over and mixed the oil himself.[10] However, priests were *permitted* to slaughter the animals for the offering Israelites;[11] they did so regularly with respect to the purification-offering of the leper,[12] or when the victims were presented in the name of the whole people, whether on Sabbaths and festivals or on other occasions;[13] and they invariably killed the pigeons and turtle-doves by wringing or wringing off their head;[14] several reasons seem to have suggested this last exception; first because in such cases the ritual was so simple that it could scarcely be divided between the worshipper and the priest;[15] especially as the blood of those birds is so scanty that it could not well be sprinkled or pressed out on the altar, unless so disposed of at once by the person who killed them, without being previously received in a vessel; and then because it was deemed desirable to enhance the value of the small sacrifice of fowls, often presented by poor people as a substitute for more expensive animals, by confiding its performance exclusively to the holy ministers of God.

How far the act of slaying the victim represented the life and death

---

Beiram sacrifice at easter with his own hand, or if unable to do it, to be at least present during the act.

[7] See the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. II.

[8] מקבלה ואילך מצות כהונה לימד על השחיטה שכשרה בכל אדם, *Talm.* Zevach. 32*a*; comp. *Maimon.* De Sanctuar. IX. 6. Hence the Sept. renders unnecessarily וְשָׁחַט in Lev. IV. 24, 29, 33, *and he shall kill*, viz. the chief or the common Israelite, by *καὶ σφάξουσι and they shall kill*, viz. the priests; and Philo (De Victim. c. 5) writes incorrectly that a priest always performed the slaughtering (*μετὰ ταῦτα*, sc. after the imposition of the hand, *λαβών τις τῶν ἱερέων καταθυέτω*); and similarly Ebn Ezra (on Lev. I. 11) and others. The statements of the text on the subject are unmistakeable; see Lev. I. 5; III. 2; IV. 24, 29, 33; see also VIII. 15.

[9] מקמיצה ואילך מצות הכהונה.

[10] יקיצה ובלילה כשרה בזר; *Talm.* Menach. 18*b*; see p. 105.

[11] Comp. 2 Chron. XXX. 15—17; XXXV. 10, 11.

[12] Lev. XIV. 13, 25.

[13] Comp. also 2 Chron. XXIX. 22—24; Ezra VI. 20.

[14] Lev. I. 15; V. 8; see Sect. XIII. 3; XV.

[15] See Lev. I. 14—17, and notes in loc.

of the offerer will be pointed out in another place;[1] it here concerns us to observe that even the mode of killing had, in many instances, undoubtedly a symbolical significance. So if the Greeks or Romans offered a victim to an Olympian god, the head was turned upward and cut with the sacrificial knife from above downward; while the head of animals dedicated to the lower gods, to heroes, or to the dead, was turned downward to the ground, and cut from below upward;[2] in the latter case, the blood was poured into a pit dug for the purpose.[3] The Greeks generally stunned and felled the victim to the ground by striking its temples with an oak club;[4] but this was distinct from the proper slaughtering (σφάζειν),[5] which was usually performed by cutting the sinews of the neck with a sharp axe,[6] and which formed the essential part of the ceremony, for by that slaughtering only which made the blood gush forth, the soul or the life of the victim was surrendered.[7] And similarly among the Romans, an inferior official or assistant[8] first struck the victim with a hammer, after which the priest slaughtered it with a knife.[9] Some tribes seem to have abstained from the use of iron instruments in killing sacrificial animals, apparently for the same reasons which induced others to avoid them in the construction of altars.[10] Plato in his mythical description of primeval customs mentions that the animals intended for victims on solemn occasions were caught "without iron, with staves and cords",[11] though they were apparently slaughtered in the usual way (ἔσφαττον). The Magi in Cappadocia called pyraethi or fire-kindlers, "did not perform the sacrifice with a knife, but beat the victim to death with a log of wood as with a mallet."[12] The Scythians and Indians strangled or suffocated the animal, "that nothing mutilated, but only that which is entire, might

[1] See Sect. XVIII.

[2] Which act was termed subponere cultrum; comp. *Eustath.* ad Il. I. 459; Schol. Apollon. Argon: I. 585; *Serv.* ad Virg. Georg. III. 492; *Myrtilus*, Lesb. 2; *Saubert*, De Sacrif. p. 415.

[3] Comp. *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 9 (*Νερτερίων—θυσίας—κατάθαπτε, καὶ εἰς βόθρον αἷμα ἴαλλε*); *Hom.* Od. XI. 35, 36 (*τὰ δὲ μῆλα λαβὼν ἀπεδειροτόμησα ἐς βόθρον, ῥέε δ' αἷμα κελαινεφές*); *Apollon.* Argon. III. 1030—1033; *Ovid*, Met. VII. 245 (et patulas perfundit sanguine fossas); comp. p. 128.

[4] *Hom.* Od. XIV. 425, 426; III. 442, 443, 449, 450; *Dion. Hal.* VII. 72.

[5] *Hom.* Od. XIV. 454.

[6] Comp. *Dion. Hal.* l. c.

[7] *Hom.* Od. XIV. 455; comp. *Apoll.* Arg. I. 427—432.

[8] The *popa* or *victimarius*; comp. *Cic.* Mil. 24; *Liv.* XL. 29; *Val. Max.* I. i. 12; etc.

[9] *Servius* ad Aen. XII. 120; *Suet.* Calig. 32.

[10] See p. 16. The prohibition of the Pythagoraeans adopted by Numa, not to stir fire with a sword (*Plut.* Num. 14), may rest upon a similar notion, since fire was regarded as holy (see no. 13 of this Section).

[11] *Plat.* Critias, c. 11 (*ἄνευ σιδήρου ξύλοις καὶ βρόχοις*).

[12] *Strab.* XV. iii. 15, p. 733.

be offered to the deity."[13] The Syrians in Hierapolis threw the wreathed victim over the terrace in the court of the temple, and killed it by the fall;[14] while on some occasions, as on the "Festival of Torches",[15] it was suspended on trees within the precincts of the temple and burnt alive.[16] Similarly at Patrae in Achaia, on the festival of Artemis Laphria, pigs, stags and roes, wolves and bears, young and old, and every kind of eatable birds were cast alive into the flames.[17] The Trojans sacrificed horses to Poseidon by throwing them alive into the waves;[18] and the old Rhodians did the like in honour of Helios.[19]

It is uncertain whether the Hebrews adopted any peculiar rite or observed fixed rules in slaughtering the victim; but the regulations laid down in the Talmud are unquestionably of later growth; they all aim at causing the death of the animal in the most natural and least painful or violent manner, so that it might not even remotely fall under the category of a "torn animal" (טרפה).[20] How little these laws harmonize with the simplicity of primitive ages will be manifest from the following short survey. The knife with which the animal is killed must have no notch (פגימה) that can be felt with the tips of the fingers or with the nails; it must, therefore, be well examined both before and after the killing; if a notch is discovered after it, the animal is unlawful for food. The knife must be put on in the middle of the neck,[21] and in quadrupeds cut through the greater part of the circumference both of the windpipe and the gullet,[22] while in birds it suffices to cut through one of the two. During the act of cutting five things are particularly to be avoided, 1. interruption (שהייה);[23] if this is extended so long that in the interval an animal of the same species might be killed, the animal is unlawful for food; 2. pressure (דרסה); the knife must be moved to

[13] *Herod.* IV. 60; *Strab.* XV. i. 54, p. 710, ἵνα μὴ λελωβημένον ἀλλ' ὁλόκληρον διδῶται τῷ θεῷ.

[14] *Lucian*, Dea Syr. 58. In a similar manner, the human victims were killed in Iceland, or they were dashed against the sacred stone of Thor, or immersed in a morass, while, among the Saxons, they were hanged, or hurled into thorny thickets (see *Wachter* l. c. pp. 94, 95), and in Rome buried alive (Liv. XXII. 57).

[15] *Πυρή* or *λαμπάς*.

[16] *Lucian* l. c. c. 49.

[17] *Pausan.* IV. xxxi. 7; VII. xviii. 7.

[18] *Hom.* Il. XXI. 132 (ζωοὺς δ' ἐν δίνῃσι καθίετε μώνυχας ἵππους); comp. *Eustath.* ad Il. XXIII. 148; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 9 (ἐς βαθὺ κῦμα θαλάσσης ζῶον ὅλον προΐαλλε); and *infra* no. 13.

[19] *Festus* s. v. October equus; comp. p. 87 note 19, p. 89 note 12. — On some barbarous modes of killing animals practised among the Romans in the time of their degeneracy from motives of wanton gluttony, see *Plut.* De Esu Carn. II. 1.

[20] See the Treatise before the eleventh chapter.

[21] *Yoreh Deah* § 20, מקום השחיטה בצוואר בקנה לצר הראש משפוי כובע ולמטה.

[22] קנה and וושט, which are termed the "signs" (סימנים) of the animal.

[23] L. c. § 23, הרי שהתחיל לשחוט והגביה ידו קודם שיגמור.

and fro,[1] and must therefore have at least double the length of the animal's neck; 3. concealment (חלדה) of the knife between the two pipes in the neck of the animal, so that it is afterwards covered with skin or flesh;[2] 4. irregularity or deviation (הגרמה), for instance, if the knife is put on in an unlawful place, or if during the act of cutting it strays to such a part;[3] and 5. disrupture (עיקר) either of the wind-pipe or the gullet.[4] After the killing, the animal is submitted to a close scrutiny, and if it is found to have in one of the vital organs a defect which in all probability would render it unfit to live beyond one year, it is interdicted to be eaten; such faults are especially a hole, however small, in the lungs or any part of the stomach, an abnormal addition to the lungs, or a deficiency in the liver or the upper jaw; imperfect formation of the skin on the brain or of the spinal marrow, and fracture of the greater part of the ribs.[5] Though these natural precautions may have suggested themselves at a comparatively early period, and are certainly extremely commendable as dietary rules, they are neither alluded to nor implied in any precept of the Old Testament; much less is any trace to be found of laws directing the mode of killing the victims. In fact, the only two statements made in this respect are entirely opposed to the rules laid down by Jewish tradition. For birds, though sometimes slain with a knife,[6] were in some chief instances to be killed by wringing or wringing off the head with the hand,[7] which, according to the Talmud, was done in the following manner: the priest took the feet of the bird with two fingers of his left hand, and the wings with two other fingers, and then turning the head between the thumb and the index, be made a cut with his nail behind the neck, and separated the nape till he came to the two *signs*, the wind-pipe and the gullet; and if the bird was intended for a holocaust, he broke both of them; if for a sin-offering, only one.[8] And in the ritual

---

[1] L. c. § 24, כגון שהניח הסכין על הצוואר ודחק וחתך למטה כחותך צנון או קישות.

[2] Ibid. כגון שהכניס הסכין בין סימן לסימן...או החליד את הסכין תחת העור או תחת צמר מסובך בצואר הבהמה וכו'; comp. *Talm.* Chul. 20*b*; *N. Fuller*, Miscell. Sacr. III. c. 14.

[3] Ibid. השוחט בקנה ולמעלה במקום שאינו ראוי לשחיטה או שהתחיל לשחוט במקום שחיטה ושחט מעט והטה הסכין וכו'.

[4] Ibid. כגון שנעקר הקנה או הוושט מהלחי ומהבשר ונשמט אחד מהם.

[5] Rabbinical tradition, subdividing these chief defects, enumerates 70 blemishes disqualifying the animal for food.

[6] שחט, Lev. XIV. 5, 50.

[7] מלק, Lev. I. 15; V. 8.

[8] Comp. *Talm.* Zevach. 65*b*, כיצד מולקין חטאת העוף חותך שדרה ומפרקת בלא רוב בשר עד שמגיע לוושט או לקנה; see also *ibid.* fol. 64; Chul. 21, 22; comp. in general, *Talm.* Chul. 18—22; *Yoreh Deah*, §§ 1—28; esp. §§ 18—28; *Maimon.* הלכות שחיטות; *Kimchi*, Lexic. sub מלק; *Reland*, Antiqq. III. i. 18—20 (Ego, observes

of averting the guilt of blood after hidden murder, not the usual mode of killing[9] was employed, but a more summary method of striking off the neck,[10] in harmony with the symbolical nature of that ceremony which thereby was to be *deprived* of the character of a sacrifice. One object was above all kept in view and aimed at, namely that all the blood should completely stream out of the body, and that none of it should be lost; for it was forbidden as food, but indispensable for atonement; though the general disregard of all religious and ceremonial laws down to the latest time,[11] extended to that one supreme point also; for Philo remarked, "Some men prepare sacrifices which ought never to be offered, strangling the victim and stifling the essence of life, which they ought to let depart free and unrestrained, burying the blood as it were, in the body."[12] Guided by similar views, the old Teutons struck the heart of the victims, whether these were men or animals, because the heart is the fountain of the blood, and the blood of the heart was pre-eminently regarded as the blood of sacrifice.

6. Receiving of the Blood (לְקִיחָה or קַבָּלָה or קִבּוּל הַדָּם).

When the blood streamed out of the dying victim, the utmost care was taken by the officiating priest, clad in his holy vestments, to receive it, at the same side of the altar where the slaughtering had been performed,[13] in a vessel[14] of rather large dimensions,[15] which he held in his right hand and was specially appropriated to the purpose.[16] It was

---

Ravius in loc., unguis adhibendi ad hunc ritum apud antiquos nec volam nec vestigium reperio); *Outram*, De Sacrif. I. xvi. 1; *Creizenach*, Schulchan Aruch, I. pp. 138, 139.

[9] שחט, Sept. *σφάζειν*.

[10] ערף, Deut. XXI. 4, 6; Sept. *νευροκοπεῖν*; Josephus (Ant. IV. viii. 16) *τοὺς τένοντας κοψάτωσαν τῆς βοός*; comp. Exod. XIII. 13; XXXIV. 20; Isai. LXVI. 3; see also *Talm*. Kerith. 25*a*; *Maimon*. Rotzeach, c. 9.

[11] See Section III.

[12] *Philo*, De Concupisc. c. 10, Op. II. p. 356, *ἄγχοντες καὶ ἀποπνίγοντες τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς ψυχῆς ἣν ἐλευθέραν καὶ ἄφετον ἐχρῆν ἐᾶν, ἐντομβεύοντες τῷ σώματι τὸ αἷμα*.

[13] Comp. *Mishn*. Zevach. V. 1 *sqq*.; see p. 174.

[14] מִזְרָק (Exod. XXVII. 3; XXXVIII. 3; Num. IV. 14; 1 Ki. VII. 40), or אַגָּן (Exod. XXIV. 6), or כּוֹס (Siphra); *φιάλη* or *καλυπτήρ* (Sept., Philo); comp. *ἀμνίον* (*Hom*. Od. III. 444) or *σφάγιον* and *σφαγεῖον* (*Aesch*. Agam. 1092; *Eurip*. Troad. 747; Elect. 800); *patera* among the Romans (*Virg*. Aen. III. 67, sanguinis et sacri pateras).

[15] Comp. Zechar. IX. 15.

[16] Comp. *Mishn*. l. c. קבול דמן בכלי שרת. If it was allowed to flow on the ground and was then taken up for sprinkling, or if it was received in the left hand, the act was, according to Jewish tradition, illegal (*Mishn*. Zevach. II. 1); although it was supposed that the blood of "the red cow" was received into the left hand, an exception that can certainly not be supported by Num. XIX. 4; comp. Lev. IV. 25, 30, 34; VIII. 15.

**deemed so all-important that no part of the blood which is the life and soul of the animal, should be lost or wasted, that the Law deviated from a fundamental principle at the offering of birds, by directing the killing to be performed by the priest instead of the offerer (see p. 185). But the act of receiving the blood was on no account permitted to the Israelite;[1] it was by tradition, and no doubt in accordance with the spirit of the Law, strictly regulated;[2] it was illegal, if performed by a non-Levite or an uncircumcised person,[3] or by the priest or High-priest without a full array of priestly garments,[4] or in a state of total or partial uncleanness,[5] or by a common priest who, on that day, had been thrown into mourning;[6] for it was the direct preliminary to that ritual, in which the whole sacrificial ceremonial centred, namely**

**7. The Sprinkling of the Blood (הַזָּיָה or זְרִיקָה or נְתִינָה).[7]**

**This was the exclusive privilege of "the priests, the sons of**

---

1 Comp. ***Mishn.*** Tam. IV. 1, שחט השוחט וקבל המקבל.

2 See ***Mishn.*** Zevach. II. 1. The blood was constantly stirred to prevent coagulation (comp. ***Mishn.*** Yom. IV. 3, שחטו וקבל במזרק את־דמו ונותנו למי שהוא ממרס בו···כדי שלא יקרוש); therefore the vessel is said to have been pointed at the bottom to preclude the priest from setting it down. But there is no foundation in the O. T. for the view implied in a passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that water was mixed with the blood (IX. 19, *λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα ... μετὰ ὕδατος*; the mistake arose probably from an erroneous application of Lev. XIV. 5, 6; Deut. XIX. 18); the Mishnah (Zevach. III. 3) declares indeed the sprinkling lawful if the blood was by chance mixed with water and kept the appearance of blood; but it would have been utterly inappropriate that the blood, the means of atonement, should be purposely diluted and vitiated.

3 זר or ערל.

4 That is, if the former was not dressed in his 4, the latter in his 8 appointed pieces (comp. Exod. XXVIII. 4; Comm. on Exod. pp. 522 *sqq.*), in which case either of them was called מחוסר בגדים. In exceptional cases, Levites received the blood and handed it to the priests for sprinkling (2 Chr. XXX. 16).

5 טבול יום or מחוסר כפורים.

6 The High-priest was not disqualified by being a mourner (אונן); see Treatise on Priesthood, ch. I. Other precepts are futile (***Mishn.*** Zevach. l. c. יושב, עומד ע״ג כלים, ע״ג בהמה, ע״ג רגלי חברו, קבל בשמאל וכו׳.

7 **The Hebrew text uses three different terms with regard to this rite; namely 1. הִזָּה *to sprinkle*, exclusively in connection with sin-offerings (Lev. IV. 6, 17; V. 9; XVI. 14, 19); 2. זָרַק *to asperse*, in reference to holocausts, thank- and trespass-offerings, generally with the addition "upon the altar round about" (על־המזבח סביב; Lev. I. 5, 11; III. 2, 8, 13; VII. 2; IX. 12); and 3. נָתַן *to put*, with respect to sin-offerings when blood was to come on the horns of the altar, and when, therefore, sprinkling would have been unsafe (Lev. IV. 7, 18, 25, 30, 34; XVI. 18; etc.). The term הזה is evidently sprinkling in a stricter sense, with the finger which had before been dipped into the blood, so that but little of it was used and the rest poured out at the bottom of the altar (Lev. IV. 7, 18;**

**Aaron."[8] It was invalid if attempted by any one not belonging to that elected family. Only when Moses initiated his brother with his sons into their sacred functions, he himself, the Levite, sprinkled the blood, because on that exceptional occasion he officiated as chief priest.[9] Indeed if an intercessor between God and the Israelite was at all deemed desirable, he was properly employed for that special act. For it not only formed the weightiest of the rituals without which the sacrifice was not considered accomplished, but it involved the chief means of atonement,[10] and was, therefore, justly termed "the kernel of the offering."[11] It was rigorously and carefully performed in all animal sacrifices of whatever class.[12] Its eminent significance is manifest: in burnt- and expiatory offerings it typified contrition and atonement; in thank-offerings, humility and submission. For the blood represented the life and existence of the animal which man offered to God either**

---

V. 9; Sept. ῥαίνω; Vulg. aspergo). But זרק is probably a copious pouring out, direct from the basin, or an aspersion of all the blood on the sides of the altar, or rather on the lower half of it, from the part where the grate (כַּרְכֹּב) of network ceased downward (see Comm. on Exod. p. 484; in the Temple of Herod, below a red-line running round the middle of the altar); so that nothing was discharged at the base (Sept. προςχέω or — in Exod. XXIV. 8 — κατασκεδάζω; Vulg. fundo). Some understand זרק to mean sprinkling upon or over the surface of the altar; so Hofmann (l. c. p. 256) renders "ausschwenkend über die Oberfläche des Altars", Winer (Real-Wört. I. 193) "über den Altar hin" (comp. σπένδειν ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τὸ αἷμα, *Pausan.* VIII. ii. 3; see *infra*), Kurtz (Opferc. p. 209) "rings um den inneren Rand des Altars"; but these and similar translations are excluded by the qualifying addition *round about* סביב (comp. *Jos.* Ant. III. ix. 1, τὸν κύκλον τῷ αἵματι δεύουσι τοῦ βωμοῦ); in some cases, the text plainly states that blood was to be poured along the *sides* (Lev. I. 15; V. 9); and Jewish tradition rigidly enjoined that no blood should come on the upper surface of the altar. The general expressions "the blood of thy sacrifices shall be poured out upon the altar" (על־מזבח, Deut. XII. 27) afford no conclusive argument, as the passage in which they occur is not intended as an accurate or ritual statement. Philo (De Victim. c. 6) takes the term "round about" (סביב) at once too literally and too figuratively in explaining, the blood is to be poured out in a circle (κύκλῳ) round the altar, "because the circle is the most complete of all figures", which would not have been easy of accomplishment on a square altar; he adds, therefore, more correctly "and also in order that no part whatever may be left empty and unoccupied by the libation of life"; though he concludes fantastically, the rite teaches that "the mind which is always performing its dances in a circle, is by every description of words, intentions, and actions, always showing its desire to please God."

8 Lev. I. 5, 11; III. 2, 8, 13; IV. 16—18, 25, 30, 34; VII. 14; V. 9; IX. 9, 12, 18; XVII. 6; comp. 2 Ki. XVI. 13; etc.

9 Lev. VIII. 15, 19, 23; see pp. 176, 184, 200.

10 עקר הכפרה.

11 עקר הזבח.

12 Lev. XVII. 6; VII. 2; etc.

as a substitute for his own life forfeited by sin, or as an oblation of gratitude and praise for benefits received.[1] Hence it was sprinkled either on the brazen, or the golden altar, or the mercy-seat, that is, on the most important and most characteristic implements of the three chief divisions of the Sanctuary, the Court, the Holy, and the Holy of Holies; it was, in fact, put upon those parts which symbolized, though in different degrees, the revelation and holiness of God, and which, therefore, if covered with the emblem of the offerer's soul, were best calculated to point to his purification and his restored union with the Deity. And while the preceding ceremonies were uniform in all classes of offerings, this chief rite varied in mode and manner according to the nature of the different sacrifices. The blood of thank-offerings and holocausts consisting of quadrupeds, was sprinkled *round about upon* the brazen altar;[2] while the blood of holocausts consisting of fowls was pressed out on its *side*,[3] evidently because it would not have sufficed for so complete an aspersion of the altar as to be everywhere visible. If the High-priest presented a sin-offering for himself, or if the elders of the people presented one for the whole community, the High-priest dipped his finger into the blood, and sprinkled of it "seven times before the Lord against the vail of the Sanctuary."[4] By the peculiar force of the number seven which indicated the sacred covenant between God and Israel,[5] and by the approach to the vail through which lay the passage from the Holy to the Holy of Holies, the ceremony was invested with the character of aspiration for purity and for harmony with God. To impress these ideas still more markedly, the High-priest put a part of the blood on the horns of the altar of incense within the Holy; for the horns, the most prominent as well as the most important part of the structure, pointed strikingly to the presence of God; while the rest of the blood was poured out at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering.[6] If the sin-offering was presented by a chief or a common Israelite, the inferior degree of authority and distinction was denoted in a twofold manner: the blood was sprinkled by a *common* priest, and a part of it was put, not on the horns of the golden, but of the *brazen*

[1] See Sect. IX. 7, pp. 121 *sqq;* comp. *Saalschütz*, Mosaisches Recht, I. 307, 308.

[2] על־המזבח סביב, see p. 190, n. 7.

[3] על־קיר המזבח, Lev. I. 15.

[4] Lev. IV. 6.

[5] The same significant number occurs frequently in reference to the rites of expiation and purification; comp. Exod. XXIX. 35, 37; Lev. VIII. 11, 33; XIV. 8, 16, 51; XV. 13, 24; Num. XIX. 4, 11, 12, 19.

[6] Lev. IV. 7, 18, 25, 30, 34; comp. IX. 9; probably at the south-western corner where, in the second Temple, it was led through two small apertures (כמין שני חוטמין דקין) into a subterranean channel in the Court and from thence into the valley of Kidron, where it was sold by the treasurers of

altar in the Court.[7] For both the High-priest and the community were identified with the Hebrew theocracy, the former as its chief representative, the latter as its actual embodiment; both stood, therefore, towards God in a relation of supreme holiness; but any individual Israelite, were he even a chief, was allied to the Deity only in proportion to his personal merit.

But it is necessary to observe, in this respect, the following chronological distinction. In holocausts, or the oldest kind of sacrifice, and in thank-offerings, the class next to them in antiquity, the blood was sprinkled "round about upon the altar."[8] There are traces to prove that the same method was for a long time also followed with regard to the latest class, or the expiatory offerings; for in reference to trespass-offerings (אשם) it is expressly commanded, that the blood should be sprinkled "round about upon the altar";[9] and the same section adds, "as the sin-offering is, so is the trespass-offering; there is one law for them."[10] Later, however, when the sin-offerings (חטאת), developed by Levitical legislators with ardent partiality, were appointed as the most effectual and most sacred means of theocratic worship, it was found appropriate to distinguish them by a peculiar proceeding with respect to the blood; and it was then determined that, on ordinary occasions, a part of it should be put on the *horns* of the brazen altar, but in cases of special moment, not only on the horns of the *golden* altar, but also on still holier parts of the sacred edifice.[11] Some such distinction was already introduced or contemplated at the time when birds also were admitted for animal offerings;[12] for while the blood of pigeons or turtle-doves offered as holocausts was simply pressed out (תִּמָּצֵה) on the side of the brazen altar,[13] it was, if these birds were presented as sin-offerings, partly *sprinkled* (וְהִזָּה) on the side of the altar, and partly pressed out at its base;[14] though the change had not advanced so far as to direct some of the blood to be put upon the horns of the altar.[15]

The most solemn sacrifices in the whole course of the religious year were doubtless those performed by the High-priest on the Day of Atonement for the expiation of himself and the people; and they

---

the Temple for manuring the fields (comp. *Mishn.* Midd. III. 2).

[7] Lev. IV. 25, 30, 34.

[8] Lev. I. 5, 11; III. 2, 8, 13.

[9] Lev. VII. 2.

[10] Ver. 7.

[11] Lev. IV. 6, 7, 17, 18, 25, 30, 34.

[12] See notes on I. 14—17.

[13] Lev. I. 15.

[14] Lev. V. 9.

[15] It is not in accordance with the spirit of the laws of expiatory offerings to contend that "the sacrifice of two birds was not valuable enough to warrant the putting of their blood upon the horns of the altar, and thus to bring it before God's special presence" (Knobel); for even a less valuable

were, among other characteristics, distinguished by a remarkable mode in the disposal of the blood. The High-priest sprinkled some of it "upon the mercy-seat eastward, and before the mercy-seat seven times",[1] that is, in the Holy of Holies, on that part of the Ark of the Covenant which bore the mysterious figures of the cherubim, the emblems of the Divine presence.[2] Moreover, he put a part of the blood round the horns of the altar of incense and sprinkled upon its sides seven times, and he thereby "cleansed it and hallowed it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel."[3] No symbols could possibly be devised more strongly expressive of the craving for union and reconciliation with God.

So essential was the act in sin-offerings, that it took place even in connection with the *red cow*, which was no proper sacrifice, and was slain and burnt without the camp: the blood was sprinkled seven times in the direction of the Tabernacle,[4] to indicate that though that animal had not been killed at the altar, it bore an intimate relation to the Sanctuary and the religious blessings which it secures.[5]

The Law contains no directions or allusions as to the mode of sprinkling. It may be expected that Jewish tradition did not fail to define a ceremony connected with one of the most important points of public worship. Accordingly, the Talmud observes that the blood was sprinkled either above or below a red line drawn round the altar midway between the base and the top: in sin-offerings, above that line, with the index of the right hand, on the horns at the four corners, beginning with the south-eastern, and proceeding round the altar from right to left, successively sprinkling at the north-eastern, north-western, and south-western corner;[6] in burnt-, thank-, and trespass-offerings, below the line, in the following manner: the priest went first to the north-eastern corner, and sprinkled at once upon the eastern and northern sides, then he passed to the south-western corner, and sprinkled the southern and western sides, so that the four sides were sprinkled with two aspersions;[7] while in the offerings of the firstborn and tithe

---

gift, the tenth of an ephah of flour, was accepted as a sin-offering (Lev. V. 11—13).

[1] Lev. XVI. 14, 15.

[2] Comp. ver. 2.

[3] Vers. 18, 19; and similarly VIII. 15, וחטא את־המזבח ... ויקדשהו לכפר עליו.

[4] אל־נכח פני אהל מועד, Num. XIX. 4.

[5] On the custom of putting, in certain cases, blood upon the right ear, hand, and foot of persons, as the leper after his recovery, and Aaron and his sons at their consecration (Exod. XXIX. 20; Lev. VIII. 24; XIV. 14), see Comm. in locc.

[6] Comp. *Mishn*. Zevach. V. 3; Tam. VII. 3.

[7] This is expressed by the phrase דמן טעון שתי מתנות שהן ארבע, *i. e.* the blood requires two aspersions which are (virtually) four (see *Mishn*.

animals, and in the paschal lamb, one single aspersion sufficed at the lower part of the altar.[8] We need hardly remark that the simple and plain regulations of the Pentateuch utterly repudiate such futile and microscopic subtleties.

Bringing the blood of the victim upon the altar was so completely in harmony with the notions generally entertained of the importance of blood in sacrifices, that it is naturally found among many ancient nations, especially among the Greeks and Romans;[9] in fact, *to sprinkle the altar with blood*[10] was synonymous with *sacrificing*.[11] The Chinese, after cutting the throat of the victim, generally a pig or cock, allow the blood, while still warm, to flow over the hands and feet of the idol, or they sprinkle it on the entire length and surface of the figure;[12] and so the old Teutons sprinkled or smeared the blood drawn from the heart of the victim upon the image of the god, and especially upon its base;[13] sometimes, as in Norway and in the great temple at Hofstader in Iceland, the blood was received in a cauldron specially placed on the altar, and containing the sacrificial twig or rod, with which the blood was marked on the image.[14]

After the blood was sprinkled followed

### 8. The Flaying of the Animal (הַפְשָׁטָה or הֶפְשֵׁט).[15]

In ordinary holocausts, the skin was taken off before the victim was burnt, and fell to the share of the officiating priest. This was probably the case whether the offering consisted of a bullock, a sheep, or a goat, although it is expressly stated with regard to the bullock only.[16] In sin-offerings of the High-priest or of the whole people, the

---

Zevach V. 4—7; comp. Zechar. IX. 15), and resembled in form the Greek letter *Γ* (כמין גם, *Maimon.* Maas. Hakkorb. c. 5); comp. also *Mishn.* Tam. IV. 1, etc.

[8] *Mishn.* Zevach. V. 8; see *Maimon.* Maas. Hakkorb. V. 6—10.

[9] Hence the usual phrases *τὸ αἷμα περιχέειν τῷ βωμῷ* (*Lucian*, De Sacrif. c. 13), or *περιάγειν ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν* (*Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 9), or *ἐπιχέειν τῷ βωμῷ* (*Eustath.* ad Hom. Od. III. 446), or *σπένδειν ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τὸ αἷμα* (*Paus.* VIII. ii. 3, see *supra*), or *αἷμα ῥαίνειν πρὸς τοὺς βωμούς* (*Porphyr.* Abstin. II. 27; comp. *Plat.* De Legg. VI. 22, p. 782, *τοὺς τῶν θεῶν βωμοὺς αἵματι μιαίνειν*); and aras sanguine spargere (*Lucret.* V. 1199, 1200), or sanguinem arae obfundere (*Tacit.* Hist. II. 3), or sanguinem in aras fundere (*Servius* ad Aen. III. 321).

[10] *Αἱμάσσειν τοὺς βωμούς.*

[11] Comp. *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 7 (see p. 128); comp. c. 27, *ταύρων δ' ἀκρήτοισι φόνοις οὐ δεύετο βωμός.*

[12] *Neuhof*, Sinische Reisebeschreibung, pp. 105, 126.

[13] *Mone*, Geschichte des Heidenthums, I. 26, 69, 92, 280.

[14] Comp. *Grimm*, Deutsche Mythologie, p. 33 *sqq.*; *Mone*, l. c. p. 294.

[15] The Talmudical rule was אין הפשט קודם זריקה (*Talm.* Zevachim, 103*b*, 104*a*).

[16] Lev. I. 6; VII. 8; see *Rashi* on Lev. I. 6.

skin was burnt together with the flesh,[1] as was occasionally done by heathen nations;[2] but it was not so destroyed in sin-offerings of a chief or a common Israelite.[3] The flaying was probably performed by a Levite under the direction of the officiating priest,[4] not by the Israelite who presented the offering,[5] since his permissive functions ceased with the slaughtering of the animal, after which commenced the duties of the appointed mediators. But the paschal lamb was, in accordance with its specific nature as an individual and domestic sacrifice, probably flayed by the offering head of the family himself, as the Levites would scarcely have sufficed for the vast number of victims killed simultaneously and within a few hours. The ancient Hebrews seem to have employed a peculiar mode of flaying not known or practised at present; they began to draw off the hide by the feet[6] in a manner that it remained entire and completely connected.[7] For this purpose there were in the Court of the second Temple eight columns with three rows of iron hooks, adapted for beasts of different sizes, since the victims were, during the operation, not to touch the ground; the animals were suspended on the hooks, and flayed on tables placed between the columns.[8]

### 9. Dissecting of the Animal (נְתִיחָה or נִתּוּחַ).[9]

If the entire animal was to be devoted to the flames, as was the case with burnt-offerings, the body was "cut into its pieces",[10] that is, into its natural limbs or members.[11] Although this arrangement probably originated in the eastern custom of serving up the meal cut into pieces or portions, and of roasting it in very small bits,[12] and was perhaps partially devised for placing the animal more conveniently upon the altar, and for facilitating its consumption by the fire; it is

---

1 Lev. IV. 11, 12, 20, 21; comp. VIII. 17; IX. 11.

2 *Plut.* Sympos. VI. 8; *Lucian,* De Sacrif. c. 13; *Pausan.* II. xi. 7.

3 Comp. Lev. IV. 26, 31, 35.

4 Comp. 2 Chr. XXIX. 34; see *Ebn Ezra* on Lev. I. 6.

5 So *Bähr,* Symb. II. 200, 351; *Knobel,* Lev. p. 343; *Keil,* Lev. p. 11; *Philippson,* Pent. p. 545.

6 Hence this process was called הרגיל.

7 See *Talm.* Bechor. 33*a* (where Rashi explains the term הרגיל thus: להפשט ראת הבהמה דרך הרגלים כל העור שלם).

8 See *Mishn.* Tamid III. 5; Middoth III. 5.

9 The Sept. has generally *μελίζειν*, the Greek technical term for the dissection of victims; Josephus (Ant. III. ix. 1) *διαμελίζειν*; comp. *Dion. Hal.* VII. 72; Philo (De Victim. c. 6) *ἡ εἰς μέλη τοῦ ζώου διανομή.*

10 נתח לנתחיה, Lev. I. 6; VIII. 20; IX. 13; comp. Exod. XXIX. 17.

11 *Targ. Onkel.* Lev. I. 6, ויפלג יתה לאיברהא; comp. Judg. XXIX. 29, ויתנתחה לעצמיה; *Philo* (De Victim. c. 5), inaccurately, *εἰς ὁλόκληρα μέρη διανεμέσθω.*

12 Comp. *Movers,* Opferwesen d. Carth. p. 96.

not impossible that it tended, besides, to make each member appear as a distinct offering, pleading in itself for Divine mercy,[13] in addition to the aggregate bulk of the animal. Hence the parts were probably not divided again into smaller pieces,[14] lest the victim appeared as a confused and chaotic mass of unseemly fragments.[15] Nor is it quite inconceivable that it was designed to characterise the sacrifice as a means of *covenant* between God and the offerer; for it is well known that compacts and treaties were frequently ratified by dissecting animals into pieces through which the contracting parties passed.[16] In thank- and expiatory offerings, the division of the victim into parts to be burnt upon the altar, and others to be handed over to the priest, was almost tantamount to dissection, which is therefore not specially enjoined with respect to those classes of sacrifice. If turtle-doves or pigeons were employed as a holocaust, the head was wrung off and burnt separately;[17] if as a sin-offering, the head was merely wrung at the neck, without, however, being separated from the body;[18] and in either case, the wings were only broken, without being severed entirely; for it evidently appeared expedient to consecrate to the holy flames the small body of the birds as complete as possible;[19] and the wings could scarcely be presented to God as a distinct offering. A proceeding analogous to

[13] Comp. Ezek. XXIV. 4.

[14] Comp. *Rashi* on Lev. I. 6, ולא נתחיה לנתחים; see also *Maimon.* Maas. Hakkorb. VI. 1—19.

[15] Hence tradition enjoined that the pieces of a holocaust should be so placed upon the altar as to resemble as nearly as possible the form of the living animal (see Sect. XIII. 3). We might understand in this sense the remark of Philo (l. c.), "The whole victim is given over to the flames on the altar, having become many things instead of one, and one instead of many" (*γεγονὼς καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς πολλὰ καὶ ἐκ πολλῶν ἕν*): but these terms have, no doubt, a mystical import admitting of various allegorising interpretations; the more so as Philo supposes the same rite to show "that all things are but one, or that they are derived from one and dissolved into one"; or that men are to thank God for the creation as a whole and for all its separate parts.

[16] Gen. XV. 10, 17, 18; Jer. XXXIV. 18—20; and Comm. on Gen. p. 367; to the passages there quoted may be added *Plut.* Quaest. Rom. 111 (*Βοιωτοῖς δὲ δημοσίᾳ καθαρμός ἐστι κυνὸς διχοτομηθέντος τῶν μερῶν διεξελθεῖν*); see also *Plut.* De Mulier. Virtut. cap. ult. (*Πύθεω γυνή*); also 1 Sam. XI. 7; and oaths were confirmed by touching the pieces of a dissected victim; in this manner Tyndareos made the suitors of his daughter Helena swear — *ἱστὰς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου τῶν τομίων*, *Pausan.* III. xx. 9; comp. *Demosth.* Aristocr. 68 (*στὰς ἐπὶ τῶν τομίων κάπρου καὶ κριοῦ καὶ ταύρου*); *Aeschin.* Fals. Legat. 87 (*τέμνοντας τὰ τόμια ... ἐξορκίζεσθαι*); *Paus.* IV. xv. 4 (*Ἡρακλέα ... ὅρκων ἐπὶ τομίων κάπρου ... δοῦναι καὶ λαβεῖν ... λέγουσιν*); *Hom.* Il. XIX. 197, etc.; comp. in general, *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. ii. 33, pp. 325, 326.

[17] Lev. I. 15.

[18] Lev. V. 8.

[19] Comp. Gen. XV. 10, ואת הצפר לא בתר.

dissection of quadrupeds, took place in the bloodless oblations that were baked in a pan; they were divided into pieces (פִּתִּים), before a part was burnt on the altar as a memorial.[1] Therefore, "an offering of pieces"[2] was common from early times, and remained in use during long periods.[3]

Some similar practices are found among other ancient nations. The sacrificial tablet of Marseilles enjoins that the honorary portion (משאת) "be cut off in pieces."[4] The Egyptians, on the great festival of Isis, cut off the legs, the extremity of the hips, the shoulders, and the neck of the victims; filled the body with fine bread, honey, raisins, figs, and various perfumes; burnt the latter with a profusion of oil, and consumed the pieces at a common banquet.[5] The Romans cut off morsels of meat[6] from the hip, the chine-bone, or other parts, and either burnt them on the altar or laid them before the gods as food.[7] The Greeks cut the animal into small pieces,[8] not at random, but according to certain well-devised rules,[9] probably in order that all who attended at the offering might obtain a piece; so at the great festival in honour of Zeus Polieus, the body of the bull sacrificed to the god, was divided into pieces and distributed among all.[10] In China, the large clay-cow which, at the grand vernal festival, was in solemn procession carried round richly decorated, was finally broken up into fragments which were allotted to the crowd.[11] The ancient Germans dissected the victim, offered one piece to the god, and left the rest to be consumed by the people.[12]

### 10. Washing of the Parts of the Victim (רְחִיצָה or מְדִיחָה).

The bowels and legs of holocausts, previous to being placed upon the altar, were carefully washed,[13] since they are chiefly liable to un-

---

1 Lev. II. 5, 6; VI. 14.

2 מִנְחַת פִּתִּים.

3 Comp. Comm. on VI. 12—16.

4 ובצועת קצרת, lines 4, 6, 13; or יקצרת, line 10.

5 *Herod.* II. 40.

6 Porriciae, prosiciae, or ablegmina.

7 See no. 12 of this Section; comp. *Voss*, Mythol. Briefe, II. p. 376.

8 *Μίστυλλόν τ' ἄρα τἆλλα*; *Hom.* Il. I. 465; II. 428; Od. III. 462; XII. 365; XIV. 430; etc.; *Apollon. Rhod.* Argon. I. 433 (*κόπτον, δαιτρεύοντε, καὶ ἱερὰ μῆρ' ἐτάμοντο*); *Dion. Hal.* VII. 72; and so *Virg.* Aen. I. 212 (pars in frusta secant).

9 Therefore the phrase *μίστυλλόν τ' ἄρ' ἐπισταμένως*, *Hom.* Il. VII. 317; XXIV. 623; etc.

10 Comp. *Porph.* De Abstin. II. 29.

11 *Du Halde*, Beschreibung des Chin. Reiches, III. 11.

12 *Grimm*, Deutsche Mythologie, pp. 27, 34.

13 Lev. I. 9; VIII. 21; IX. 14; comp. 2 Chr. IV. 6. In the second Temple this was done first privately in a special cell (לשכת מדיחים), and then openly on the marble tables placed before the colums on which the victim was flayed (p. 196); comp. *Mishn.* Shekal. VI. 4, שלשה עשר שלחנות היו

cleanness. This reason sufficed to suggest the law; it is hardly necessary to look for hidden motives or symbolical explanations, such as are pointed out by Philo,[14] who supposes that the cleaning of the bowels exhorts us to purify our appetites, while the cleaning of the feet signifies that "we must no longer walk upon the earth, but soar aloft through the air" by following the impulses of the soul which yearns for Divine truth and longs "to move in concert with the sun, the moon, and all the rest of the most sacred and most harmonious company of the stars, under the immediate command and government of God." As a necessary preliminary to being placed upon the altar, all the offerings were salted, and thus rendered fit to serve as a covenant between God and the worshipper.[15]

### 11. The Rite of Waving (תְּנוּפָה).[16]

Certain offerings or portions of offerings mostly belonging to the eucharistic class, before being put upon the altar, were to pass through a ceremony which the Levitical law calls *waving*. The rite is not described in the Bible; but according to Jewish tradition, it was performed in the following manner. The priest placed the offering in the hands of the offerer,[17] and his own hands under the offerer's hands, after which he made first a motion forward and backward,[18] and then upward and downward,[19] which rites were supposed to indicate, first, that the offering was really the gift of him who presented it; secondly, that it was laid before God by His chosen priests, to whose share it partially fell;[20] and lastly, that it was devoted to the Lord of heaven and earth who rules in every sphere and region;[21] while in the waving of the firstfruit-sheaf, the movement to and fro is said to have been designed to avert obnoxious winds,[22] the movement upwards and down-

במקדש שמנה של שיש בבית המטבחים שעליהן מדיחין את הקרבים.

14 De Victim. c. 6.

15 See Sect. IX. 1; comp. *Talm.* Menach. 21*a* (היין והדם והעצים והקטרת אין טעונין מלח).

16 Sept. *ἀφαίρεμα, ἀφόρισμα, ἐπίθεμα*; see *infra*.

17 Comp. Exod. XXIX. 24; Lev. VIII. 27; hence the Sept. *ἐπίθεμα* (Lev. VIII. 29; comp. VII. 30, *ἐπιτιθέναι δόμα*). If several persons presented one sacrifice together, one of them only performed the waving in the name of all (comp. *Mishn.* Menach. IX. 9, אחד מניף לכל החברים), whereas in such cases all took part in the imposition of the hand (see p. 176).

18 מוליך ומביא. 19 מעלה ומוריד.

20 Comp. Lev. VII. 34.

21 Comp. *Talm.* Succ. 37*b*, מוליך ומביא למי שהארבע רוחות שלו מעלה ומוריד למי שהשמים והארץ שלו; *Abarban.* on Lev. XXIII. 20, p. 57*a* (לששת צדדי העולם להראות כי ליהוה הארץ ומלואה); *Witsius*, Miscc. I. 503 (Deo omnia implenti, omnia tuenti et possidenti victima rite porrecta fuit); see also *Bähr*, Symb. II. 376—378.

22 כדי לעצר רוחות רעות.

wards, to avert injurious dews.[1] This rather complex conception is hardly in harmony with the spirit of the Pentateuch. On the one hand, the offerer did not at all co-operate in the rite, which was exclusively performed by priests even in absolutely private offerings.[2] On the other hand, the Hebrew term does not authorise a movement to the four parts of the globe, but merely one forward and backward,[3] it may be, several times repeated, to mark the gift as *presented* and *dedicated* to God, since men also were "waved."[4]

The following oblations, including both animals or portions of them and vegetables, were associated with the ceremony: the firstfruit-sheaf offered on the second day of Passover;[5] the two firstfruit-loaves presented on Pentecost, and the two lambs which accompanied them;[6] particularly the breast of the ordinary thank-offerings,[7] to which, in the ram of consecration of Aaron and his sons, and in the thank-offerings at the conclusion of the priests' installation, the fat and fat parts, and the right shoulder were exceptionally added;[8] the cereal offerings which accompanied the ram of consecration,[9] the fore-shoulder (זְרוֹעַ) of the ram together with the cereal oblation presented at the comple-

---

[1] כדי לעצר טללים רעים, *Talm.* Menach. 62*a*.

[2] Comp. Lev. XIV. 12, 24; Num. V. 25; VI. 20; etc.

[3] Comp. Isai. X. 15; XI. 15; XIX. 16.

[4] Num. VIII. 10—21; see *infra*; comp. Exod. XXIX. 24, 26, 27; Isai. XLV. 6; Ps. CXIII. 3; Mal. I. 11; also Genes. XLIX. 25; Deut. XXXIII. 13. Hence תנופה is simply a dedicated gift (Exod. XXXV. 22; XXXVIII. 24, 29; Num. XVIII. 11), synonymous with תרומה (comp. Num. XXXI. 52 and Exod. XXXVIII. 24). The view was once extensively upheld, and by a strange anachronism has still its supporters, that the תנופה took the significant form of the cross (comp. *Vitring*. Obss. Sacr. Lib. II. c. 16, p. 457; *Neumann* Sacr. Vet. T. Salut. p. 38); but it was merely assumed from dogmatical or typical conjectures, without the slightest foundation in fact or argument. Michaelis (Suppl. p. 1615) explains the word from a Syriac etymology "depositio rei sacrae ante Jovam et altare"; but the act of offering or surrendering the oblation was more essential than that of placing it upon the altar; besides the waving and the placing on the altar are mentioned as two separate operations (Num. V. 25). Keil (Lev. p. 51; Arch. I. 244), Öhler (in Herz. X. 640), Hofmann (l. c. p. 283), a. o. believe that, while the movement forward indicated the devotion of the gift to God, the movement backward symbolised that it was taken back and given over by God as a present to the priests, His servants (comp. also Kliefoth, Lit. Abh. IV. 59); but the rite has exclusive reference to the altar, not to the priests. — On להניף in Lev. VII. 30, see Comm. in loc.

[5] Lev. XXIII. 11.

[6] Lev. XXIII. 17, 20.

[7] Lev. VII. 30, 34.

[8] Exod. XXIX. 22, 26; Lev. VIII. 25, 29; IX. 21. From these extraordinary sacrifices it can hardly be concluded, that the fat was always, much less that everything intended for the altar, was waved or heaved.

[9] Exod. XXIX. 23, 24; Lev. VIII. 26.

tion of the Nazirite's vow;[10] the lamb and the log of oil brought by the leper after his recovery;[11] and lastly the offering of jealousy presented by the suspected wife.[12] With the exception of the last, all these sacrifices were, or bore the character of thank-offerings, in which indeed a symbolical acknowledgment of the blessings bestowed by the Lord of Creation was eminently appropriate.[13] Whenever the rite was performed with the entire victim, it preceded the slaughtering.[14] In some cases, the offerings so hallowed were burnt on the altar,[15] while in others, they belonged to the priests.[16] Thus the ceremony, from whatever point it may be viewed, manifests itself as a consecration and surrendering of the gift to God. But its character is still more distinctly revealed by the fact that the Levites also, on their initiation into their solemn functions, underwent the same procedure: for Moses was commanded, "Thou shalt bring the Levites before the Lord; and the children of Israel shall put their hands upon the Levites; and Aaron shall wave the Levites[17] as a wave-offering before the Lord from the children of Israel, that they may execute the service of the Lord":[18] which words leave no doubt with regard to the deeper meaning of this peculiar act. The shew-bread was not waved, because it was marked as holy to God by the very place which it occupied on the golden table of the Sanctuary; nor was the holocaust or the bloodless oblation of the High-priest and the priests at their consecration waved, because they were burnt entirely to God; nor the bloodless offering that accompanied a holocaust or thank-offering, because the latter were sufficiently characterised as sacred; nor the expiatory offerings, whether animal or vegetable, because they were no "food of the Lord."[19]

---

[10] Num. VI. 20.

[11] Lev. XIV. 12, 24.

[12] Num. V. 25. Comp. *Mishn.* Menach. IX. 9, תנופה נוהגת בקרבנות היחיד ובקרבנות הצבור, בחיים ובשחוטים, בדבר שיש בו רוח חיים ובדבר שאין בו רוח חיים.

[13] That most of the portions waved were not consumed on the altar, but surrendered to the priests, makes little difference in the matter; for after they had once been dedicated to God, He disposed of them according to His pleasure; see no. 14 of this Sect.

[14] Comp. Lev. XIV. 12, 13, 24, 25; XXIII. 20. According to the Mishnah (Menach. V. 7), the private thank-offerings were heaved when killed, the public thank-offerings either alive or killed, and the trespass-offering of the leper alive.

[15] Exod. XXIX. 22, 24; Lev. VIII. 25, 26.

[16] Lev. VII. 31, 34; IX. 21; X. 14, 15; XXIII. 11, 20; Num. V. 25; VI. 20; XIV. 12, 24; comp. also Exod. XXIX. 26; Lev. VIII. 29.

[17] Probably by making them walk forward and backward before the altar, but hardly by conducting them up the elevation that leads to it, or to the door of the Sanctuary, since the Levites officiated before, not at the altar, and in the Court, not in the Holy.

[18] Num. VIII. 10, 11.

[19] See Sect. XV.

## 12. The Rite of Heaving (תְּרוּמָה).

In some passages the rite of *heaving* is mentioned in conjunction with that of waving. It is in the Pentateuch no more described than the latter; nor does the etymology of the term suggest a clear notion; for it merely implies that the offering was passed upwards and downwards, or more probably that it was raised to or towards the altar, which was high,[1] in order to dedicate it to God.[2] The various conjectures hazarded are purely imaginative.[3] The ceremony took place, except in a few extraordinary cases,[4] with the right shoulder of thank-offerings, after which this belonged to the priest.[5]

It is, however, probable that originally the identical rite of waving (תנופה) was performed both with the right shoulder and with the breast, those two chief portions of the victim, which in thank-offerings were allotted to the priests,[6] evidently after those parts had been placed upon the fat and the fat pieces;[7] for the term תרומה, occasionally employed in connection with the shoulder, signifies merely the consecrated gift or the offering;[8] and it is used in this sense with reference

---

1 Comp. Lev. IX. 22, וירד; p. 174.

2 Comp. *Ebn Ezra* on Exod. XXIX. 27, ואין הונף כמו הורם כי יורם למעלה ולא יונף.

3 As an instance may be mentioned Neumann's explanation (l. c. p. 38) "Si תנופה eam contrectat Dei revelationem, quae Hebraeis nomine יהוה adoratur, תרומה tendit ad obscuros horrores, qui in appellatione אלהים conferuntur: ubi junguntur, nomen judicii cum nomine gratiae unitum apparet"; a conceit not unworthy of the most uncritical age and school; comp. also Michaelis on Lev. VII. 34, "Presents might be humbly presented to a king, either by lifting them up to his throne, or by laying them down at his feet"; but the latter meaning does not lie in the derivation of תנופה, from נוף *to turn, to move*.

4 Lev. VIII. 25, 29; IX. 21; see *supra*.

5 Lev. VII. 30—34; X. 15.

6 Exod. XXIX. 24; Lev. VIII. 27; Num. VI. 20; see notes on Lev. X. 12—15.

7 Lev. IX. 20, 21; X. 15.

8 Lev. VII: 14; Num. XVIII. 8, 11; so that תרומה is formed from הרים as מַשָּׂא from נשא; and is, therefore, an equivalent of תנופה (see *supra*), with which it is sometimes employed promiscuously (comp. Exod. XXXV. 21, 24 and 22; XXXVIII. 24 and Num. XXXI. 52; see Num. XVIII. 11. Ewald (Alterth. p. 79) translates תנ׳ and תר׳ aptly Weihung und Schenkung; Sept. generally ἀφόρισμα καὶ ἀφαίρεμα, though it does not consistently maintain the distinction between the two notions; Vulg. in Exod. XXIX. 24 explains rather than translates the words והנפת אתם תנופה by et sanctificabis eos elevans coram Domino. On the Punic tablet of Marseilles, משאת occurs repeatedly for *honorary portion of sacrificial meat* (from נשא in the sense of *vocem tollere, to vow, to dedicate*; *Levy*, Phoen. Stud. III. pp. 45, 60; see *supra* p. 72 note 3; comp. מַשְׂאֵת, Gen. XLIII. 34; 2 Sam. XI. 8; see also Jer. XL. 5; Am. V. 11; Esth. II. 18; *Movers*, Opferwes. der Carth. pp. 89—91, 127, 128), though in other Phoenician inscriptions that word is used as a synonym of נדר *vow*.

to all oblations presented to God and to all imposts paid to the priests,[9] to taxes consisting of animals and productions of the soil, as firstborn beasts and tithes, of gold and silver, of territory and pious contributions of any kind.[10] However, it seems impossible to deny[11] that in several passages the *heaving* (תרומה) appears as a distinct ceremony in some way analogous to the *waving* (תנופה); as, for instance, "Thou shalt sanctify the breast of the wave-offering, and the shoulder of the heave-offering, which is waved and which is heaved up, of the ram of consecration";[12] here the parallel cannot be mistaken, and it must be admitted that Hebrew ritualists of a later date, deriving תרומה from הֵרִים not in the meaning of *giving* and *presenting*, but of *lifting up*, understood it as the rite of heaving, in the sense above described:[13] but we need hardly remark that it would be erroneous to attribute this meaning to the word everywhere, as has been done both by ancient and recent writers.[14]

No decided analogy to the Hebrew rites of waving and heaving can be discovered among other nations. The supposed allusions on the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles are too uncertain for clear inferences.[15]

---

[9] Num. XV. 19, 20; XVIII. 19, 24, 26 *sqq.*; Deut. XII. 6, 11, 17; Neh. X. 38; XII. 44; XIII. 5; Sept. in Exod. XXV. 2 *ἀπαρχαί firstfruits*; in Exod. XXX. 13 *εἰσφορά tax.*

[10] Exod. XXV. 2—7; XXX. 13—15; XXXV. 5, 21, 24; XXXVI. 3, 6; Lev. XXII. 12; Num. V. 9; XXXI. 28, 41, 52; Isai. XL. 20; Ezek. XX. 40; XLV. 1, 13, 16; XLVIII. 8—12, 20; Mal. III. 8; Ezra VIII. 25; and הֵרִים with מִן means simply *to take off* (Lev. II. 9 — like קמץ in ver. 2 — IV. 8, 10 — like הסיר in vers. 31, 35 — 19; VI. 8; Num. XVIII. 26, 30, 32; comp. also Lev. IV. 8 and III. 3); so that תרומה would be *a portion set apart* to God, (thus Onkelos אַפְרָשׁוּתָא, in Exod. XXV. 2; XXX. 13; XXXV. 21; Lev. VII. 34; etc.; Sept. *ἀφαίρεμα* in Ex. XXXV. 21; Germ. *Abhub*; though this does not apply to Num. XXXI. 50, 52, where all the gold was a תרומה); and הרים with לַיהוָה *to dedicate to God* (Lev. XXII. 15), like הניף ליהוה (Exod. XXXV. 22; comp. Num. VIII. 13); whereas the phrase הֵרִים אל־יהוה or לִפְנֵי יהוה never occurs.

[11] As has been done by Gesenius (Thes. p. 1277, although in an earlier part of his work, Thes. p. 866, he seems to incline to the received opinion); Knobel (Comm. p. 413); Öhler (l. c. p. 641), F. W. Schultz (Das Deuteronomium erklärt, pp. 397, 398); see, on the other hand, *Kurtz*, Opferc. §§ 133—138, where, however, not all arguments are equally acceptable.

[12] Exod. XXIX. 27; comp. Lev. VII. 34; X. 14, 15; Num. VI. 20.

[13] It is not impossible that they "connected the waving with God's dwelling in the Tabernacle among His people, but the heaving with His residing in heaven" (*Kurtz* l. c. p. 234).

[14] As Reland (Antiqq. Sacr. III. i. 17), Carpzov (Appar. pp. 709 *sqq.*), Outram (De Sacrif. p. 162), *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 135—137, Bähr (Symb. II. 355 *sqq.*), *Ewald* (Alterth. pp. 79—81), Winer (Real-Wört. II. 677, 678), *Kurtz*, (l. c. § 136), a. o.

[15] Supposed even that the words in line 20, כל כהן אש יקח משאת בר צל אש שת בפס וו נע, are to be translated "every priest who takes an honorary

It is true, the Romans designated the act of offering to the gods the entrails of victims, or of laying them upon the altar or at any other appropriate place, by the special and technical term *porricere*;[1] but that term, merely retained from the old religious phraseology,[2] implied no ceremony or fixed form of dedication. The eastern and imaginative character of the Hebrews was more fertile and inventive in significant religious symbols.

### 13. The Burning of the Offering.[3]

The sacrificial rites were completed by the combustion of the offering or of those parts of it that were destined for the deity. Though common to animal and vegetable sacrifices, the act and its meaning are best understood in reference to the former. In bringing the victim to the door of the Sanctuary, the worshipper signified his intention of devoting it to God; by the imposition of the hand he marked it as his own gift and his substitute; as such he proved and surrendered it by the act of killing; then the sprinkling of the blood signified the devo-

portion, single, roasted in fire, puts it into the hand of him who moves", it is impossible to ascertain the nature and object of that "moving"; were it analogous to הניף or הרים, we should expect a causative form הנע, not the intransitive נע; besides, waving and heaving took place with the raw, not with roasted pieces. Movers (l. c. p. 126) explains, "it denotes the solemn manner in which the offerer, with the sacrificial portions in his hands, moved in different directions, as if to seek the deity, at whatever part it might be, and to invite his acceptance of the gift" (comp. pp. 124, 125); but תנופה and תרומה imply the moving of the oblation, not of the offerer.

[1] For porrigere, projicere; comp. *Macrob.* III. 2, et ex disciplina haruspicum, et ex praecepto pontificum verbum hoc solemne sacrificantibus est; Varro (R. R. I. 29) explains it, exta deis cum dabant, porricere dicebant; and Verranius (after Q. Fabius Pictor in *Macrob.* l. c.), exta porriciunto, diis danto in altaria aramve focumve, eove quo exta dari debebunt; comp. also *Virg.* Aen. V. 237, 238 (Extaque salsos porriciam in fluctus), 775, 776; see also *Plaut.* Ps. I. iii. 34; *Liv.* XXIX. 27; therefore, *porrectum* was used in contradistinction to *profanum* (see *Festus* sub profanum); and *porriciae* were consecrated gifts, whether consisting of sacrificial pieces or other oblations, exactly like תנופה (see *Solin.* V. 23; *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 25, praesiciae, prosiciae).

[2] Like *commovere* (struem) and *obmovere* (ferctum), *Cat.* R. R. 134.

[3] The usual term for burning sacrifices on the altar is הִקְטִיר, that is, to make rise in *smoke* (comp. קִיטֹר *smoke*, Gen. XIX. 28; Ps. CXIX. 83); hence קְטוֹרָה (Deut. XXXIII. 10) or קְטֹרֶת *incense*, which was entirely burnt on the altar; and it is employed with reference to all classes of sacrifice (Lev. I. 9, 17; II. 2, 9; III. 5, 11, 16; IV. 10, 19, 26; V. 12; VI. 8, 15; VII. 5; etc.); whereas burning elsewhere and not in connection with the service of the altar is expressed by שרף (Exod. XII. 10; XXIX. 14, 34; Lev. IV. 12, 21; VI. 23; VIII. 17, 32; IX. 11; XVI. 27; Num. XIX. 5; etc.); comp. a similar distinction between profane and clerical terms in טבח and זבח, to slaughter for consumption and to kill as a sacrifice; a. o.

tion or wrought the justification of his soul; while lastly the burning, that is, not the annihilation[4] but the rising up of the offering in smoke, represented the soaring of the soul, cleansed and hallowed, heavenward to the throne of God, who graciously accepts the humble oblation. It indicated that the end of the sacrifice was fully attained;[5] for it practically gave up the sacrifice as "the food of God", and as "the offering made by fire, a sweet odour to the Lord." It was, therefore, the final consummation of the pious deed.[6] In holocausts and thank-offerings, it symbolised the worshipper's unlimited submission to God, whether in reverence or gratitude, but in expiatory sacrifices, it typified the complete removal or covering (כפר) of the transgressions thenceforward effaced in the sight of God.[7] It was equal in significance to the imposition of the hand and the sprinkling of the blood. For these three rites mirrored the chief stages in the inward transformation of the offerer — from his feeling of meek dependence or of sinfulness, through the hope of moral liberty and atonement, to the certainty of acceptance and spiritual regeneration. One of them possessed pre-eminent weight in one of the three chief classes of sacrifice — the burning in holocausts, the sprinkling of the blood in expiatory offerings, and the imposition of the hand in thank-offerings; and thus the specific character of each is unmistakably marked.[8] In any case a portion of the victim was burnt on the *altar*, and it was this circumstance that stamped the animal as a *sacrifice*[9] — in holocausts, the whole animal with the exception of the skin; in eucharistic and most of the expiatory offerings, the fat and some fat parts which might well be taken to represent the whole victim;[10] while in the most solemn of the sin-offerings, those killed for the High-priest or the whole people, the remaining flesh together with the hide was burnt, in a clean place, without the camp or town, where the ashes, temporarily preserved in the Court eastward of the brazen altar,[11] were poured out[12] by a priest

[4] Comp. *Kurtz* l. c. p. 125.

[5] Hence הקטיר is not only used as coordinate with זבח (1 Ki. III. 3, מזבח ומקטיר), but assumes the general sense of *sacrificing* (1 Ki. XIII. 1; Jer. XLVIII. 35; Hos. II. 15; 1 Chr. XXIII. 13; 2 Chr. II. 5; etc.).

[6] Considering the importance of this part of the ritual, Jewish tradition declared that the fire was to be put on the altar by priests, not by Levites, and not by less than two persons; see *Ebn Ezra* on Lev. I. 7.

[7] The ideas of substitution and vicarious suffering are expressed by the killing, not the burning of the victim.

[8] See pp. 1—4.

[9] Comp. p. 73.

[10] Comp. Isai. I. 11; see Sectt. XIII. XIV.

[11] Lev. I. 16, מְקוֹם הַדֶּשֶׁן.

[12] שֶׁפֶךְ הַדֶּשֶׁן; Lev. IV. 11, 12, 21; VI. 4; VIII. 17; IX. 11; see Sect. XV. In the time of the second Temple, there was a house for the reception of the ashes, בית הדשן (*Mishn.* Meil. II. 4; *Maimon.* Maas. Hakkorb. VII. 2, 3), or

not clad in his pontifical robes or his official garments of white linen, but in his ordinary dress;[1] for the flesh could, in those cases, not be burnt on the altar, nor within the camp or holy city which represented the community of God, because the victims had been laden with the punishment of those in whose name they had been offered:[2] yet it could be burnt in a clean spot only, because it was the flesh of sacrifices, which could never be divested of their sacred character, and inherently differed from ordinary animals.

The bloodless offering of the High-priest and the priests was burnt entirely;[3] for it could not be consumed by priests, because they were the offerers, nor could it be allowed to the Israelites, because none of them was entitled to touch the "food of God." In all other vegetable oblations, which, with a few remarkable exceptions, were invariably accompanied by incense and oil,[4] a small portion only, generally a hand-full, was burnt by the priest on the altar, together with all the frank-incense, as "a sweet odour" or as a "memorial" (אַזְכָּרָה) to God, significantly so called, because it was designed to bring the worshipper into the grateful remembrance of God,[5] whether the *minchah* was the usual cereal gift,[6] or the extraordinary offering presented in cases of conjugal jealousy,[7] or merely the frank-incense put on the shew-bread and then burnt.[8] This explanation, simple and obvious as it is, seems in harmony with the whole sacrificial ritual, and therefore preferable to the various conjectures that have been ventured; so it has been maintained that the "memorial" indicated the proclamation, diffusion, or praise of the name of God;[9] but the burnt portions, rising on the

---

בית השרפה (*Mishn.* Kerith. VI. 2; Yom. III. 2; VI. 7). The "red cow" intended for purposes of purification, was both killed and burnt without the camp (Num. XIX. 5, 9); it was brought into no connection with the altar, and it was therefore no sacrifice (see p. 194).

1 Lev. VI. 4, see Comm. in loc. This circumstance proves sufficiently that the ashes and its removal possessed no religious or symbolical character, though as the residue of that which had been consumed on the holy altar, the ashes claimed a certain consideration, and were therefore deposited in a clean place, and according to later regulations by a priest who had prepared himself by bathing (comp. *Mishn.* Tam. I. 2, מי שהוא רוצה לתרום משכים וטובל). Unnecessary are the speculative or typical interpretations of Baumgarten (Comm. p. 141), Michaelis (Typ. Gottesg. p. 75), Brentano (Comm. on IV. 12), a..o.

2 See Sect. XVIII.

3 Lev. VI. 15, 16.

4 See pp. 114—120.

5 Compare the pregnant phrase מַזְכִּיר לְבֹנָה (Isai. LXVI. 3) *he who offers incense as a memorial.* The אזכרה was, therefore, not meant "to testify the offerer's remembrance of God" (Vater): see notes on II. 1—3, Philological Remarks.

6 Comp. Lev. II. 2, 9, 16; VI. 8.

7 Num. V. 26.

8 Lev. XXIV. 7.

9 *Bähr*, Symb. II. 328.

altar as the principal or exclusive gift of the offerer, were meant to plead *his* cause, not to glorify God; it cannot be proved that the term was originally applied to frank-incense only, which typified the name of God, and that it was gradually extended to all the parts of the sacrifices which, like frank-incense, were burnt to God.[10] Nor do we require mysterious interpretations — for instance, that the burning of the sacrifice was "a yielding up to the Lord of the body with its members, powers, and instincts", to be purified from frivolity and sin by the fire of "the sacred and sanctifying spirit of God";[11] or that it intended to purify the *offering*, "the earthly elements" of which were said to remain behind, while "its proper essence rose to heaven in finest and aerial embodiment",[12] or "divested of its material form and changed from a terrestrial into a heavenly nature:"[13] the oblation, in itself pure, was delivered up to the fire not for its own sake, but for the relation it bore to the worshipper and to God. But we are utterly unable to understand the process of reasoning which suggested the opinion, that the burning of the sacrifice — the hope and means of grace — typified the *eternal punishment of hell,* wherefore the fire on the brazen altar, miraculously kindled by lightening from heaven, was to burn perpetually, and salt, the emblem of permanence,[14] was to be employed with every offering:[15] an opinion which confusedly throws the flesh of sin-offerings into the same category as the oil and incense of vegetable oblations, and which interprets the "sweet odour" ascending to God to mean the unspeakable and ever relentless torture of wretched sinners.

It is true that the smell of the burnt animals or of parts of them must have been most offensive;[16] we can well understand the surprise of strangers who asked, "whether the smoke and stench of burning hides, bones, bristles, fleeces, and feathers, a smell intolerable to the sacrificers themselves, could possibly be pleasing to the deity";[17] and

---

[10] See pp. 118—120.

[11] *Keil*, Archaeol. I. p. 210; comp. p. 231; Comm. on Lev. p. 17; similarly also Hirscher (Christl. Moral, I. p. 327); Hasenkamp, Kahnis (Dogm. I. 272 "the purification of man reconciled with God by the fire of the holy ghost"), Philippson (Pentat. p. 570, the burning is a symbol of the transition and the transformation of the visible and earthly into the invisible and Divine by means of purification). Kurtz (Opferc. pp. 130—132) has, if not retracted, at least modified, a similar opinion advocated in a previous work (Mos. Opfer, pp. 87 *sqq.*).

[12] *Kurtz*, l. c. p. 125.

[13] *Kliefoth*, l. c. p. 62.

[14] Comp. Lev. IX. 24, and Comm. in loc.; Sect. IX. 1.

[15] So *Michaelis*, Typische Gottesgelahrth. pp. 62—64; *Meyer*, Blätter für die höhere Wahrh. X. 51—53; *De Maistre*, Abendstunden, II. 354; and others; comp. Isai. LXVI. 24; Mark IX. 43—48; see *Bähr*, Symb. II. 349; *Kurtz*, Opferc. § 73.

[16] Comp. *Theodor*. Quaest. 62 in Exod.

[17] Comp. *Arnob*. Adv. Nat. VII. 16,

it is not impossible that the desire to counteract that ill-odour originally prompted the addition of the frank-incense.[1] But it ought to be remembered that the sacrifices had an ulterior or symbolical significance; that the burning of the victim or of its best parts, whatever the attendant circumstances, was an act of self-denial, or of pious submission, or of grateful acknowledgement, and that the physical inconvenience which it engendered, was utterly insignificant compared with the noble and spiritual ends desired.[2]

The sacrificial portions, unless placed before the gods as *lectisternia*,[3] were by most other nations also devoted to them by means of the flames; in which respect we find even the curious notion that the smoke of the burning oblation carried the worshipper's name to the knowledge and the abode of the deity.[4] The Thebans in Egypt buried in a sacred vault the ram which they annually killed in honour of Jupiter and Hercules;[5] and the Phocaeans in Tithorea buried in an appointed place the remains of victims killed at the festivals in honour of Isis.[6] The Scythians, after having strangled the victim completed the sacrifice, "without kindling any fire."[7] The Greeks generally buried the animals slain to propitiate the lower gods[8] or to ratify oaths;[9] and both Greeks and Romans threw the dedicated portions of victims destined for marine deities into the sea.[10] But flesh buried or thrown into the water is inseparable from putrefaction, a notion scrupulously avoided in connection with sacrifices;[11] while the burning not only makes the offering *rise* heavenward towards the Divine abode,[12] but

---

Ergone ille putor qui ex coriis tollitur, atque exspirat ardentibus, qui ex ossibus, qui ex setis, ex agnorum lanitiis gallinarumque deplumis, dei munus et honor est, mactanturque hoc illi quorum templa cum adire disponitis, ab omni vos labe puros, lautos castissimosque praestatis?; comp. cc. 15—17.

[1] See p. 118. [2] Comp. p. 8.

[3] See pp. 6, 7.

[4] Comp. *Lucian*, Ikaromen. c. 26, *ὁ καπνὸς ἀνιὼν ἀπήγγελλε τῷ Διὶ τοῦ θύοντος ἑκάστου τοὔνομα.*

[5] *Herod.* II. 42; comp. *Lucian*, De Sacrif. c. 15, *οἱ δὲ καὶ θάπτουσι μόνον ἀποσφάξαντες.* [6] *Pausan.* X. xxxii. 9.

[7] *Herod.* IV. 60; see p. 186.

[8] *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 9, *Νερτερίων κατάθαπτε, καὶ εἰς βόθρον αἷμα ἴαλλε*; and *καὶ θάπτειν τούτοις — τοῖς ὑποχθονίοις — θύσαντας τὰ σώματα*; comp. also *Pausan.* II. xxxi. 11.

[9] *Pausan.* III. xx. 9 (*ἐξορκώσας δὲ τὸν ἵππον κατώρυξεν ἐνταῦθα*); see p. 197.

[10] *Virg.* Aen. V. 237, 238, 775, 776; *Liv.* XXIX. 27 (secundum eas preces cruda exta victimae, uti mos est, in mare porricit); see p. 187.

[11] Comp. pp. 133, 134.

[12] Comp. עֹלָה *burnt-offering* (Section XIII); *Hom.* Il. I. 317 (*κνίση δ' οὐρανὸν ἷκεν ἑλισσομένη περὶ καπνῷ*); VIII. 549 (*κνίσην δ' ἐκ πεδίου ἄνεμοι φέρον οὐρανὸν εἴσω*); etc.; *Pind.* Isthm. III. (or IV) 110, 111 (*φλὸξ αἰθέρα κνισάντι λακτίζοισα καπνῷ*); *Lucian*, Sacrif. c. 9; Prometh. 5; Cauc. c. 19; see also pp. 6, 7. Tholuck (Das A. T. im N. T. p. 79) observes, "the rising smoke

secures a complete and perfect removal, free from all impurity,[13] on which subject more will be said in another place.[14]

## 14. Sacrificial Meals.

Lest any act connected with pious offerings should have been meaningless, a symbolical significance was attached even to those parts that were not burnt on the altar, but eaten either by priests or Israelites. Indeed sacrificial meals formed, in one of the chief classes of offering, the most prominent and characteristic feature. They could of course not take place in holocausts which were burnt on the altar entirely, with the exception of the skin;[15] nor in the most important sin-offerings —, those slain for the whole people or for the High-priest —, which were partly burnt on the altar and partly without the camp;[16] nor in the bloodless oblations of the High-priest and the common priests, which were also delivered to the flames entirely,[17] since they could appropriately be eaten neither by the offering Aaronites nor the inferior Israelites. But the meals were ordained in reference to all other offerings, though they differed in meaning and in the degrees of importance. The bloodless oblations presented by Israelites fell to the share of the priests, with the exception of the "memorial" (אַזְכָּרָה), and were to be consumed by the *males* among them alone, in the holy place, that is, in the Court of the Sanctuary, near the altar,[18] where the solemn act had been performed, and later in special cells at the side of the Court of the Temple;[19] for those oblations were "most holy":[20]

---

of sacrifices is not less an unconscious symbolism than the uplifting of the hands at prayers." The Greek verbs *θύειν to sacrifice*, and *θύειν to rush along* or *to rage*, seem to belong to different roots; for in the former the first syllable is predominantly short, in the latter long; *θύειν* can, therefore, hardly be explained to refer to the flame or smoke rising up from the altar (so *Curtius*, Gr. Etym. I. 224; *Benfey*, Gr. Wurzellexic. II. 271; *Pott*, Etymol. Forschungen, I. 1—211); since *θύειν* in the second meaning occurs only in connection with the rushing of wind or waves or blood (*Hom*. Od. XI. 420; XII. 400; Il. XXI. 234).

13 Comp. Lev. VII. 19; Zech. XIII. 9; Sir. II. 5; 1 Cor. III. 15.

14 See Comm. on VI. 1—11.

15 Lev. I. 6; VII. 8.

16 See p. 205.

17 Lev. VI. 15 (חק עולם ליהוה. כליל תקטר), 16 (כליל תהיה לא תאכל); comp. *Joseph*. Ant. III. ix. 4, *ἱερέως δὲ κομίσαντος καὶ ὁποσονοῦν, ὁλοκαυτεῖν ἀναγκαῖον.*

18 אצל המזבח, Lev. X. 12.

19 Comp. Ezek. XLII. 13, הנה לשכות הקדש אשר יאכלו שם הכהנים ··· קדשי הקדשים.

20 קדש קדשים, see p. 76; comp. Lev. II. 3, 10; VI. 9, 11; X. 12, 13. — The Mishnah (Zevach. XIV. 4—8; comp. Megill. I. 11) makes the following historical remark. After the Tabernacle had been erected, the "most holy" sacrifices were invariably eaten "within the curtains" of the sacred structure (לפנים מן הקלעים); but as regards the sacrifices of less holiness (קדשים קלים), the practice changed: while the Hebrews wandered in the

in which respect the provident arrangement was made that some of the oblations — namely those prepared in an oven, a pan, or a cauldron — were allotted to the officiating priest individually, while others — especially those consisting of flour only whether mixed with oil or not — were assigned to all the Aaronites collectively, to serve as their common sustenance.[1] In praise-offerings, four kinds of cake accompanied the animal sacrifice; one cake of each sort was delivered up to the priest who performed the sprinkling,[2] and who had to eat his portion also on the consecrated spot, near the Divine abode. Though in these cases the ordinances served chiefly the material subsistence of the elected tribe, they aimed also at hallowing the remains of the gifts that had been dedicated to God and which He graciously allowed to His servants. Analogous to these bloodless oblations were the trespass-offerings, the flesh of which belonged, in the first instance, to the acting priest, but might be shared by him with all the males of his order, and was to be consumed in the Court of the sacred edifice.[3]

But the case was different with respect to those less important sin-offerings of which no blood had been brought into the interior of the Sanctuary; the priests received as their portion all the flesh that had not been burnt on the altar, and they, the male Aaronites exclusively, were *bound* to eat it in the holy place,[4] to indicate by that meal, that they were the appointed mediators of propitiation between God and the Israelites; for God gave them the sin-offering "to remove the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord":[5] the repast was a part of their official functions; its omission was a grave offence and a criminal dereliction of duty certain to

---

desert, those offerings were consumed within the circumference of the camp; while the Tabernacle was in Gilgal, at any place; while in Shilo, anywhere in its vicinity from where the town was visible; while in Nob and Gibeon, in all cities of Israel; but when the ark was transferred to Jerusalem, within the walls of this town: in the last cases, the regulations included the second tithes also. It needs hardly to be remarked that these statements of the Mishnah are not based upon any, much less upon reliable tradition, but are purely speculative and obviously fanciful (comp. p. 29 note 24).

[1] Lev. VII. 9, 10; see Sect. XI.

[2] Lev. VII. 12—14.

[3] Comp. Lev. VII. 6, 7.

[4] Comp. *Mishnah*, Zevach. V. 3, ונאכלים לפנים מן הקלעים לזכרי הכהונה, adding בכל מאכל in whatever preparation (comp. X. 7, ובכלם הכהנים רשאים לשנות באכילתן לאכלן צלויים שלוקים ומבושלים וכ׳; see also 1 Sam. II. 13; 2 Chr. XXXV. 13), limiting, though without Scriptural authority, the time to the day of the sacrifices to midnight (ליום ולילה עד חצות), like the praise-offerings (see *infra*), and extending the same restriction to the trespass- and public thank-offerings and to cereal oblations (V. 5; VI. 1).

[5] Lev. X. 17; see *Philo*, Vict. 11.

provoke the dire anger of God.[6] — The nature of the sacrificial meal was still more marked in reference to eucharistic sacrifices (שְׁלָמִים); for it constituted their distinctive trait. It appears indeed that the public thank-offerings were entirely handed over to the priests, with the exception of the fat and fat parts which were burnt on the altar; this is at least certain with respect to the two lambs which, on Pentecost, were presented with the first-fruit loaves as שלמים,[7] and is fully in accordance with the character of the class, though a general and distinct precept is not given in the Pentateuch:[8] thus the public thank-offerings would, with regard to the meals, fall into the same category as the trespass-offerings. But the flesh of private thank-offerings was so divided that the fat and fat parts were burnt on the altar,[9] the right shoulder was surrendered to the officiating priest, and the breast to all the Aaronites as common provision,[10] while the remainder was left to the offering Israelite. Now the portions reserved to the priests could be eaten by them together with their families and servants, both males and females, at any place, provided it was levitically clean:[11] the meal had therefore not, like that connected with sin-offerings, an official or symbolical character, but it was merely designed for the external support of the priests and the maintenance of their households, or as a compensation and return for their services at the Sanctuary. But very different was the repast of the offering Israelite on such occasions. He had to eat his portions of the eucharistic sacrifice, within a fixed and limited time,[12] not only with his family, his wife, his sons, and his daughters, nor only with his man-servants and his maid-servants, but he was enjoined to invite also as his guests poor people, especially Levites who had no certain or regular income; the meal was to be held, not at any place the offerer might chose, but within the town of the common Sanctuary alone;[13] and all those who partook of it were rigidly ordered to be free from uncleanness, a contravention of which command was threatened with excision.[14] Similar regulations

---

6 Comp. Lev. X. 16—18; see also Sect. XV.

7 Lev. XXIII. 20.

8 Deut. XXVII. 7 does not harmonize with it; but 1 Ki. VIII. 63, being obviously an historical exaggeration, deserves no notice; see p. 6.

9 Lev. III. 3—5, 9—11, 14—16; VII. 31.

10 Lev. VII. 31—34; X. 14, 15.

11 Lev. X. 14; comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. V. 6, 7, המורם נאכל לכהנים לנשיהם ולבניהם ולעבדיהם.

12 Lev. VII. 15—18; XIX. 5—8; XXII. 29, 30; comp. Exod. XII. 10; XXIX. 34; Lev. VIII. 32.

13 Comp. *Mishn.* Kelim, I. 8, לפנים מן החומה ... שאוכלים שם קדשים קלים; or more fully Zevach. V. 6, 7, נאכלים בכל העיר לכל אדם בכל מאכל.

14 Comp. Lev. VII. 19—21; Deut. XII. 6, 7, 11, 12; comp. XVI. 11, 14; 1 Sam. IX. 12, 13, 19, 22—24; XVI. 3, 5 (התקדשו ובאתם אתי בזבח ויקדש את־ישי ואת־בניו); 2 Sam. VI. 18, 19.

obtained with regard to the tithes of corn, wine, and oil, the firstlings of the herds and flocks,[1] to vows and free-will gifts of any kind.[2] The character of these feasts cannot be mistaken; it was that of joyfulness tempered by solemnity, of solemnity relieved by joyfulness: the worshipper had submitted to God an offering from his property; he received back from Him a part of the dedicated gift, and thus experienced anew the same gracious beneficence which had enabled him to appear with his wealth before the altar; he therefore consumed that portion with feelings of humility and thankfulness; but he was bidden at once practically to manifest those blissful sentiments by sharing the meat not only with his household, which thereby was reminded of the Divine protection and mercy, but also with his needy fellow-beings, whether laymen or servants of the Temple. Thus these beautiful repasts were stamped both with religious emotion and human virtue. The relation of friendship between God and the offerer which the sacrifice exhibited, was expressed and sealed by the feast which intensified that relation into one of an actual *covenant;*[3] the momentary harmony was extended to a permanent union;[4] and these notions could not be expressed more intelligibly, at least to an eastern people, than by a common meal, which to them is the familiar image of friendship and communion, of cheerfulness and joy: thus when Isaac and Abimelech made a league, the former "gave a feast, and they ate and drank";[5] and when Jacob concluded a treaty with Laban, they made a pile of stones, "and they ate there upon the pile."[6] Thus the eucharistic repasts were the emblems of that community into which the sacrificer entered with the Deity; a conception found among other nations also.[7] Some critics have expressed an opposite view, contending that the offerer was not considered as the guest of God, but, on

---

[1] According to the Deuteronomist; see Treatise on Priesthood, section III.

[2] Deut. XII. 6, 7, 11, 12, 17, 18; comp. *Mishnah*, Zevach. V. 8.

[3] See pp. 2, 10. The Lord's Supper has by Christian writers been conceived as a sacrificial meal of a similar nature and import (comp. *Delitzsch*, Comm. zum Brief an die Hebr. pp. 747, 748), a view which is indeed not without foundation in the N. T., comp. 1 Cor. X. 16—21; see also John VI. 45—58.

[4] But it is inadmissible to speak of a "unio mystica" with God (so Kurtz), or of the "blessedness of the kingdom of heaven which it prefigures, since the earthly food, by having partially been given up to God, had become a symbol of the true celestial food" (Keil); in which exaggerations the truth which they imply is veiled, if not lost.

[5] Gen. XXVI. 28, 30.

[6] Gen. XXXI. 46; comp. Josh. IX. 14, 15; Ps. XXIII. 5; Matth. XXII. 4; Luke XIV. 15; *Bähr*, Symb. II. 373.

[7] For instance, among the Greeks; the Scholiast to Hom. Il. III. 310 observes, ἡγοῦντο γὰρ ὥσπερ συσσιτεῖσθαι τοῖς θεοῖς.

the contrary, God as the guest of the offerer:[8] but this is against the clear expressions of the Law; the sacrificer surrendered the whole victim to the Deity,[9] and confirmed his intention by burning on the altar the fat parts, which represented the entire victim; he could not well invite as his guests at once God and his household together with strangers; and the apostle Paul says distincly, "are not they who eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar" or "of the Lord's table?"[10] Philo observes, therefore, aptly: "the sacrifice, when once placed on the altar, is no longer the property of the person who offered it, but belongs to Him to whom the victim is sacrificed, who, being a beneficient and bounteous God, makes the whole company of those who offer the sacrifice, partakers at the altar and messmates, only admonishing them not to look upon it as their own feast, for they are but stewards of the feast, and not the entertainers."[11]

The matter being so understood by the Hebrews, a participation in the meals of idolatrous sacrifices was deemed a fatal offence;[12] for it was almost tantamount to the acknowledgment and worship of heathen gods; the Israelites who shared the feasts of Baal-Peor in the time of Moses, were represented as having been directly devoted to the service of that idol; the Moabites "called the people to the sacrifices of their gods; and the people ate and bowed down to their gods; and Israel joined himself to Baal-peor";[13] for which aberration they had to atone by a fearful pestilence.[14] The pious, therefore, scrupulously avoided the repasts of heathen sacrificers;[15] nay, as a matter of precaution, they shunned all convivial intercourse with idolaters, from fear that any of the viands or of the wine had been dedicated to some heathen deity,[16] since meat of sacrificial animals was frequently offered for public sale. But the early pagan converts to Christianity could not so easily disengage themselves from a habit so deeply ingrained in their lives and minds; they often joined their heathen friends at the meals held in the temples of their idols;[17] and they more commonly attended their sacrificial feasts in their own houses.[18] The apostles struggled perseveringly

---

[8] So *Hofmann*, Schriftbew. II. i. 229; *Hengstenb.* Opfer, p. 40; *Neumann*, Sacra V. T. Salut. p. 37; *Tholuck*, l. c. p. 88; *Öhler*, l. c. p. 642; *Keil*, Archäol. I. 250, 251; comp., on the other hand, *Bähr*, Symb. II. 373, 374; *Kurtz*, Opferc. pp. 134—139; see 1 Cor. X. 16—21.

[9] Comp. Lev. III. 1, 6, 7, 12; VIII. 12, 29; see also XXI. 22.

[10] 1 Cor. X. 18, 21; comp. Mal. I. 12.

[11] *Philo*, De Victim. c. 8, *ἐπίτροποι γὰρ εὐωχίας εἰσίν, οὐχ ἑστιάτορες.*

[12] Exod. XXXIV. 14, 15.

[13] Num. XXV. 1—3; comp. Ps. CVI. 28, 29.

[14] Num. XXV. 9; Ps. CVI. 29, 30.

[15] Tob. I. 10—12. [16] Dan. I. 12; etc.

[17] 1 Cor. VIII. 10; *Plaut.* Rud. Prol. 60—62, II. iii. 13; Poenul. II. i. 44.

[18] 1 Cor. X. 21, 27, 28.

to eradicate the dangerous propensity; they emphatically enjoined all their followers "to abstain from meats offered to idols",[1] which they also called "pollutions of idols."[2] Nevertheless, more distant congregations remained in uncertainty or disagreement on the matter; and the Corinthians, agitated by serious disputes, invoked the advice and decision of St. Paul; for some maintained that as the idols are "nonentities" or "nothings"[3] and imaginary phantoms, with which a covenant or communion is an impossibility, the sacrifices offered to them can have no reality or force, and they might, therefore, without danger be shared by believers; while others were not disposed to take this view of the nature of the heathen deities. Now St. Paul indeed permitted the Christians to buy and to eat all meat that was offered to them even by heathens, "without asking questions for conscience sake";[4] but if they were informed or convinced that it was meat of victims presented to idols, they were rigidly to abstain from it, for, he said, "You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils, you cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils";[5] it is true that "an idol is nothing in the world",[6] since "there is no other God but one";[7] but there are many persons weak enough to consider the idols as real beings, and who, therefore, by eating meat sacrificed in their honour "defile their conscience";[8] therefore the intelligent also should eschew such meals, because their presence at them might mislead the feeble and become to them a stumbling-block;[9] moreover, though the idols are nothing, yet "the gentiles offer the things which they sacrifice to devils", with whom the Christians ought to have no fellowship whatever.[10] Yet in spite of this thoughtful and decided opinion of the apostle, the objectionable habit lingered for centuries in many congregations.

From these remarks alone it will be sufficiently obvious how common and far-spread sacrificial repasts were among heathen nations.[11] They formed indeed an essential element in pagan religions. In Greece and Rome, it was customary, whether the offerer held the feast within the precincts of the temple, or, as was more frequently the case, at his own house,[12] to send a portion of the meal to friends as a pre-

[1] *Εἰδωλόθυτα*, Acts XV. 29; XXI. 25.

[2] *Ἀλισγήματα τῶν εἰδώλων*, Acts XV. 20.

[3] אֱלִילִים, see Comm. on Exod. p. 103; comp. Lev. XIX. 4 (אלילים); Deut. XXXII. 21 (לא־אל or הבלים).

[4] 1 Cor. X. 25, 27.

[5] 1 Cor. X. 21.

[6] *Οὐδὲν εἴδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ.*

[7] VIII. 4; X. 19.

[8] VIII. 7, *ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ... μολύνεται.*

[9] VIII. 9—13; X. 23, 24.

[10] X. 20.

[11] Comp. Exod. XXXIV. 15; Num. XXV. 2; 1 Cor. VIII. 10.

[12] Comp. *Aristoph.* Plut. 227, 228; *Plaut.* Poen. II. i. 44; III. iii. 3.

sent;[13] and it was considered an act of mean and niggardly shamelessness to forget the acquaintances on such occasions.[14] The old Teutons, eager to feast in honour of the gods and to offer food for their statues to whom they not only attributed human reason and speech, but also human wants and desires, peculiarly extended and developed the sacrificial repasts,[15] at which they indulged in wild and noisy mirthfulness,[16] in music, dance, and varied games; which they frequently employed for conciliating the feuds of enemies; and which were commonly held on the fresh graves of the departed, as the notorious funeral solemnities of the Suedes and Danes repeated every nine years and disgraced by human sacrifices. The German converts to Christianity clung long and tenaciously to their ancestral habits; they rendered necessary rigorous edicts of the popes, and the imposition of heavy penalties by Christian princes; yet the former found it expedient to permit believers, if compelled by force, to eat of heathen offerings provided that in doing so they made the sign of the cross; or they judiciously transformed the public feasts of sacrifice, which were principally celebrated to mark the chief phases in the course of the sun, or the seasons with their produce,[17] into Christian festivals or days of penitence,[18] as for instance the splendid repasts in the middle of the winter[19] into Christmas, the vernal banquet of the Norwegians into Easter, and that of midsummer[20] into Pentecost. Thus sacrificial festivities were, far into the middle ages, celebrated in honour of Christ, of the virgin Mary, and especially of the saints, whose birthdays and anniversaries were commonly transferred to such days on which heathen feasts had previously been held; and a remnant of the grand sacrificial revelries kept by the old Norwegians in mid-summer, has been preserved to this day on the island of Bornholm, where it is annually solemnised, on the 24th day of June, in a grove and enclosure in the parish of Rutha.[21]

---

[13] *Theocr.* V. 139—141; *Plut.* Arat. 15; Agesil. 17 (*ἔθυσεν... καὶ διέπεμπε μερίδας τοῖς φίλοις ἀπὸ τῶν τεθυμένων*); *Plaut.* Mil. glor. 711 (sacruficant, dant inde partem mihi majorem quam sibi). Aristotle supposed that *μεθύειν* was derived from *μετὰ τὸ θύειν*, because men used wine "after sacrificing" (*Athen.* Deipnos. II. 11).

[14] Comp. *Theophr.* Char. 9. An exception was permitted at the sacrifices in honour of Hestia; comp. *Hesych.* sub Ἑστία; *Zenob.* Prov. IV. 44.

[15] Or *Gildi*, that is, common meals.

[16] Hence called *Blot-fagnadur*, that is, joy of sacrifice.

[17] Comp. *Wachter*, in Ersch u. Grub. Encycl. III. iv. 134, 135.

[18] Comp. *Beda*, Hist. Eccles. Lib. I. c. 30.

[19] Jul or Jol, or in Norway Midsvetrar-blot or Therrablot.

[20] The Midsommergilde.

[21] Comp. *Wachter*, l. c. pp. 130—138. — On the paschal sacrifice of the Hebrews and the repast connected with it, see Sect. XVII; comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. V. 8, הפסח אינו נאכל אלא בלילה וכ׳.

## XI. THE BLOODLESS OFFERING (מִנְחָה or קָרְבַּן מִנְחָה).[1]

### 1. Its general character.

Vegetable offerings presented to the Deity from early ages, were at least co-eval with animal sacrifices.[2] But in the course of time, the latter class was regarded as peculiarly acceptable, not only because of its superior value, implying a higher degree of self-abnegation, but also on account of the power of atonement specially attributed to the blood. Therefore vegetable oblations were predominantly presented by people of humbler means, and probably formed but a subordinate gift even of agriculturists. Gradually, however, the notion evidently prevailed that, as human repasts do not consist of meat alone, but require the addition of vegetable or cereal food and of wine, all sacrifices offered to the Deity ought to be composed of the same leading elements. Hence the Greeks and Romans invariably accompanied

---

[1] From מָנַח *to present a gift* (comp. Gen. XXXII. 14, 19; XLIII. 11; Judg. III. 15; hence Sept. ξένιον in 2 Ki. VIII. 8; Hos. X. 6; see *J. C. Volbroth*, De sacrificio farreo Hebraeorum cum similibus aliarum gentium ritibus comparato, pp. 12—14; Sept. in Neh. XIII. 5 and 2 Chr. VII. 7 μαναά, comp. in the old religious language of the Romans *porriciae*, the parts of the victim laid before the gods, from *porricere* for *projicere*, see p. 204), not from נחה *to lead up* (Buxtorf), nor from נח *to submit, to show submission* (Mecklenburg). Although the term מִנְחָה *gift* originally comprised all vegetable oblations of whatever kind (comp. Gen. IV. 3), nay applied to all, even to animal, sacrifices (Gen. IV. 5; perhaps also 1 Ki. XVIII. 29; 2 Ki. III. 20; Dan. IX. 21; see p. 72; comp. however, p. 36, and *infra*; hence Sept., generally, θυσία or δῶρον θυσία, or προσφορά, Aq. δῶρον, and Vulg. oblatio or oblatio sacrificii or sacrificium, Lev. II. 3), it is in the Levitical law restricted to *cereal* offerings, whether consisting of roasted ears of corn or plain flour, of cakes, bread, or flour prepared in various ways (therefore the Sept. σεμίδαλις in Lev. IX. 4; Isai. I. 13; LXVI. 3, the Vulg. simila in Lev. IX. 4, the Syriac translation has סמידא or קורבן דסמידא *oblatio similae*, Michael. Mehlopfer, besides unblutiges Opfer). The rendering of Luther and the English Version — Speisopfer, meat-offering — appears in some way to qualify the general term, without however removing its indistinctness; yet the sacrificial tablets of Marseilles (line 12) and of Carthage (l. 9) have the combination זבח צר an (animal) sacrifice with (vegetable) food (צר = צִיר or צֵדָה, Ps. CXXXII. 15; Neh. XIII. 15; Gen. XLV. 21; Exod. XII. 39; etc.; Arab. زاد), besides זבח שמן a sacrifice with oil, whether the oil was mixed with it (corresponding to חלת לחם שמן in Exod. XXIX. 23; Lev. VIII. 26, or בלולות בשמן in Exod. XXIX. 2), or formed an accompanying libation: the inscription of Carthage has also זבח במנחה (line 10).

[2] Comp. Gen. IV. 3; see Sect. II: the comprehensiveness of the original meaning of the term מנחה bespeaks also a period when vegetables formed the principal *gifts* or *sacrifices*; as the history of sacrifices naturally suggests.

animal sacrifices with salted grits;[3] and the Levitical law ordained that all usual holocausts and thank-offerings, whether presented on ordinary days or on sabbaths and festivals,[4] whether in consequence of vows or as voluntary gifts, whether by Israelites or strangers, should be supplemented by vegetable and drink-offerings;[5] it never omitted to repeat that injunction with respect to the regular and public burnt-offerings, those killed every morning and evening,[6] on every sabbath[7] and day of the new-moon,[8] on the three great agricultural festivals,[9] on the "Day of Memorial", the first of the seventh month,[10] and the Day of Atonement;[11] and it extended the regulation to a variety of special sacrifices, as those presented after recovery from leprosy, or at the end of the Nazirites time of seclusion.[12] The cereal oblation was, with regard to the quantity of the materials, nicely varied according to the species of animals which composed the bloody sacrifice, and increased in proportion to their numbers, that it might strikingly retain its character as a subordinate accessory. For the Law prescribed that each lamb or goat was to be accompanied by a *minchah* of one tenth of an ephah of flour, mingled with one fourth of a hin of oil; each ram by two omers of flour, mingled with one third of a hin of oil; and each bullock by three omers of flour, mingled with half a hin of oil: if more than one animal was sacrificed, the *minchah* was to be multiplied accordingly.[13] It is evident that these arangements were based on customs dating from very remote epochs, when the idea of sacrifice was still associated with the rude and gross conception of food offered to the deity;[14] though this view is neither sanctioned in the Pentateuch, nor attributable to the Levitical legislators.[15] Bloodless offerings were, however, ordered only with quadrupeds; they do not seem to have been ordinarily coupled with birds, probably because the latter

---

[3] The οὐλαί or οὐλοχύται, mola salsa; see p. 112, note 9.

[4] Comp. Num. XV. 3, במועדיכם; the contrary views (*Maimon.* Praef. in Zevach., Maas. Hakkorb. c. 3) are therefore unscriptural.

[5] Num. XV. 3—9, 14—16; comp. Lev. VII. 12, 13.

[6] Exod. XXIX. 40, 41; and hence called מנחת תמיד.

[7] Num. XXVIII. 9.

[8] Num. XXVIII. 12—14.

[9] Num. XXVIII. 20, 21, 28, 29; Lev. XXIII. 13, 18.

[10] Num. XXIX. 3.

[11] Num. XXIX. 9, 10: all which were מנחות צבור; comp. in general Sect. XIII.

[12] Comp. Lev. XIV. 10, 20, 21, 31; Num. VI. 15, 17; comp. Exod. XXIX. 2, 23; Lev. VIII. 26; see also *Mishn.* Menach. VII. 2.

[13] See Num. XV. 4—12; comp. XXVIII. 5, 9, 12, 14, 20, 21, 28. 29; XXIX. 3, 4, 9, 10, 14, 15; Lev. XIV. 21. The Mishnah (Menach. IX. 1) believes that every omer was to be meted out separately in a measure holding that quantity.

[14] See p. 7; comp. Judg. VI. 19, 20.

[15] See p. 8.

were, as a rule, presented by poorer persons, to whom an additional oblation would have been burdensome; although in exceptional cases the rule was departed from.[1] Nor is it difficult to account for their omission with the paschal lamb, or with the firstlings and tithes of animals; for the former, peculiar in various points and almost *sui generis*, was in itself and exclusively characteristic of the occasion, and the latter were gifts rather than sacrifices, and therefore required no complements. But it is certainly remarkable that they were also suppressed in connection with sin-offerings, the latest class of sacrifice, which may be said to have been properly regulated in the Pentateuch only;[2] this exception may indeed have been partially suggested by the circumstance that the sin-offerings were pre-eminently the *expiating*, that is, symbolically, the *bloody* sacrifices,[3] but partially also by the legislator's desire of divesting those most solemn offerings from all accessories that have no bearing upon their innermost nature and import, and of absolutely depriving them of the character of social cheerfulness.[4] However, he preserved the custom of the *minchah* in conjunction with holocausts and thank-offerings; he could apprehend no abuse of it, because its meaning was unmistakably disclosed by the whole spirit of his code; he might reasonably expect that its earliest origin would gradually be effaced and forgotten, and that it would be understood in harmony with the Levitical system, which commanded the Hebrews to offer to the Deity the chief objects of their wealth and their food, of their cattle and cereal productions.[5] And he himself made an important step towards maintaining the spiritual character of the *minchah* by rigidly excluding, except in a few significant instances,[6] *leavened* bread, and by thus marking the oblations as holy.[7]

This being the manifest historical development of the practice and the ordinance, it will not be difficult to estimate the various symbolical views that have been proposed on the subject. "As in the bloody sacrifices", observes Bähr,[8] "the נֶפֶשׁ, the principle of life, was given over with the blood, so in the bloodless offering, which formed its accessory, those substances were surrendered which preserve and support the

1 Comp. Lev. XIV. 21, 31 (עלה על־ המנחה).

2 In Lev. XIV. 10, 20, the מנחה belonged to the holocaust, not to the sin-offering.

3 Comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. 398.

4 See Sect. XV.

5 Comp. pp. 78, 81, 85. Ewald observes justly with regard to the shew-bread, that they "stand in the Jahveh-religion like an isolated instance entirely apart from the other offerings" or as "a hallowed remnant from a very different age" (Alterth. p. 28; comp. p. 121).

6 Lev. VII. 13; XXIII. 17.

7 See pp. 133—135.

8 Symb. II. 216.

blood and thereby the נֶפֶשׁ." However, this opinion, proceeding as it does from the author's erroneous estimate of the nature of the *minchah* (see *infra*), is untenable: for in most cases, a small portion or a handful only of the bloodless offering was burnt on the altar; animals were appointed for sacrifices, not less than cereals and vegetables, on account of their nutritious and life-sustaining power; and these cereals and vegetables are the food of man, and not of the animals whose blood was poured out, a circumstance the more fatal to that view, as its framer rejects the idea of a real substitution.[9] Others, on the contrary, insisting that the sacrifices are in all cases an exchange of life for life, have laboured to vindicate this meaning for the bloodless offerings likewise, declaring that the plants also have a soul or נפש, which can be given up for the life of man, and that their soul manifests itself in the *odour* or fragrance: but there is not the remotest proof of this conception having obtained among the ancient Hebrews,[10] although later Jewish writers attributed to the plants a "germinating soul",[11] and Greek and Roman authors currently entertained the same idea.[12] Nay it is impossible not to recognise a certain opposition in which the animal and vegetable offerings are placed in the Pentateuch: the domestic beasts, comparatively requiring but little care, possess a certain physical affinity with man,[13] which renders them fit to serve as substitutes in his stead, while the cereal productions are the inert results of his exertion toilsomely forced from a reluctant soil; the former represented therefore predominantly the person and wealth, the latter, offered as they were not in their raw and natural state but skilfully prepared and combined, pointed to the labour and avocation of the worshipper; so that both united aptly reflected his entire life and existence.[14]

---

[9] See Sect. XVIII.

[10] The terms יחיו דגן ויפרחו כגפן (Hos. XIV. 8), or אם יזקין בארץ שרשו ובעפר ימות גזעו (Job. XIV. 8), and the like, are poetical metaphors, and so *Horat.* Epist. I. xii. 21 (verum seu pisces seu porrum et caepe trucidas); *Stat.* Theb. V. 527, 528 (percussae calidis afflatibus herbae, Qua tulit ora cadunt).

[11] נפש הצומחת, *Kimchi* on Ps. LXXVIII. 47.

[12] Comp. *Porphyr.* De Abst. I. 18, *εἰ δὲ, ὥς φασι, καὶ τὰ φυτὰ ψυχὴν ἔχει*; *Maxim. Tyr.* Diss. XXVII, *φυτὸν κατὰ τὸ ἔμψυχον καὶ ἀπαθές*, or *κοινωνεῖ θηρίον φυτῷ κατὰ τὸ ἔμψυχον*; *Seneca*, Epist. VI. 6 (58), placet enim satis et arbustis animam inesse, itaque et vivere illa et mori dicimus.

[13] Comp. *Theophr.* in Porph. Abst. II. 22, *τῆς γὰρ φιλίας καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸ συγγενὲς αἰσθήσεως πάντα κατεχούσης...οἰκεῖα εἶναι νομίζων τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ζώων.*

[14] Yet it cannot be asserted that the bloody and the bloodless sacrifices were entirely different in their ends and objects, that "the former aimed at atonement (לכפר), the latter at thanksgiving" (לאזכרה; so *Kliefoth*, l. c. p. 87): the vegetable sin-offering was presented for atonement, and eucharistic offerings were frequently of the bloody kind. The tendency of both classes is

Again, the *minchah* has been explained as the earthly foundation of the heavenly worship represented by animal sacrifices;[1] or as the spiritual food, which mirrored forth the Israelites' mission and work in the vineyard of the Lord, or the duty imposed upon them by their covenant with God;[2] or, strange to say, as a fine of property which the offerer inflicted upon himself, in the same manner as the animal sacrifices involved both such a fine and the idea of capital punishment,[3] notions utterly foreign to the system of Hebrew sacrifices; or as "zeal in good works",[4] so that, in connection with the holocaust and the thank-offering, it was meant to impress the uselessness of sanctification and confession without the practical exercise of virtue: of which interpretations we can discover no trace whatever in the Old Testament; it is indeed difficult to understand why vegetables and cereals should recall the notions of good works and of "purity"[5] more decidedly than animal sacrifices, several classes of which symbolise the perfect and unconditional devotion to a pious life. But curious as these views are, they are surpassed by the almost incredible conceit that the *minchah* points to "the missionary zeal" of Christianity among the Jews.[6]

However, a *minchah* was, under various circumstances, also presented as an independent sacrifice,[7] by the nation every sabbath when the twelve cakes of shew-bread were placed on the golden Table in the Holy, on the second day of Passover when the first sheaf of ripe barley,[8] and on Pentecost when the first loaves from the new wheat were presented;[9] by the High-priest on the day of his initiation, when the offering, like every bloodless oblation of priests, was burnt entirely;[10] by the very poor as a sin-offering[11] for certain offences,

identical, though the blood was deemed chiefly instrumental for propitiation, and the cereal oblations were predominantly eucharistic in their nature.

1 *Neumann*, Sacra V. T. salutar. p. 6.

2 *Kurtz*, Opferc. pp. 242, 243, inappropriately referring to John IV. 32, 33; VI. 27.

3 *Thalhofer*, l. c. p. 39.

4 *Hengstenberg*, Opfer, p. 44, and others.

5 So *Lewysohn*, Opfer, § 10; see Lev. XI. 37; comp. Mal. I. 11; Isai. LXVI. 20.

6 *Hengstenberg*, Opfer, p. 45, fancifully leaning on Isai. LXVI. 20; Rom. XV. 16. The view that the Hebrew *minchah* is a type of the Lord's Supper, maintained especially by the Catholic Church, is inappropriate, because no part of it was allowed to the people — independently of the objectionable nature of all typical expositions, see p. 166; comp. also *Hoefling*, Origenis doctrin. de sacrif. Christian. II. 26—32.

7 Termed in Jewish writings הבאות בפני עצמן, in contradistinction to those accompanying an animal sacrifice, הבאות עם הזבח.

8 מנחת העמר, Lev. XXIII. 10, 11; comp. p. 121.

9 מנחה חדשה (Lev. XXIII. 16; Num. XXVIII. 26) or בכורים (Lev. XXIII. 17, 20).

10 מנחת חינוך, Lev. VI. 12—16; see notes in loc.

11 מנחת חוטא.

instead of an animal sacrifice, when oil and frank-incense, the emblems of holiness and devotion, were excluded;[12] and by the wife suspected and accused of infidelity,[13] when not only oil and incense were avoided, but ordinary barley-meal was employed instead of fine wheaten flour required for every other *minchah*.[14] In nearly all these cases the *minchah* was prescribed to consist of not less than one tenth of an ephah, or an omer,[15] of flour,[16] from the reason above alluded to, that so much was supposed to be required for the daily food of one man.[17] The only exception admitted in the Law was the bloodless oblation presented by the High-priest on the day of his consecration, which was limited to one half of an omer, from considerations pointed out in another place.[18] Jewish tradition fixed the rule that no single private and voluntary *minchah* should exceed 60 omers, since the amplest public *minchah* — that offered on the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles, if happening on a Sabbath — consisted of 61 omers,[19] and it was deemed appropriate that the former should be inferior in dignity to the latter.[20]

The instances above enumerated prove sufficiently that it is idle to deny, as has frequently been done, the independent character of the bloodless offerings;[21] the facts that they accompanied the greater number of animal sacrifices, and that for such cases the quantity of the materials to be used was fixed by the Law,[22] afford no conclusive proofs; for holocausts and burnt-offerings were very frequently killed together;[23] can it thence be inferred that they were never presented separately? The *minchah* is, no less than the animal sacrifices, called "an offering made by fire to the Lord" or "food of the Lord."[24] The sheaf on Passover and the loaves on Pentecost were manifestly the principal offerings

---

[12] Lev. V. 11—13; comp. vers. 1—5; see Sect. XV.

[13] מנחת סוטה or קנאות.

[14] Num. V. 15, 16, 25, 26; comp. Lev. II. 1, 4, 5, 7; see pp. 103, 120. On the exaggerated scrupulousness of the later Jews with respect to the excellence and purity of the flour see *Mishnah*, Menach. VI. 5—10 (the wheat was to be rubbed in the hands 300 times and beaten 500 times; the flour had to pass through 11 to 13 sieves; etc.); comp. VIII. 1 (וכלן אינן באים אלא מן המובחר), 2.

[15] עשירית האפה or עשרון or עמר. See notes on Exod. XVI. 16, 36.

[16] Lev. V. 11; comp. XXIII. 17.

[17] Exod. XVI. 16—18; see p. 104. Each of the twelve shew-bread contained *two* omers of flour (Lev. XXIV. 5).

[18] Lev. VI. 13; see Comm. in loc.

[19] Viz. 39 omers with the 13 bulls, 14 with the 14 lambs, 4 with the 2 rams, 2 with the ordinary or daily 2 lambs, and 2 with the 2 lambs of the sabbath sacrifice; comp. Num. XXIX. 12—16; see Sect. XX.

[20] *Mishn.* Menach. XII. 4; comp. IX. 3; XIII. 1; *Talm.* Menach. 103*b*.

[21] So *Bähr*, Symb. II. 199, 265; *Hengstenb.* Opfer, p. 95; *Kliefoth*, l. c. p. 116; a. o.

[22] Num. XV. 1—18; see *supra*.

[23] See Sect. XIII.

[24] אשה ליהוה (Lev. II. 16) or לחם יהוה (XXIII. 7; comp. XXI. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22; XXII. 25; etc.).

of those festivals, to which the animal sacrifices were joined as collateral, if not subordinate, as is manifest from the wording of the commands, "On the day when you wave the sheaf, you shall offer a lamb without blemish" etc.;[1] and, "You shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves...and you shall offer with the bread seven lambs without blemish of the first year" etc.[2] Nay on the second day of Passover, the holocaust of one lamb was, contrary to the general rule, accompanied by a *minchah* of *two* tenths of an ephah of flour instead of one, evidently because the firstfruit-sheaf presented on the same day was regarded as equivalent to a sacrificial animal.[3] It is even not improbable that for long periods, reaching to the later times of the monarchy, a bloodless offering alone was publicly presented in the evening, and not an animal holocaust with its accompanying *minchah*, as ordained in the Pentateuch. If some passages are indistinct,[4] one at least is conclusive: the king Ahaz commanded the priest Uriah to burn on the great altar which he had erected after the admired pattern of one of Damascus "the burnt-offering of the morning and the *minchah* of the evening";[5] so that the latter was evidently a chief offering exactly like the former; and if it be contended that the term *minchah* is there, as in some other instances, synonymous with sacrifice in general and therefore *means* animal holocaust, this supposition is overthrown by the words which follow, "and the burnt-offering of the king and his *minchah*, and the burnt-offering of all the people of the land and their *minchah* and their drink-offering." Moreover, the very laws which enjoin merely flour with oil as an *accompanying* מנחה, prove that the varied and very different forms of bloodless offerings mentioned in the introductory sections of Leviticus were meant as independent oblations. For as the first chapter treats of holocausts and the third of thank-offerings, so the second details the commands regarding the *minchah*, which, according to the whole tenour of that code of laws, is no less a distinct class of sacrifice than the two kinds between which it is introduced, and than the expiatory offerings by which it is followed.[6] It may be that the bread and flour (or corn)

---

[1] Comp. Lev. XXIII. 12.

[2] Lev. XXIII. 17, 18; comp. *Mishn.* Menach. IV. 3.

[3] Lev. XXIII. 13.

[4] 1 Ki. XVIII. 29; 2 Ki. III. 20; Dan. IX. 21. The reasons suggested by Lightfoot (Opp. I. 715) in explanation of the usage in Daniel, are not to the purpose.

[5] 2 Ki. XVI. 15, הקטר את־עלת־הבקר ואת־מנחת הערב וכ׳; see p. 36.

[6] Comp. אדם כי־יקריב (Lev. I. 2) and ונפש כי־תקריב (Lev. II. 1); comp. also *Maimon.* Pref. to Menach.; *Thalhofer*, l. c. pp. 51 *sqq.*, 112 *sqq.*; *Stöckl*, Das Opfer nach seinem Wesen und seiner Geschichte, pp. 287 *sqq.*; *Keil*, Luther. Zeitschr. 1860, p. 610; Archäol. II. 215; *Kurtz*, Opferc. pp. 260—270 (modifying his opinion expressed in his earlier work on the subject); *Öhler* in Herzog's Real-Encycl. l. c. p. 621.

of the bloodless offerings corresponded with the body or flesh of the bloody sacrifices, the oil of the one with the burnt fat of the other, and the (red) wine of the former with the blood of the latter;[7] but these very analogies tend to corroborate the independent nature of the *minchah,* which in every essential point consisted of its own components and rites, and did not require the support of the more imposing class of offerings.

2. Mode of Oblation.

The *minchah* which formed the accompaniment of burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, was always fine wheaten flour, merely mingled with oil.[8]

Now, if it belonged to a holocaust, it is most natural to suppose that it was, like the animal, burnt entirely on the altar, in accordance with the nature of the class; and thus the Law ordains it in one particular case;[9] though it appears that the practice was not settled in this respect, and that, in some instances, a small part only was burnt, so that the *minchah* strikingly maintained its distinct character, as is clearly stated in one passage at least.[10] If it belonged to a thank-offering, it sufficed in all cases to devote to the altar a part only, as was the case with the victim which constituted the principal sacrifice.

But if the *minchah* was presented alone as a voluntary gift or in consequence of a vow, it could be offered in various forms and with different ceremonies.

If it simply consisted of fine flour, unprepared, the offerer mixed it with salt, poured oil, and put frank-incense upon it. In this state he handed it over to the priests, one of whom then took off a portion, designated as "a handful" (מְלֹא קֹמֶץ),[11] of the flour together with the oil that was upon it and all the frank-incense, and burnt it to God on the brazen altar in the Court, as "a memorial" (אַזְכָּרָה) or a tribute of

---

[7] See *Bähr*, Symb. II. 215; though the parallels are but vague, and cannot be pressed closely; comp. *Kurtz*, Opferc. pp. 244, 245.

[8] On the various kinds of oil used in the later Temple-service see *Mishn.* Menach. VIII. 4 ("there are three kinds of olives and each yields three kinds of oil"); see supra pp. 104, 105.

[9] Lev. XIV. 20, "and the priest shall burn the burnt-offering and the bloodless offering upon the altar"; and the same view is taken by many writers (comp. *Winer*, l. c. II. 494; *Keil*, Archäol. II. 256; *Öhler*, l. c. p. 634; *Thalhofer*, l. c. p. 113 *sqq.* a.o.; on the other hand *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 51; but Lev. VII. 10 (וכל מנחה בלולה בשמן וחרבה וכ׳) does not prove his opinion.

[10] Lev. IX. 16, 17, "and he brought the burnt-offering, and offered it according to the law; and he brought the bloodless offering, and took a handful thereof and burnt it upon the altar"; comp. *Kurtz* l. c. p. 269.

[11] Lev. II. 2; V. 12; VI. 8; and in IX. 17 the act is described וימלא כפו ממנו.

homage; the rest[1] belonged to "Aaron and his sons", that is, to the priests generally, as common property.[2] Jewish tradition maintains that the act of taking off (קמיצה) was performed with the right hand in a peculiar manner,[3] at the south-western corner of the altar, and that a handful was taken off from every omer of which the *minchah* consisted:[4] which arrangements have no foundation in the Law; the last is even contrary to it; but it is certainly correct that no one except a priest in a state of perfect purity and fully robed in his official vestments, was permitted to perform the rite;[5] for it belonged to those essential acts which stamped the gift as a sacrifice.[6]

If the oblation was composed of unleavened cakes or wafers[7] *baked in the oven,*[8] the offerer carefully mingled the former and "anointed" or brushed over the latter with oil,[9] not forgetting the indispensable salt, and brought them to the officiating priest; the latter took off a part, probably a handful,[10] and burnt it on the altar of holocausts as "a memorial" to God;[11] the remainder belonged to himself,[12] or was, according to a later regulation, left to his whole order, like the offerings of the preceding class.[13]

---

1 Termed שירי מנחות ישראל; comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. IX. 5; Menach. VI. 1.

2 Lev. II. 1—3, and Comm. in loc.; VII, 10; p. 210.

3 The priest spread his three middle fingers over the palm of his hand (פושט את אצבעותיו על פס ידו, *Mishn.* Menach. I. 2), and took care that nothing of the מנחה reached over the thumb or the little finger, which was considered one of the most difficult priestly operations, like מליקה — a puerility rejected by Maimonides and others. On the contrary, מלא קמץ seems to be a full and ample portion (comp. לקמצים, Gen. XLI. 47).

4 קמץ אחד לעשרון אחד; comp. *Siphra* VI. 3.

5 *Mishn.* Menach. I. 2; excluded were מחוסר בגדים, טבול יום, אונן, זר, etc., in fact the same who were disqualified from "receiving the blood" of victims (see p. 190; comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. II. 1).

6 Hence the canon מקמיצה ואילך מצות כהונה.

7 חלות מצות or רקיקי מצות (see p. 104; חלה is hardly to be derived from חול *to go in a circle*, so that it would be a round cake, like כִּכָּר, Exod. XXIX. 23), according to tradition, 10 in number, as in all similar *minchahs* (*Mishn.* Menach. VI. 5, כל המנחות באות עשר עשר).

8 מַאֲפֵה תַנּוּר.

9 בלולות and משוחים, see p. 105. The Mishnah observes (Menach. VI. 3), that all *minchahs* prepared in a pan or cauldron require a threefold application of oil — first some of it is put into the vessel, and then the flour, after which oil is again mixed with the meal; and when the dough has been baked and divided into pieces, oil is a third time put over it.

10 According to tradition, again at the south-western corner of the brazen altar.

11 For מֵאֵלֶּה (in Lev. II. 8) refers to the three kinds of bloodless offerings last named in the text, those prepared in the oven, the pan, and the cauldron; see Comm. in loc.; comp. *Mishn.* Menach. VI. 1.

12 Lev. VII. 9.

13 Lev. II. 4; 8—10; VII. 9. It is im-

If the *minchah* was to be *baked in the pan,*[14] the offerer mingled it with oil and salt, and after having baked the dough, divided it into small pieces,[15] over which he again poured oil; the priest then acted precisely as in the former case.[16]

If it was *cooked in a pot* or *cauldron*,[17] it was mixed with salt and oil, and when ready, taken by the offerer to the priest, who proceeded in precisely the same manner as has just been stated.[18]

The *minchah* which formed a part of the praise-offering (זֶבַח תּוֹדָה) consisted of unleavened cakes mingled with oil, unleavened wafers anointed, and cakes poured over with oil and prepared of fine flour that had been soaked (מֻרְבֶּכֶת) in that fluid;[19] to these three kinds of cake were added loaves of leavened bread to be eaten at the repast which followed the offering: the acting priest received one piece of each of the four cereal oblations.[20] — The High-priest, on the day of his inauguration, presented both in the morning and in the evening half an omer of fine flour, thoroughly saturated with oil, prepared in a pan, and divided into small pieces, after which it was burnt entirely.[21] — As a firstfruit-offering from the harvest it was ordained to present roasted ears of corn from the choicest fields, upon which oil and frankincense were put; then the priest took off and burnt "the memorial" with all the incense upon the altar, and kept the rest for his own use.[22]

These were the principal private *minchahs*.[23] Besides them some were to be presented in the name of the nation.[24]

A regular and permanent oblation of this kind were the twelve

---

possible to reconcile the obvious contradiction between Lev. VII. 9 and II. 10.

14 מִנְחָה עַל־הַמַּחֲבַת.

15 פתות פתים; see p. 198; comp. the curious Rabbinical precepts in *Mishn.* Menach. VI. 4, where the general principle is set forth, כל המנחות הנעשות בכלי טעונות פתיתה.

16 Lev. II. 5, 6, 8—10.

17 מִנְחַת מַרְחֶשֶׁת.

18 Lev. I. 7—10.

19 See Comm. on VII. 11—21.

20 Lev. VII. 12—14; see Comm. in loc. According to the Mishnah (Menach. VII. 1) this *minchah* was made of 5 seahs of Jerusalem, which were equivalent to 6 such as the Hebrews knew in the desert, or to 2 ephahs; half of that quantity was applied for the unleavened cakes. The שתי תודות in Neh. XII. 31, presented by Nehemiah as a thank-offering at the consecration of the wall of Jerusalem, are not two loaves (*Reland*, Antiqq. Sacr. III. vii. 2), but probably two bodies or chorusses of men offering up thanks-givings for the people.

21 Lev. VI. 12—16; see Comm. in loc.; comp. *Mishn.* Menach. VI. 2.

22 Lev. II. 14—16, and Comm. in loc.

23 מנחת יחיד. The cereal sin-offering and the "offering of jealousy" have above been alluded to (p. 220; comp. Sectt. XV. XVI.); on the Nazirites offering at the end of his term of seclusion see Num. VI. 14—20; and on the presentation of the earliest vegetable productions see Deut. XXVI. 1—11; *Saubert*, De Sacrif. pp. 92, 93.

24 מנחת צבור.

**unleavened *shew-bread*[1] which, each consisting of two omers of fine flour,[2] and arranged in two equal rows on the Table of the Holy,[3] were renewed every Sabbath, and then eaten by the priests in the holy place;[4] on each row frank-incense was put in a golden cup[5] to be burnt "as a memorial", and to typify that the cakes were consecrated to God,[6] to whom the people of Israel submitted their supplication for their daily sustenance and who bountifully grants their prayer.[7] We cannot see that the shew-bread were intended to "intimate that most useful of all virtues, temperance, since to a lover of wisdom a loaf is sufficient nourishment, keeping the bodies free from mixing of the**

---

1 לֶחֶם פָּנִים (Exod. XXV. 30; XXXV. 13; XXXIX. 36; 1 Sam. XXI. 7; 1 Ki. VII. 48; 2 Chr. IV. 19), so called because they were placed "before the Lord" (לִפְנֵי יהוה, Ex. XL. 23; Lev. XXIV. 8), in the Holy, towards the Holy of Holies (other explanations are artificial), or לֶחֶם הַמַּעֲרֶכֶת (Neh. X. 34; 1 Chr. IX. 32; XXIII. 29), because the loaves were "arranged" on the Table (comp. Exod. XL. 23, ויערך עליו ערך לחם לפני יהוה; 2 Chr. II. 3; XXIX. 18; see Lev. XXIV. 6), or לֶחֶם הַתָּמִיד (Num. IV. 7, Sept. *οἱ ἄρτοι οἱ διαπαντός*, comp. Lev. XXIV. 8), the *permanent* bread. — The loaves were undoubtedly unleavened, though the Hebrew text does not expressly state it; how should leaven which was excluded even from the altar of the Court, be brought into the interior of the Sanctuary? The Mishnah states the rule, "all bloodless oblations were unleavened, except the loaves of the praise-offering and the two loaves of Pentecost" (Menach. V. 1); and Josephus (Ant. III. vi. 6) describes the shew-bread *ἀζύμους ... καθαροῦ πάνυ τοῦ ἀλεύρου*.

2 According to the Mishnah (Menach. XI. 4), each was 10 inches long, 5 wide, and one inch thick, with horns (קרנות) 7 inches high. The preparation of the cakes was later entrusted, perhaps hereditarily, to the family Garmo (בית גרמו), which knew how to prevent their ever breaking or getting mouldy (*Mishn.* Shekal. V. 1); as the holy incense was skilfully prepared by the family Aftinas (בית אבטינס).

3 On the mode in which it was done see *Mishnah*, Menach. XI. 5—8.

4 Not earlier than the ninth, and not later than the eleventh day after they had been baked, according to *Mishn.* Menach. XI. 9.

5 And later also salt; see p. 110; comp. *Philo*, Vit. Mos. III. 10 (*ἡ δὲ τράπεζα τίθεται πρὸς βορείοις, ἐφ' ἧς ἄρτοι καὶ ἅλες*). According to Jewish writers, the frank-incense was placed between (על) the two rows, in a space which was left, two inches wide; which is both against the meaning of the Hebrew words (ונתת על־המערכת וכ׳, Lev. XXIV. 7) and against the spirit of the command, which closely joins the incense with the shew-bread, not with the Table.

6 Exod. XXV. 30; Lev. XXIV. 5—9; comp., however, 1 Sam. XXI. 7; Mark II. 26. See Comm. on Exod. p. 481; comp. also *Joseph.* Antiq. III. vi. 6; x. 7; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 202—210.

7 On the analogy and difference between the shew-bread and the *lectisternia*, or holy cakes, of heathen nations, see p. 7; comp. *Bähr*, Symb. I. 435—438. It is absurd to call the former "Tafelbrod" or "Naturallieferung für den Nationalkönig"; comp. *supra* p. 217.

disease, and the intellect sound, and healthy and sober";[8] or "incessantly to keep alive the conviction that the zeal in good works is a holy duty of the people, while their renewal on every Sabbath was designed to point out that such zeal ought to gather fresh strength on the days of rest and devotion consecrated to the Lord";[9] or that they pointed to "the bread through which God manifests Himself, or by the eating of which the soul beholds God";[10] while the incense burnt on the cakes shows that "the good works ought to be commenced and carried out with prayers."[11] Who recognises the simplicity of the Scriptures in speculations at once mystical and playful?

The firstfruit-sheaf of barley prescribed for Passover was presented with the rite of waving; a part of it was burnt as "a memorial" on the altar; the rest was left for the benefit of the priests. The ceremony, but slightly touched upon in the Pentateuch,[12] is thus described in the Mishnah. After the corn that was to compose the omer had been cut, in the night of the fifteenth of Nisan, with much ceremonial by three persons with three scythes, and put into three baskets,[13] it was taken to the Court of the Temple; the grains were gently beaten out with canes or stalks of plants[14] to prevent their being crushed,[15] thrown into an iron pan (אבוב) perforated at the bottom to allow the fire to pass through everywhere, and then spread on the ground of the Court, so that the wind blew through them; they were next put into a coarse grits'-mill, and ground till one tenth of an ephah of flour, that had passed through 13 sieves, was obtained. Oil, then the flour, and oil again were put into a vessel, mixed, and waved together with frank-

---

[8] *Philo*, De victim. c. 3, where the *twelve* cakes are taken to correspond to the twelve months, and the two rows in which they were arranged, to the equinoxes (so also *Joseph.* Ant. III. vii. 7, *ἀποσημαίνει τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν εἰς τοσούτους μῆνας διῃρημένον*); whereas they manifestly referred to the twelve tribes of Israel, like the twelve precious stones in the High-priest's breastplate; comp. also De Vita Mos. III. 10 (Opp. II. 151 Mang. *ἡ δὲ τράπεζα τίθεται πρὸς τοῖς βορείοις ... ἐπειδὴ τῶν πνευμάτων τὰ βόρεια τροφιμώτατα κτλ.*)

[9] *Hengstenberg*, Opfer, p. 45; comp. also *Michael.* Typ. Gottesgel. § 28, "the shew-bread are a figure of obedience towards God as manifested in the fruits of good works, whether that obedience dwells in our own heart or in the breast of our Mediator"!

[10] *Bähr*, Symb. I. 428; comp. pp. 425—432; Salamon. Tempel, p. 180; *Stöckl*, l. c. pp. 299, 300.

[11] Comp. *Hengstenb.* l. c. p. 48.

[12] Lev. XXIII. 10, 11.

[13] *Mishnah*, Menach. X. 1—3; comp. 9, "the omer ought to be brought from standing not from cut corn, from fresh not dry ears, by night not by day", though the reverse did not make the act unlawful.

[14] בקנים ובקליחות חובטים אותו.

[15] Or according to other authorities, the ears were roasted by the fire, comp. Lev. II. 14, מנחת בכורים · · · אביב קלוי באש.

incense; a handful was taken off by the priest and burnt, and the rest reserved to the sacerdotal order.[1] Such minute and pedantic observances were derived from a few general statements of Scripture, which do not even warrant the grinding of the grains; and indeed Josephus mentions a much simpler mode of procedure.[2]

The two leavened loaves from the new wheat presented on the Feast of Weeks, and consisting of one omer of fine flour each,[3] were also submitted to the rite of waving,[4] like the two lambs at the same time killed as thank-offerings,[5] and then entirely given over to the priests for food;[6] for being leavened, nothing of them could be burnt on the altar.[7] The Mishnah[8] describes the manner as follows: the priest places the two loaves on the two lambs, puts both his hands underneath, and lifts them to and fro, upwards and downwards.[9]

## XII. THE DRINK-OFFERING (נֶסֶךְ).[10]

In harmony with the anthropomorphic notions which guided early generations in their religious customs, a complete sacrifice, like a complete meal, was composed of meat, bread, and wine. This practice obtained among the Hebrews also,[11] and it was in the Levitical code consolidated by the law that every animal holocaust and thank-offering, whether private or public, if consisting of a quadruped, was to be accompanied not only by a cereal gift but also by a libation of wine,[12] the quantity of which was, like the flour and the oil of the bloodless oblations, carefully graduated according to the animal which consti-

---

[1] *Mishn.* l. c. 4.

[2] *Jos.* Ant. III. x. 5; see Comm. on Exod. p. 182.

[3] Jewish tradition fixed the length of the loaves at 7 inches and the width at 4 inches, with horns at each side of 4 inches (*Mishn.* Menach. XI. 4).

[4] Wherefore the loaves (שתי הלחם) were also called לחם תנופה, Lev. XXIII. 17.

[5] Ver. 20.

[6] They were to be eaten, according to subsequent ordinances, not earlier than two, and not later than three days after they had been baked (*Mishn.* Menach. XI. 9).

[7] Lev. II. 12; see Comm. on Exod. p. 456.

[8] Menach. V. 6.

[9] Comp. also ibid. XI. 1, 2. — On the burning of incense, see pp. 118—120; and on the bloodless offerings of other nations, pp. 90—92; comp. also *Schömann*, Griech. Alterth. II. 217—220.

[10] Or נָסִיךְ (Deut. XXXII. 38); Sept. *σπονδεῖον* or *σπονδή*; Vulg. libamentum or libamen; Luther, Trankopfer.

[11] See 2 Ki. XVI. 13; Hos. IX. 4; Joel I. 9, 13; II. 14; comp. Gen. XXXV. 14; 1 Chr. XXIX. 21; 2 Chr. XXIX. 35.

[12] It is unwarranted to suppose (with *Kurtz*, Opferc. p. 257), that the Pentateuch commanded libations not during the wanderings in the desert but only after the settlement in Canaan; לדרתיכם (Ex. XXIX. 42) is not "by your descendants" but "throughout your generations", that is, for ever (comp. עלת תמיד); and any argument based upon Num. XV, would apply to the מנחה no less than to the נסך.

tuted the chief sacrifice; for the measure was in every case identical with that of the oil, the fourth part of a hin being prescribed with each lamb, the third part of a hin with each ram, and half a hin with each bull.[13] Whether a libation was to be added to the independent cereal offerings also, is not distinctly stated, but it is not improbable, and accords well with the nature of the *minchah;*[14] and the circumstance that the vessels used for libations were ordinarily placed on the golden Table,[15] seems to justify the conclusion that the shew-bread also was coupled with a drink-offering. In later times, wine and oil were kept, in casks, in the inner Court of the Temple,[16] and the overseer of the drink-offerings was one of the fifteen chief officers (ממונים) of the Sanctuary.[17]

We need hardly remark, that the libation as ordained in the Pentateuch reveals no trace of its pagan origin; it was evidently understood as an additional means of marking the victim as consecrated to God and of hallowing the ceremony; it was retained as essential because wine formed, like cattle and corn, a chief part of Palestine's wealth; and it was, therefore, like the meat and the flour, also termed "a sweet odour to the Lord."[18] But it is significant that the expiatory sacrifices were, according to the enactments of the Pentateuch, not coupled with drink-offerings,[19] for reasons probably kindred to those which recommended the omission of cereal accompaniments in the same solemn classes of sacrifice.[20] A libation of wine was also suppressed in burnt-offerings of birds which were generally confined to the poor, and the purification-offering of the leper which involved peculiar and exceptional rites.[21] Hence the Mishnah states the law not quite correctly thus, "All the sacrifices of the community and of individuals require drink-offerings, except the firstlings, the tithe animals, the paschal lamb, the sin-and trespass-offerings, though the expiatory sacrifices of a leper demand a drink-offering".[22] In later times, libations of wine could even be offered alone as free-will gifts.[23]

---

[13] Num. XV. 3—11; comp. XXVIII. 7 (where שכר is used instead of יין, see p. 106), 9, 14; XXIX. 6, 16, 24; VI. 15, 17, etc.; Exod. XXIX. 40, 41; XXX. 9; Lev. XXIII. 13, 18; Num. VI. 15; *Mishn.* Shekal. V. 3, 4; also Menach. IX. 3; see p. 217.

[14] See p. 221. That such was not the case can at least not be concluded from the silence in the second chapter of Leviticus, which merely details the various forms of the *minchah*, and has therefore no occasion to mention the נסך which was uniform in all instances.

[15] Exod. XXV. 29; Num. IV. 7.

[16] *Jos.* Bell. Jud. V. xiii. 6.

[17] *Mishn.* Shekal. V. 1.

[18] Num. XV. 7, ריח ניחוח ליהוה.

[19] Comp. Num. XV. 5; VI. 17.

[20] See p. 218.

[21] Lev. XIV. 10 *sqq.*; comp. p. 117.

[22] *Mishn.* Menach. IX. 6, כל קרבנות הציבור והיחיד טעונין נסכים וכו׳.

[23] Called נסכים הבאים בפני עצמן,

The mode of libation is not described in the Law, but it appears that at least a part of the wine was out of golden vessels poured into the flames,[1] and thus came upon the brazen altar, like the meat and the fat, the flour and the cakes, the oil and the incense, as "food to the Lord" or "an offering made by fire, a sweet odour to the Lord",[2] while the rest was probably either, like the blood, poured at the sides of the brazen altar, and perhaps partly round its base, as is confirmed by statements of later Jewish writers,[3] or at the south-western corner of it, as Rabbinical tradition fixed. In this manner all the wine was disposed of, and the priests who were forbidden to drink any strong beverage when they entered the holy precincts,[4] received no part of it.

Libations of wine very commonly accompanied ancient sacrifices,[5] even if these consisted of human victims.[6] They were, at all periods, offered by the Israelites to the worshipped idols of surrounding tribes.[7] They formed in some instances the chief religious act connected with offerings, as among the Syrians in Hierapolis, who in certain cases simply led the victim before the altar, and there poured the libation upon it, after which it was conducted home, and killed by the offerer with suitable prayers.[8] They were indispensable at the sacrifices of the Greeks and Romans, who put a part of the wine on the head of the victim which was thereby consecrated,[9] or into the flame by which the flesh dedicated to the gods was burnt.[10] But they were also offered by

---

in contradistinction to נסכים הבאים עם הבהמה (*Mishn*. Zevach. IV. 3, and Bartenur. in loc.; *Talm*. Temur. 114*b*); comp. *Mishn*. Menach. XII. 4 (מתנרבים יין ואין מתנרבים שמן).

[1] Exod. XXV. 29, "dishes, and bowls, and cans, and cups with which the libations are made (אשר יסך בהן), of pure gold"; XXXVII. 16; Num. IV. 7.

[2] Num. XV. 10 (this clear statement cannot be understood, as by Rashi in loc. היין אינו אשה שאינו ניתן על האש); comp. Exod. XXX. 9 (לא תסכו עליו); Num. XXVIII. 7 is indistinct; see *Kurtz*, Opferc. p. 259; on the other hand, *Thalhofer*, l. c. p. 118.

[3] Josephus (Antiqq. III. ix. 4) observes, *σπένδουσι δὲ περὶ τὸν βωμὸν τὸν οἶνον*; in Sir. L. 17 (15) we read *ἐξέχεεν* (viz. the wine) *εἰς θεμέλια θυσιαστηρίου*; comp. also *Maimon*. Maas. Hakkorb. II. 1.

[4] Lev. X. 9, and Comm. in loc.

[5] Comp. *Herod*. II. 40; *Aeschyl*. Suppl. 981, 982 (*θύειν τε λείβειν τε... σπονδάς*); *Aristoph*. Nub. 426; Pac. 1102; *Strab*. XV. iii. 14; Curt. VII. 8 (the Scythians); *Euseb*. Praep. Ev. IV. 20; *Arnob*. Adv. Nat. VII. 29—32; *Athen*. XI. 71, p. 486; XIV. 78; *Herodian*, V. 5, where the excessive extravagance of Heliogabalus in his offerings is described, so that "whole streams of wine and blood flowed along", the wine being of "the oldest and most precious"; etc. etc.

[6] *Herod*. IV. 62.

[7] Deut. XXXII. 38; Isai. LVII. 6; LXV. 11; Jer. VII. 18; XIX. 13; XLIV. 17; Ezek. XX. 28.

[8] *Lucian*, De Dea Syr. 57.

[9] Comp. *Virg*. Aen. VI. 244 (frontique invergit vina sacerdos); *Michaelis*, Mos. R. § 187.

[10] *Hom*. Il. I. 462, 463; XI. 775 (*σπένδων αἴθοπα οἶνον ἐπ' αἰθομένοις ἱεροῖ-*

themselves, before the cup was tasted, as a tribute and homage due to the gods;[11] at the commencement of meals,[12] or after their conclusion when the "pledge-cup" was presented to the good Deity,[13] or if the party remained for drinking, in which case three libations were usually poured out, one to the Olympian Zeus and the other celestials, one to the heroes, and the third to Zeus the Saviour and Accomplisher,[14] although the custom varied according to time and place;[15] or as "sleep-libations" (*κοιταῖα*) before retiring to rest to ask the gods of night, especially Hermes, for propitious dreams;[16] or merely to add solemnity to prayers,[17] and sometimes to impart strength and sanctity to treaties and alliances,[18] whence they occasionally were compounded of wine and blood.[19] They consisted not only of wine, whether pure[20] or mixed with water — the former especially at offerings, the latter at or after meals[21] — but also of honey, oil, or milk, whether pure and individually, or diluted with water, or mixed together.[22] Some deities, solemn and severe, required "sober libations"[23] not comprising wine;[24] others, as the gods of Hades, were honoured with libations of honey currently considered as an

---

*σεν*); Od. III. 459, 460; *Virg.* Aen. VI. 254 (Pingue super oleum infundens ardentibus extis); etc. Cases of sacrifices without libations were exceptional (comp. Paus. I. xxvi. 6; VI. xx. 2; Schol. Soph. Oed. Col. 100).

[11] *Hom.* Il. VII. 480, *οἶνον δ' ἐκ δεπάων χαμάδις χέον, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη Πρὶν πιέειν πρὶν λεῖψαι ὑπερμενέϊ Κρονίωνι; Plat.* Phaed. c. 66, p. 117 B (*ἀποσπεῖσαι*).

[12] Comp. *Hom.* Il. X. 578, 579; *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 20; Athen. IV. 22, p. 143.

[13] *Athen.* XV. 47, 48, p. 693, (*ἀγαθοῦ δαίμονος πρόποσις*).

[14] Zeus *σωτήρ* and *τέλειος*; *Pollux*, Onom. VI. 15; comp. *Becker*, Charicl. II. 262.

[15] Comp. *Athen.* I. 28; II. 3, 7; XV. 17, 47; *Diod. Sic.* IV. 3.

[16] *Heliod.* III. 45; comp. *Hom.* Od. VII. 136—138; see, however, *Heliod.* III. 16 init.

[17] Comp. *Hom.* Il. XVI. 225—232.

[18] Which hence, like the libations, were called *σπονδαί* (comp. Philipp. II. 17), but also *λοιβίδες*, and the vessels used *σπονδεῖα* and *λοιβάσια*, the former for wine, the latter for oil; *Athen.* XI. 71.

[19] See p. 128. The Carmani, when at their banquets they wished to testify their friendship for each other, cut the veins on their faces, and mingled the blood which flowed down with the liquor, and then drank it, "thinking it the very greatest proof of friendship to taste one another's blood" (*Athen.* II. 24, *τέλος φιλίας νομίζοντες, τὸ γεύεσθαι τοῦ ἀλλήλων αἵματος*).

[20] *Ἔνσπονδος, merum*; comp. Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 1132 (*ἄκρατος σπονδή*).

[21] Comp. *Athen.* X. 30; XV. 48; *Pausan.* II. xi. 4; V. xv. 6.

[22] *Aeschyl.* Pers. 611—613; *Soph.* Oed. Col. 159 (*κάθυδρος οὗ κρατὴρ μειλιχίων ποτῶν ῥεύματι συντρέχει*), 481; Electr. 895; *Eurip.* Orest. 115 (*Μελίκρατ' ἄφες γάλακτος οἰνωπόν τ' ἄχνην*; comp. *Eustath.* ad Od. X. 519); *Strab.* XV. iii. 14 (p. 732); *Ovid*, Metam. VIII. 274, 275; *Sil. Ital.* XIII. 434 (Fundunt mella super Bacchique et lactis honorem); *Athen.* XI. 71; *Pollux*, X. 75.

[23] *Νηφάλια*, comp. p. 139.

[24] Comp. *Porph.* De Antr. Nymph. 19 (the bee is *ζῶον μάλιστα δίκαιον καὶ*

emblem of death.[1] Oedipus to propitiate the Eumenides was advised, first to draw water from a perennial spring, to put it into skilfully wrought urns which he was to wreathe with the new-shorn wool of a young lamb, and to pour it out as a libation, turning to the rising morn;[2] but then he was to fill another cup "with water and with honey but to add no wine",[3] and to pour it out on the ground, after which, fixing on the spot with both his hands three times nine olive-boughs, he should pronounce a prayer to the goddesses with inaudible voice, and then to depart, taking care not to turn back[4]—an instructive ceremony combining many characteristic features of ancient worship.

For water also was deemed acceptable as a libation. The early Greeks used water with their victims, in times of urgency and in default of wine,[5] and sometimes water and milk together with wine.[6] Fire and water were by the Egyptian priests frequently presented to the statues of the gods, because they were considered both by the Egyptians and Persians as the two purest elements; and every day when the temple of Serapis in Alexandria was opened, a singer standing on the steps of the portico, sprinkled water over the marble-floor, while he held forth fire to the people.[7] For it was an axiom extensively held, "the water is the best of all things",[8] or "the water sanctifies";[9] it was deemed

---

*νηφαντικὸν, ὅθεν καὶ νηφάλιοι σπονδαὶ αἱ διὰ μέλιτος*); *Aesch.* Eumen. 107 (*χοάς τ' ἀοίνους, νηφάλια μειλίγματα*); *Poll.* Onom. VI. 3 (*τὸ νηφάλια θύειν*..: *ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ χρῆσθαι θυσίαις ἀοίνοις κτλ.*); *Paus.* V. xv. 6. Theophrastus, however, it is uncertain on what authority, explains the "sober" libations to be exclusively those of water (*Porph.* Abst. II. 20, *νηφάλια δ' ἐστὶν τὰ ὑδρόσπονδα*); comp. *Hermann*, Gottesd. Alterth. § 25, note 20; *Schömann*, l. c.; *Bernays*, Theophr. Schrift über Frömmigkeit, pp. 94, 95.

1 *Porph.* l. c. 18; *Plut.* Symp. IV. vi. 2; comp. p. 141.

2 *Πρὸς πρώτην ἕω*; comp. *Soph.* Electr. 424, 425; *Lucian*, Necyomant. c. 7; *Stat.* Theb. 605; see also p. 175, note 18.

3 *Ὕδατος, μελίσσης, μηδὲ προςφέρειν μέθυ.*

4 *Soph.* Oed. Col. 466—492.

5 Comp. *Hom.* Od. XII. 362, 363, *Οὐδ' εἶχον μέθυ λεῖψαι ἐπ' αἰθομένοις ἱεροῖσιν, Ἀλλ' ὕδατι σπένδοντες ἐπώπτων ἔγκατα πάντα*: but *μέθυ* does not seem to be wine but meth, which among the earlier Greeks took the place of the former; comp. *Schömann*, Gr. Alterth. II. 220.

6 *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 20, *Οἶνον καὶ γάλα βάλλε, καὶ ὕδατος ἀγλαὸν εἶδος*; perhaps also *Athen.* XI. 93 (the *πλημμοχόαι* on the last day of the Eleusinian Mysteries) comp. *Schömann*, l. c. p. 382. Theophrastus believes that the earliest libations were water (*ὑδρόσπονδα*), then followed honey (*μελίσπονδα*) since men found this fluid first at hand as the fruit of the bees' labour, next oil (*ἐλαιόσπονδα*), and lastly wine (*Porph.* De Abst. II, 20; comp. c. 19).

7 See *Sharpe*, Egypt. Myth. etc. pp. 40, 68; comp. *Strab.* XV. iii. 14 (p. 732).

8 *Pind.* Ol. I. 1, *ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ.*

9 *Τὸ ὕδωρ ἁγνίζει*; *Plut.* Quaest. Rom. 1.

sacred, because "free from putrefaction", and conducive to generation[10] and calm reflection,[11] in fact "to add vigour to the mind and body";[12] it was believed to possess nutritious and remedial powers,[13] and was therefore chiefly used for libations in cases of danger and illness,[14] or at offerings for the dead, as was the case among the Hindoos,[15] and is still usual among the Dahomans;[16] especially the water of certain rivers, as the Nile and Ganges, was regarded as hallowed and divine, and pre-eminently desirable for all solemn lustrations, for which purposes it was sent in vessels sealed by priests to all parts of the country and even into foreign lands.[17] Now the Hebrews also seem primitively to have employed water for libations. Thus it is related that in the time of Samuel, at a period of distress and misfortune, they assembled in Mizpah, "and drew water and poured it out before the Lord,[18] and fasted on that day",[19] when wine, the great exhilarator, which rejoices God and men, would not have been in harmony with the mournful occasion; and David is stated to have "offered as a libation to the Lord"[20] the water which three of his heroes had procured for him at the peril of their lives.[21] A later Jewish custom, alleged to be founded on a tradition from Moses, but not acknowledged by the Sadducees, was the

---

[10] *Συνεργεῖ γὰρ γενέσει τὸ ὕδωρ*; *Porph.* Antr. Nymph. c. 17; comp. *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 35; *Athen.* Deipnos. II. 14, quoting Theophrastus, *ἐνιαχοῦ ὕδωρ γενέσθαι παιδογόνον*, and *τὸ Νείλου ὕδωρ πολυγονώτατον καὶ γλυκύτατον*.

[11] *Athen.* II. 19 (*Εὔβουλος εὑρετικούς φησι τὸ ὕδωρ ποιεῖν τοὺς πίνοντας αὐτὸ μόνον*); comp. 21, 22 (*Δημοσθένης ὑδροποτῶν καὶ μεριμνῶν τὰς νύκτας*); for "water is more digestible (*πεπτικώτερον*) than wine", ibid. c. 23; comp. 25.

[12] *Κινητικὸν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος*, Diocles and Praxagoras in *Athen.* l. c. 25.

[13] *Athen.* l. c. 14, 25.

[14] *Ovid*, Fast. VI. 157, Spargit (sc. Cranae) aquis aditus (viz. of the house in which in the infant Procas had been attacked by the wild birds Stryges) et aquae medicamen habebant.

[15] *Manu*, III. 70, 74.

[16] At the Sin-Kwain or Water-sprinkling custom; *Burton*, Mission to Gelele, II. 167—176.

[17] Comp. *Hom.* Od. IV. 477, 581 (*Αἰγύπτοιο, διιπετέος ποταμοῖο*); *Juven.* VI. 527—529 (Ibit ad Aegypti finem, calidaque petitas A Meroe portabit aquas ut spargat in aedem Isidis); *Athen.* II. 23; see *Bohlen*, Alt. Ind. I. 250—252; Comm. on Gen. pp. 640, 641; on Exod. pp. 122, 123.

[18] וישפכו לפני יהוה.

[19] 1 Sam. VII. 6. There is no indication to prove that the pouring out of the water was meant as "a symbolical act expressing humble submission and grief" (Drusius, Thenius, a. o.; comp. Ps. XXII. 15; Lam. II. 19), or as "a ceremonial of purification" (Gerlach, a. o.); it was what it appears *prima facie*.

[20] ויסך ליהוה.

[21] 2 Sam. XXIII. 16; comp. 1 Ki. XVIII. 34. Whether the metaphor in Lament. II. 19 refers to this kind of libation is uncertain; and it is equally doubtful whether the broth of the victim poured out by Gideon on the command of the angel (Judg. VI. 19, 20) was intended as a drink-offering.

solemn ceremony of drawing water from the river Shiloah for the sacrifices of the Feast of Tabernacles, a ceremony carried out with such rejoicings that the saying became proverbial, "whoever has not seen the joy of carrying the water,[1] has never in his life seen joy":[2] the water was poured out at the altar together with the wine,[3] and allowed to flow off through one of the two apertures at the south-western side of the altar.[4] However, the sacrificial system of Leviticus could not sanction libations of water, since it started from the fundamental principle that all offerings must represent the life, the labour, or the wealth of the worshipper.

## XIII. THE BURNT-OFFERING (עֹלָה).

### 1. Its general character.

Holocausts form probably the most important kind of primitive offerings; for they involve most strikingly the idea of *sacrifice*, and express most completely the absolute submission to the power of the deity.[5] They were certainly a principal characteristic in the public worship of the Hebrews, nay its very foundation. Their interruption at the common Sanctuary was regarded as a national disaster involving almost the annihilation of the theocracy.[6] They sometimes represented the whole class of animal sacrifices.[7] Killed at the central Sanctuary, they were designed by the Law to keep alive the feeling of humble dependence on Jehovah, and were used as a chief acknowledgment of His theocratic rule.[8] They marked the habitual tone of the

---

1 שמחת בית השואבה; comp. Isai. XII. 3.

2 *Mishn.* Succ. IV. 9, 10; V. I. 4.

3 Comp. ניסוך המים in *Mishn.* l. c. IV. 9.

4 See p. 162; comp. also *Maimon.* Tamid c. 10; *Goodwin*, Mos. et Aaron, III. vi. 12, and *Hottinger's* notes in loc.; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 197—200.

5 They were therefore termed *sacrificia latreutica.*

6 2 Chr. XXIX. 7; Dan. VIII. 11; XI. 31; 1 Macc. IV. 38—59; *Joseph.* Bell. Jud. VI. ii. 1.

7 Am. V. 22; Jer. XIV. 12; see p. 74. Tholuck (Das A. T. im N. T. p. 90) observes correctly, "Im mosaischen Kultus drückt das Brandopfer das religiöse Ergänzungsbedürfniss im allgemeinsten Umfange aus."

8 Hence even the Pharasaical rigour of later times, though limiting the general permission of the Pentateuch (Lev. XVII. 8; XXII. 18, 25; Num. XV. 29), allowed foreigners to offer at least holocausts at the Temple, in spite of the opposition of zealots (*Mishn.* Shekal. VII. 6 עכום ששלח עולתו ממדינת הים וכו'; *Philo*, Legat. ad Caium c. 23, Opp. II. 569, where speaking of the emperor Augustus he observes, *προςτάξας καὶ δι' αἰῶνος ἀνάγεσθαι θυσίας ἐνδελεχεῖς ὁλοκαύτους καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων προςόδων ... ἃ καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ἐπιτελοῦνται καὶ εἰς ἅπαν ἐπιτελεσθήσονται, μήνυμα τρόπων ὄντως αὐτοκρατορικῶν*; *Jos.* Ant. XI. iv. 3; Bell. Jud. II. xvii. 2); while they were excluded from all other offerings (comp. *Maimon.* Maas. Hakk. c. 3). Foreign

religious life of the nation, for which reason the fire was to be permanently maintained on the brazen altar, both by day and night.[9] They were the most unselfish offerings, "sacrificed for God Himself alone, who ought to be honoured for His own sake and not for that of any other being or thing."[10] Therefore, they were to be presented in the name of the people, regularly and throughout the year, every morning and every evening[11] as "continual burnt-offerings",[12] on every sabbath[13] and day of the new-moon;[14] on the three great agricultural festivals,[15] when the people assembled "to appear (לְרָאוֹת) before the Lord";[16] on the Day of Memorial celebrated on the first day of the seventh month,[17] and on the Day of Atonement.[18] They were moreover prescribed to individuals on various important occasions — after recovery from leprosy[19] or "a running issue",[20] to women after childbirth,[21] and to the Nazirite, when he had been defiled by contact with a corpse,[22] and when the time of his separation terminated.[23] And they were ordained as a part of ceremonials of consecration — when the Tabernacle or Temple was dedicated,[24] when Aaron and his sons were initiated into the functions of hereditary priesthood,[25] and the Levites were appointed the privileged ministers of the priests;[26] they typified, on such occasions, the Divine authority to which the offices were subjected, and to which the functionaries owed their power as delegates and instruments. But their principal weight lay in applications unconnected with positive precepts of the Law. They were, in a great measure,

---

rulers, especially from the time of Alexander the Great, ordered a regular sacrifice of burnt-offerings in their name, as a sign of their sovereignty, so that a refusal on the part of the Hebrews to offer them, was equivalent to rebellion against their authority.

9 Lev. VI. 2, 5, 6.

10 *Philo*, De Victim. c. 4; the holocaust was hence called *θυσία ἄγευστος*.

11 Exod. XXIX. 38—42; Num. XXVIII. 3—8, 23, 31; XXIX. 11, 16; 2 Ki. XVI. 15.

12 עֹלַת תָּמִיד (Sept. *θυσία* or *ὁλοκαύτωμα ἐνδελεχισμοῦ*); Exod. XXIX. 38, 42; Num. XXVIII. 3, 6, 23, 31; Ezek. XLVI. 15; Ezr. III. 5.

13 Num. XXVIII. 9, 10.

14 Num. XXVIII. 11—14; XXIX. 6.

15 Exod. XXIII. 15; XXXIV. 20; Lev. XXIII. 12, 37; Num. XXVIII. 19, 27; XXIX. 13, 17, 20, etc.; Deut. XVI. 6, 7; 2 Chr. XXXV. 12, 14, 16.

16 Exod. XXXIV. 24; Deut. XXXI. 11; comp. Isai. I. 12. Therefore called עולת ראיה.

17 Num. XXIX. 2.

18 Num. XXIX. 8; Lev. XVI. 24. The public burnt-offerings amounted annually to no less than 1245 animals; see the computation in Sect. XX.

19 Lev. XIV. 19, 22, 31.

20 Lev. XV. 14, 15.

21 Lev. XII. 6—8.

22 Num. VI. 9—11.

23 Ibid. vers. 13, 14.

24 Num. VII. 15, 21, 27, etc.; Ezra VI. 17; comp. 1 Chr. XXIX. 21, 22; 2 Chr. XXIX. 31, 32.

25 Exod. XXIX. 18, 25; Lev. VIII. 18; IX. 2, 7, 12, 16.

26 Num. VIII. 8, 12.

left to the option of the pious,[1] when anxious to testify in any emergency of life, whether sorrowful or joyous, their reverential allegiance to God's sovereignty;[2] and on national occasions their vast numbers indicated the spontaneous impulse of the heart.[3] Indeed they preponderated so decidedly among the Hebrews that foreign observers and historians described them as their only kind of offerings.[4] Thus particularly calculated to foster the feeling of humility, because not presented after a special trespass, but as a general expression of frailty and sinfulness, they partook of the character of expiatory offerings, and in earlier periods formed their substitute,[5] as, on the other hand, even in the time of Ezra, sin-offerings were occasionally burnt as holocausts.[6] If the whole congregation had unwittingly erred and transgressed a Divine commandment, they were ordered to offer for their expiation both a bullock as a burnt-offering and a goat as a sin-offering.[7] Holocausts were professedly designed as an atonement for those who presented them in a proper spirit; and the imposition of the hand had there nearly the same meaning as in sin-offerings,[8] so that the Rabbinical maxim is justified "the burnt-offering expiates the transgressions of Israel";[9] there is some truth in the paraphrase of Jonathan, who after the command, "the one lamb — for a burnt-offering — thou shalt offer in the morning", adds the explanation, "to atone for the sins of the night", and after the words, "and the second lamb thou shalt offer towards the evening", inserts, "to atone for the sins of the day";[10] and Abarbanel described them not incorrectly, if vaguely, to aim at "uniting man's intellectual aspirations with God."[11] Their

---

1 Hence called נְדָבָה, Ezek. XLVI. 12; 2 Chr. XXIX. 31, 32.

2 Judg. XX. 26; 1 Sam. VII. 9; Ps. LXVI. 13—15; 2 Chr. XXXI. 2.

3 Comp. 2 Sam. VI. 13; 1 Ki. III. 4; VIII. 5; Ezra VI. 17; VIII. 35; 1 Chr. XXIX. 21; 2 Chr. XXIX. 32, 33; see p. 6.

4 *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 26; see Sect. XX. Yet it is against the proofs of history to contend that burnt-offerings, gradually increasing among the Hebrews, contracted the scope of all other sacrifices (*Ewald*, Alterth. p. 52); for they themselves yielded, in the course of time, to the expiatory offerings, and were thus considerably limited in their operation.

5 Comp. Lev. XVII. 11; see Sect. XV.

6 Ezra VIII. 35.

7 Num. XV. 22—26.

8 Lev. I. 4, ונרצה לו לכפר עליו; comp. XIV. 20; XVI. 24; also Gen. VIII. 21.

9 עולה מכפרת על עונותיהם של ישראל.

10 Num. XXVIII. 4, למכפרא על חובי ליליא וכ'. This character of the holocaust, long disputed, is now almost universally admitted (*Tholuck*, l. c., ā. o.). Yet it would be erroneous to suppose that the term עולה was used indifferently for holocausts and sin-offerings, and still more so for thank-offerings, as Neumann (Sacra V. T. Salutaria, p. 7) attempts to prove.

11 *Abarban.* on Lev. I. 1—9, תכלית העולה לדבק הנשמה השכלית עם יוצרה; others attributed to it even the power

true nature is, perhaps, most clearly discernible in the account that Job, whenever his sons had completed their cycle of feasts, "sent and sanctified them, and rose up early in the morning, and offered burnt-offerings according to the number of them all: for Job said, 'It may be that my sons have sinned, and cursed God in their hearts.'"[12] — It is, therefore, hardly an exaggeration if Philo, Ebn Ezra, and others termed the holocaust the "best" and "highest", the "choicest" or "most exquisite" kind of sacrifice;[13] it was certainly, according to the Pentateuch, to consist of an unblemished *male* animal — whether bullock, ram or goat[14] — which was considered the superior species;[15] and though the Law permitted or prescribed also holocausts of pigeons and turtle-doves of either sex, particularly in order to render them accessible to persons of limited means,[16] the larger quadrupeds were selected in preference, and slain in unlimited numbers, to prove the offerer's readiness and self-abnegation. In this sense their spiritual character was vindicated by Rabbinical writers, who set forth the canon, "the holocaust is offered only for the cogitations of the heart",[17] and explained that the victims were burnt "to atone for the thoughts that rise in the mind."[18] Yet it would be unwarranted to trace this meaning to the Hebrew term עֹלָה.[19] This simply refers to the external destination of the holocaust "to rise up" (עלה) on the altar entirely in the flames[20] or

---

of securing to the worshipper the gift of prophecy; or apprehended that, if these sacrifices were neglected, God would indignantly desert the Tabernacle, and return to His heavenly abode (*Ebn Ezra* on Lev. I. 1).

[12] Job. I. 5; comp. XLII. 8; Bauer (Gottesd. Verf. I. 84) even calls Job's sacrifices, though unjustly, *sin-offerings*, see *supra*.

[13] *'Ανώτατον, ἄριστον*, *Philo*, De Vict. cc. 4, 5; מהנבחרת, *Ebn. Ezra* on Lev. I. 3; ראש הקרבנות, *Abarb.* Introd. to Lev. c. IV, which designation he specially applies to the daily or regular burnt-offerings.

[14] Lev. I. 3, 10.

[15] See pp. 95, 96; comp., however, 1 Sam. VI. 14; VII. 9; see p. 36.

[16] Lev. I. 14; XII. 8; XIV. 22; XV. 14; Num. VI. 11.

[17] אין העולה באה אלא על הרהורי הלב

[18] Comp. *Targ. Jonath.* Lev. VI. 2, דאתיא לםכפרא על הרהורי לבא; *Ebn Ezra* on Lev. I. 4, הגוף הקרב לכפר על העולה על הרוח יקרא עולה.

[19] As is evidently done by Ebn Ezra in the definition quoted; by Abarbanel (Introd. to Levit. c. IV), who takes the עלה as a symbol of the soul of man, which after his death *ascends* to the throne of God to be united with Him for ever; and by Hengstenberg, who explains the עלה as "a type of the *elevation* of the heart to the living God."

[20] It is unnecessary, in order to obtain this sense, to depart from the plain and obvious signification of the Hebrew verb עלה and to derive the word from עול or על (غلّ) to *glow*, to *burn* (so *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 50), so that עֹלָה would be not the *burnt* but the *burning* offering (Glühopfer, comp. Lev. VI. 2); but this has no foundation in the Hebrew usage. It is true that all sacrifices are connected with "rising" or burning on the altar (p. 73); but the עלה is "the rising

the smoke (הקטיר);[1] wherefore עלה is not only called "an offering made by fire" (אִשֶּׁה), but also כָּלִיל the *entire* or *whole* sacrifice,[2] to which עלה is joined not only in apposition,[3] but which is added to it by *and* with poetical emphasis.[4] It is, however, unsafe to deduce the character of the class from the exceptional appellation כליל, according to which it is the "*complete* and *perfect*, the *comprehensive*, and *all-embracing*, general or universal offering, which realises the idea of sacrifice, and forms the centre of all religious worship"[5] — a conception which indeed incidentally implies the true characteristics of holocausts, but introduces extraneous notions which necessarily lead to misconceptions in the details of the ritual.

## 2. Its History.

As burnt-offerings were probably the most ancient sacrifices, they are, in the Book of Genesis, fitly attributed to some of the earliest patriarchs — to Abel, the first breeder of cattle, anxious to mark his gratitude for the increase of his flocks;[6] to Noah who had been delivered by the special intervention of the Divine power, together with the germs of a new animal creation, over which his descendants were thenceforth to have unlimited dominion;[7] and to Abraham, when he had received back his son Isaac from the hand of God.[8] They are reported, later, in the time of Moses,[9] when Jethro desired to manifest his reverence for God's greatness shown in the redemption of Israel from Egypt,[10] when the Hebrews solemnly received the "Book of the

---

offering" *par excellence*; so that even עֲלָה alone is used for ascending as a burnt-sacrifice, and הֶעֱלָה alone for offering one on the altar (Ps. LI. 21; Judg. VI. 28; 2 Ki. XVI. 12).

[1] Hence עלה is not identical in sense with קרבן, meaning generally "that which comes upon or reaches the altar" (comp. *Talm.* Zevach. 7*b*, אמר רבא עולה דורון הוא; see p. 72; so Knobel, Neumann, a. o., taking passages as 1 Sam. XV. 22 and Hos. VI. 6 for a precarious support; comp. Sept. Ps. LI. 22, ἀναφορά; see Sect. XIV): it is not, like קרבן a generic, but a specific term; and the combination קרבן עלה (Lev. I. 3, 14, עלה קרבנו) would be strangely pleonastic and inexpressive.

[2] Deut. XXXIII. 10.

[3] עולה כליל, 1 Sam. VII. 9; comp. Lev. I. 9; VI. 15, 16. The term כליל occurs also on the Punic tablet of Marseilles (lines 3, 5, 7, 9, 11), but means there the *perfect offering*; comp. also *Ewald*, Bibl. Jahrb. I. 211.

[4] עולה וכליל, Ps. LI. 21. Therefore, the Chaldee translators render both עֲלָתָא and גְּמִירָא; the Sept. ὁλοκαύτωμα (comp. Mark XII. 33; Hebr. X. 6), or ὁλοκαύτωσις, and sometimes ὁλοκάρπωμα and ὁλοκάρπωσις; Philo ὁλόκαυτον; the Vulg. holocaustum, Germ. Ganzopfer.

[5] So *Bähr*, Symb. II. 361, 362.

[6] Gen. IV. 4; the מנחה of Abel, though not qualified, was according to the context most probably a עלה.

[7] Gen. VIII. 20; comp. IX. 2, 3.

[8] Gen. XXII. 13; comp. vers. 2, 3, 4, 8.

[9] Comp. Exod. X. 25.

[10] Exod. XVIII. 12.

Covenant",[11] when they recklessly inaugurated the worship of the *golden* calf,[12] and when Aaron and his sons were consecrated for their holy offices;[13] in the time of Joshua, when this general engraved the precepts of the Law on Mount Ebal;[14] in the epoch of the Judges, when Gideon destroyed the altar of Baal to secure the worship of God alone;[15] during the leadership of Samuel, when the Ark of the Covenant was conveyed from the Philistine territory to Beth-shemesh,[16] when a war with the Philistines was imminent,[17] and when Saul was anointed as king;[18] in all periods of the Hebrew monarchy,[19] and at its restoration after the exile.[20] Most of the events just alluded to clearly imply the characteristic ideas of holocausts — the humble and contrite acknowledgment of the Divine sovereignty: but as an occurrence may at the same time mark the successful attainment of some desired end, holocausts were not unfrequently coupled with joy-offerings;[21] and as the general confession of sinfulness may be qualified by an anxiety of expiating a particular trespass, holocausts were often combined with sin-offerings.[22]

Yet the notion of internal atonement was a growth of a later time; it formed a distinctive feature of the theology of the Pentateuch, and was developed gradually, in the course of centuries, and after many struggles and fluctuations.[23] We are, therefore, compelled to suppose that the expiatory character which the burnt-offerings manifestly bear in the Levitical law, was stamped upon them by the subsequent compilers of this code, and was then superadded to their original meaning as offerings of awe and propitiation, a meaning which they had long shared with the sacrifices of other religious systems of antiquity.

---

[11] Exod. XXIV. 5.

[12] Exod. XXXII. 6.

[13] Exod. XXIX. 16—18; comp. Num. XXIII. 1—3, 14, 15, 29, 30.

[14] Josh. VIII. 31; comp. XXII. 23.

[15] Judg. VI. 26; comp. XI. 31; XIII. 16.

[16] 1 Sam. VI. 14, 15.

[17] 1 Sam. VII. 9, 10; XIII. 9.

[18] 1 Sam. X. 8.

[19] Comp. 2 Sam. VI. 17, 18; XXIV. 25; 1 Ki. III. 4; VIII. 64; IX. 25; 2 Ki. V. 17; X. 24.

[20] Ezr. III. 2, 3.

[21] שלמים or זבח; comp. Exod. X. 25; XVIII. 12; XXIV. 5; XXXII. 6; Num. X. 10; Deut. XXVII. 7; Josh. VIII. 31; Judg. XX. 26; XXXI. 4; 1 Sam. X. 8; XIII. 9; 2 Sam. VI. 17, 18; XXIV. 25; 1 Ki. III. 15; IX. 25; 1 Chr. XVI. 1, 2; 2 Chr. VII. 1; XXXI. 2; Ps. LI. 18, 21; LXVI. 13—15; Isai. LVI. 7; 1 Macc. IV. 56 (*προςήνεγκαν ὁλοκαυτώματα μετ' εὐφροσύνης, καὶ ἔθυσαν θυσίαν σωτηρίου κτλ.*); etc.

[22] Lev. V. 7; VIII. 14, 18; IX. 3; Num. VI. 11, 14; XXVIII. 11, 15, 19, 22, 27, 30, etc. It cannot, however, be asserted that burnt-offerings necessarily and invariably formed an accompaniment both of thank- and sin-offerings (so *Bähr*, Symb. II. 362), as the latter classes had a meaning perfectly distinct.

[23] See Sect. XV.

### 3. The mode of sacrificing.

1. If the holocaust was a bullock, a sheep, or a goat, the offerer, after the usual preparation, took the animal to the Court of the Sanctuary before the brazen altar, and there placed his right hand on its head,[1] after which he killed it at the northern side of the altar. A priest received the blood, and another sprinkled it round the sides of the altar,[2] while a third, or a Levite who assisted at the menial duties of the service, flayed the victim and reserved the hide as a perquisite of the priest "who offered up the burnt-offering", that is, who sprinkled the blood.[3] The same minister cut the animal "into its pieces" or its natural limbs, carefully washed the bowels and legs with water,[4] and salted all pieces. Priests then placed wood on the fire which was perpetually kept on the altar of burnt-offerings, laid upon the wood the head, the bowels, and the legs, together with the other parts and the fat (פֶּדֶר) that had been taken out of the flesh and the entrails, so that the entire animal, except the skin,[5] was consumed on the altar as "a sweet odour to the Lord",[6] of course accompanied by the legally prescribed cereal and drink-offerings.[7] It is not improbable[8] that in general first the head, the shoulders, the fat, and the members of the body were laid on the burning wood, and that this was the עֹלָה *par excellence*;[9] and that then only the bowels and legs, so apt to be covered with impurity and to communicate it to the rest, were washed and added to the pile.[10] It is of the nature of the *holocaust* (or כָּלִיל) to suppose that, primitively, the hide also was delivered up to the flames, as was done with some kinds of sin-offering;[11] but the latter were burnt without the camp, the holocausts on the altar; and as the smell thus caused within the hallowed precincts must have been too offensive to admit even figuratively of the designation of "sweet odour", the hide was subsequently excepted from the general destruction, but was indirectly dedicated to God through His representatives, the priests.

---

1 Although this rite is mentioned in connection with the bullock only, it was undoubtedly performed with holocausts of sheep and goats also (see p. 177); therefore the Sept. adds in the text, though without authority, *καὶ ἐπιθήσει τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ*.

2 Lev. I. 5. 11; VIII. 19; IX. 12; Ex. XXIX. 16; comp. 2 Ki. XVI. 15; see pp. 184, 185.

3 Lev. I. 6; VII. 8; comp. vers. 7, 14, 33.

4 Comp. *Joseph*. Ant. III. ix. 1.

5 And according to Jewish tradition, the "sinew of the hip" (גִּיד הַנָּשֶׁה, Gen. XXXII. 33).

6 See Lev. I. 3—9; VIII. 18—21; IX. 12—14; Exod. XXIX. 15—18; and the explanation of the ceremonies in Sect. X.

7 Sectt. XI. XII.

8 From Lev. IX. 13, 14, compared with *Joseph*. Ant. III. ix. 1.

9 Lev. IX. 14.

10 Comp. also p. 197; and Comm. on Lev. I. 1—9.

11 Lev. IV. 11, 12, 21, etc.; see p. 205.

When the holocaust was a turtle-dove or a pigeon,[12] the following ceremonies, exclusively performed by the priest,[13] were observed: the priest brought it to the altar, wrung off (מלק) its head, and in doing so pressed out the blood on the side of the altar. He then salted the head and put it on the altar into the flames. Next removing the crop (מֻרְאָה) with its excrements (נֹצָה),[14] and casting it on the eastern side of the altar, to the place of the ashes, he cleft (שִׁסַּע) the wings with his hand,[15] without, however, breaking them off, and then burnt on the altar what remained of the bird.[16]

## XIV. THE THANK-OFFERING (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים or שְׁלָמִים)[17]

### 1. Its General Character and History.

Sacrifices intended as an acknowledgment for some temporal boon, were naturally associated with elements of joy and homeliness excluded from the severer classes of offering; the solemnity was tempered by cheerfulness;[18] the diviner aspirations were mingled with human feelings and cravings. God, the Master and Judge, was merged in God, the Benefactor and Rescuer.[19] The holocaust and the sin-offering represented the life and person of the worshipper; the thank-offering was pre-eminently his gift or a part of his property; the former typified self-sacrifice, the latter grateful reciprocity of benefits; the former were prompted by a feeling of disturbed harmony with God, the latter was presented in a state of virtual union with Him. Hence the *shelamim* (שלמים) may well be explained as *safety-offerings*;[20] for they were connected with wants deemed essential to happiness and a

---

12 For it was lawful to offer one of these birds as a sacrifice; comp. *Talm.* Kinn. 24*a*, צריכה להביא עוד פרידה אחת.

13 See p. 188.

14 And probably the feathers; see Comm. on I. 16.

15 אין שסוע אלא ביד, comp. *Rashi* on I. 17.

16 See Lev. I. 14—17, and the Ceremonies in Sect. X.

17 For שְׁלָמִים is used even for a single animal presented as a thank-offering (Lev. VII. 14; IX. 22; Num. VI. 14; Ezek. XLV. 15), though once the singular שֶׁלֶם occurs (Am. V. 22), as on the Punic inscription of Marseilles (lines 3, 5, 7, 9, 11), and sometimes זֶבַח alone denotes praise- and thank-offering (Exod. XVIII. 12; Lev. XIII. 37; Num. XV. 3, 8; Deut. XII. 6; 1 Sam. I. 21; II. 19; comp. I. 4; Ps. LI. 18; see p. 74, note 6), though occasionally ושלמים is added (Josh. XXII. 27, זבחים ושלמים): the combination זבחים שלמים (1 Sam. XI. 15) is easily intelligible, זבחים being the generic, שלמים the specific term; comp. p. 74, note 6.

18 Comp. Deut. XXVII. 7; 1 Sam. XI. 15; comp. Num. X. 10; 2 Chr. XXX. 21, 22; 1 Macc. IV. 56.

19 See pp. 1, 2.

20 From שלם *to be sound, healthy,* or *safe* (Job IX. 4; XXII. 21); thus the Sept. frequently σωτήριον or θυσία σωτηρίου, Philo (De Vict. 7—9), Outram (l. c. p. 115, sacrificia salutaria), Hengstenb., Keil, Öhler, Bunsen, a. o. (Heilsopfer).

secure existence. The translation *thank-offering*[1] may be entertained;[2] the vague rendering *peace-offering*[3] can only be admitted if peace is understood as an equivalent for safety, or if chiefly the frame of mind is considered in which the sacrifice was offered;[4] while the rendering "feast-offering"[5] entirely abandons the Hebrew designation, and is derived from one particular, though important characteristic of the class:[6] the translations *purity-offering*,[7] because clean persons only were allowed to eat of it;[8] *restoration-offering*,[9] because it restored the sinful man to a proper state of innocence;[10] and *sacrifice of completion*, "because in partaking of it the relation between God and the worshipper appeared perfect and complete",[11] or because it formed the complement of other offerings,[12] or because "that which on the part of the offerer was deficient in his relation to God was made complete by it":[13] these and other translations are unsupported by Biblical statements. Nor is it plausible to explain שלמים as the *perfect offering* in the sense that at once God, the priests, and the offerer received a portion of it, and thereby concluded a mutual alliance.[14]

---

[1] Thus *Joseph.* Ant. III. ix. 1, 2, *χαριστήριος θυσία*; Luther, Rosenm., Gesen., Winer, De Wette, a. o.

[2] Though it is based upon the meaning of שלם in Piel (to requite, to recompense; comp. Ps. LVI. 73; Hos. XIV. 3; and שִׁלּוּם Mic. VII. 3), not in Kal, which does not occur in that sense; comp., however, שַׁלְמֹנִים (Isai. I. 23) *reward, bribe*; and כֹּפֶר and כִּפֵּר.

[3] Used in the English version in accordance with *εἰρηνικὴ θυσία* commonly employed by the Septuagint, and victima pacifica or pacificum of the Vulgate; so also Gussetius (sacrif. pacalia, quibus pax cum Deo favetur), Tholuck, Kahnis, Delitzsch, a. o. (Friedensopfer), and according to Kurtz (Opferc. p. 215) expressing that the offerer is שָׁלֵם עִם־יְהֹוָה (1 Ki. VIII. 61; XI. 4; XV. 3; comp. also שְׁלֹמִי *my friend*, and Gen. XXXIV. 21), which is too abstract for sacrifices so primitive and so general.

[4] Comp. *Abarban.* Introd. to Lev. IV. sub fin., ולכן נקראו שלמים לפי שהם בבחינת השלום שבא על המקריב; *Rashi* and *Grotius* on Lev. III. 1; *Carpzov*, Appar. Crit. p. 706; etc.

[5] Michaelis, Boothroyd, a. o.

[6] Comp. *Joseph.* Antiq. III. ix. 1, *κατ' εὐωχίαν δρᾶται τῶν τεθυκότων*.

[7] Sacrificium teleticum, *ἀπὸ τῆς τελετῆς*.

[8] Comp. Lev. VII. 20; *Rosenm.* Lev. p. 26.

[9] Comp. Job VIII. 6.

[10] Comp. *Movers*, Opferw. der Carth. p. 62.

[11] *Baumgarten*, Lev. p. 132, Vollendungsopfer.

[12] See *infra*.

[13] *Bähr*, Symb. II. 369.

[14] Comp. *Abarb.* Introd. to Lev. c. I, ולכן נקראו שלמים שנותנים שלום למזבח לכהנים ולבעלים; *Outram*, De Sacrif. I. xi. 1; *Dav. Kimchi* sub שלם; *Venema*, Dissert. Sacr. L. II. p. 349. Artificial is the long and laborious deduction of Neumann (Sacr. V. T. Salut., pp. 17—27), who finally arrives at the result that the שלמים "eum figunt menti statum, in quo humana religio integritatis nitore perfusa ac sensu perfecti in se divinat atque in mundo vestigia ut pacis inde natae perfruatur gaudiis" — manifestly comprising a complexity of notions utterly foreign to the simple Hebrew term; in an earlier treatise the same writer ventured the translation

It cannot be difficult to understand and account for the peculiar regulations fixed by the Law with respect to thank-offerings. The victims, whether of the herd or the flock, were not required to be males; female animals were equally acceptable.[15] The bloodless oblation added to the thank-offering, consisted, in some cases, not only of unleavened cakes and wafers, but also of leavened bread, to remind the Israelite of his ordinary life and subsistence.[16] Not the whole animal was burnt, but some special parts only were delivered to the Deity as "an offering made by fire, a sweet odour to the Lord";[17] two choice portions, the breast and the right shoulder, were reserved for the priests, who ate them with their wives, their children, and their servants, within the precincts of the Sanctuary, while the rest was consumed in convivial feasts, in any part of the sacred town, by the offerer himself with his family and household, together with the Levite, the poor, and the stranger, his invited guests.[18] This social element connected with the שלמים strengthens the conclusion derived from internal reasons that this class of sacrifice, at least in its Levitical development, is of much later origin than the holocausts; for it pre-supposes a degree of legal and political organisation considerably in advance of primitive existence. Now let it be observed that all the fat, together with the members and organs to which it is chiefly attached, as the kidneys and the fat tail (אַלְיָה) of certain kinds of sheep,[19] was burnt to God on the altar; and let it be considered that the *minchah* which belonged to the thank-offering, was in an unusual degree prepared with oil; for not only were the cakes and wafers mingled and anointed, but the flour itself of which they were made, was sometimes saturated (מֻרְבֶּכֶת) with it:[20] therefore *fatness*, typical of abundance and prosperity, of joy and gratitude, appears to be the leading characteristic of thank-offerings.[21] It is hence obvious, that thank-offerings did not, as has been contended, form a mere accessory to holocausts supposed to have invariably preceded; they emanated from a frame of mind so peculiar, so important, and so beneficial for religious education that they could well be pre-

"Seligkeitsopfer" (in Schneider's Zeitschr. 1853, p. 543).

[15] Comp. Lev. III. 1, 6, 12; IX. 4, 18; XXII. 21; XXIII. 19; Num. VI. 14; XV. 8; 1 Ki. VIII. 63; see p. 95.

[16] Lev. VII. 13; comp. Am. IV. 5; Num. VI. 15; see p. 135.

[17] Lev. III. 5, 11, 16.

[18] See Sect. X. 14.

[19] Lev. II. 3—5, 9—11, 14—16; comp. IV. 26; VI. 5; 1 Ki. VIII. 64 (חלבי השלמים).

[20] See p. 105, note 23.

[21] See pp. 129, 130. Philo (De Victim. 7) speculates on the probable reason why the brain and the heart, being the dominant and therefore the most precious organs, were not offered rather than the fat and the fat parts; but his arguments apply to the heart and brain of man, and not of animals.

scribed in the Law independently of any other class of sacrifice. Holocausts were indeed frequently accompanied by thank-offerings;[1] but this combination originated in the nature of the former rather than of the latter kind; for as holocausts flowed from a general feeling of dependence and moral deficiency, and as their oblation by private individuals was not tied to fixed times, they were often delayed till a peculiar event of a joyful nature reminded the Israelite, to his humiliation, both of God's goodness and his own unworthiness; and then he joined a holocaust to his thank-offering. The combination of both was indeed singularly appropriate; though according to its character, either of them was fitly offered alone and at different seasons.

Again, it is true that the thank-offering also possessed atoning power; its ritual with regard to the sprinkling of blood, quite generally described as an atonement of the soul,[2] was exactly identical with those ordained for holocausts.[3] But the sprinkling formed the kernel and centre (עִקָּר) of the animal thank-offering only in so far as it marked the slaughtered beast as a *victim*; it characterised the category in general, but was not the specific peculiarity of the individual class, which consisted in the burning of the fat parts and in the common meals which followed the sacrifice. The thank-offering expiated because, prompted as it was by gratitude for mercies and blessings received, it naturally called forth in the pious mind not only the feeling of submission but also of defects and shortcomings, and therefore spontaneously invited to purification, moral improvement, and to earnest efforts for effecting a closer approach to God's holiness. But these were the *effects* of the thank-offering rather than its primary *object:* it originated in a state of inward peace, or from a supposed union with God: but the self-examination occasioned by the offering, necessarily proved that that union was capable of a higher intensity and power.[4] As eucharistic

---

[1] See p. 239. [2] Lev. XVII. 11.

[3] See Sect. X. 7; comp. Lev. VII. 14, 33.

[4] More than this cannot be contended without abandoning the sphere of the Pentateuch, and straying into fanciful aberrations like this, "the word שלמים points fundamentally to direct completion of the imperfect, to a removal of guilt and to conciliation; the offerer, independently of his general sinfulness, appears specially in a condition requiring expiation, and when that condition has been altered, the state of שלום can ensue" (*Bähr*, Symb. II. 379). No proof can be derived from the meaning of the word הודה, because that verb, though signifying *to praise*, never in itself signifies *to confess sins*, but simply to *confess*, and receives the former sense only by the addition of עון, חטא, or a similar word (Lev. V. 5; XVI. 21; XXVI. 40; Ps. XXXII. 5; Neh. I. 6; IX. 2); and no Hebrew reader would have understood קרבן תודה to mean "an offering for the confession of sins". The profound and pure-minded author of שלה (on Lev. I. 2)

offerings were presented in gladness of heart and out of the abundance of man's property, they never consisted of vegetable oblations alone or of birds, as pigeons and turtle-doves, the less so as these would not have sufficed for the altar, the priests, and the convivial meals which formed so essential a part of the sacrifice. A legal command was not given on the subject; it was hardly required considering the strongly marked nature of the eucharistic sacrifice.

Now the thank-offerings, originally forming one great class, were by the Levitical code divided into two separate kinds[5]—those that were obligatory and prescribed by the Law, as the two lambs offered on the Feast of Weeks,[6] and the ram presented by the Nazarite at the end of his term of seclusion,[7] and those that were presented in consequence of a vow or as a voluntary gift.[8] In the former case, they received in the Levitical legislation the distinctive name of *praise-offering*.[9] They

---

correctly explains that the thank-offering was to be presented in a state of grace, but spiritualising in his wonted manner, he observes "if a man feels within himself a complete devotion to God, he brings a thank-offering of which he himself has a part, like God and the priest, and he thus helps to fulfil the injunction 'You shall be to Me a kingdom of priests'."

[5] Comp. p. 40.

[6] Lev. XXIII. 19; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 455, 456.

[7] Num. VI. 14.

[8] נדר או נדבה; comp. Lev. VII. 12, 16; XXII. 21; XXIII. 38; Num. XV. 3, 8; XXIX. 39; Deut. XII. 6, 17.

[9] זֶבַח תּוֹדַת הַשְּׁלָמִים (Lev. VII. 13, 15) or זֶבַח תּוֹדָה or זֶבַח הַתּוֹדָה (Lev. VII. 12; XXII. 29; Ps. CVII. 22; CXVI. 17), also simply תּוֹדָה (Jer. XVII. 26; XXXIII. 11; Am. IV. 5; Ps. LVI. 13; 2 Chr. XXIX. 31); Sept. and Philo (De Victim. 9) θυσία αἰνέσεως, and so 1 Macc. IV. 56 (θυσία σωτηρίου καὶ αἰνέσεως). It is obvious that the term זבח תודה, in accordance with its literal sense "sacrifice of praise", originally applied to all offerings of thankfulness presented on joyful occasions, whether in consequence of a vow or not (comp. Ps. LVI. 13; CVII. 22; CXVI. 17, 18; 2 Chr. XXIX. 31; XXXIII. 16), and was thus in some measure synonymous with זבח שלמים (comp. also *Hengstenb.* Opfer, p. 38), though in early times the שלמים was offered also in distress and before deliverance (see p. 248), the תודה never on such emergencies; but later, when the subdivision of the class was established, its meaning was contracted and it became the ordinary terminus technicus for *one* species; while the word שלמים was reserved for the general confession of gratitude, even without a particular occasion; so that it stands in the same relation to the תודה, as the holocaust does to the sin-offering. The definition which Philo (De Vict. 9) gives of the זבח תודה, that it was offered for general prosperity and happiness in life (ἀπολέμῳ καὶ εἰρηναίῳ βίῳ χρώμενος ἐν εὐπαθείαις τε καὶ εὐτυχίαις ἐξεταζόμενος, ἀπήμων καὶ ἄπταιστος ὢν κτλ.) is not warranted by the Biblical accounts; and the translation confessio or sacrificium confessionis (*Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. III. ii. 3, p. 765; comp. 2 Chr. XXX. 22) unnecessarily omits the *chief* notion, namely the confession of *benefits* received. The view of Ewald (Alterth. p. 55) that he who offered a זבח תודה enhanced the solemnity of the act by causing professional singers

were naturally regarded as most solemn, and therefore surrounded with more stringent regulations. For it appears that originally the time for the repasts connected with thank-offerings, was the day of the sacrifice and the next following, so that what remained on the third day was to be burnt.[1] But after the adoption of the sub-division it was deemed desirable to distinguish the praise-offerings by more rigid observances, and to restrict the time of their consumption to the very day of the sacrifice, including, however, the succeeding night up to the next morning;[2] while the primitive arrangement was retained with regard to the thank-offerings presented as vows or voluntary gifts.[3] Again, the praise-offering was accompanied by an extraordinary bloodless oblation (מנחה) not demanded with the voluntary or vowed sacrifice.[4] Besides, there was this gradation fixed between a thank-offering as a vow and as a free-will gift that, in the former case, the animal was required to be absolutely perfect; while, in the latter, it was accepted even if its members were either abnormally long or short.[5]

It is untenable to understand the offerings of the vow or free-will gift as supplications for the future, and the praise-offering as thanks for the past;[6] for the vow and not unfrequently also the free-will gift were presented after the event.[7] Subtle and almost cunningly designing is the remark of Hengstenberg that offerings of thanks are properly identical with offerings of supplication, because "it is a delicate mode of entreaty to return thanks as if the object of the prayer had already been granted."[8] And the difficulty is glossed over rather than removed by the remark, that "in misfortune it must appear especially necessary and salutary to be sure of peace with God."[9]

The motives of the Law in limiting the time for the consumption of the sacrificial flesh, do not seem so uncertain or so recondite as has

---

and musicians to chant and perform hymns of praise, has found no adherent.

[1] Lev. XIX. 5—8.

[2] Lev. VII. 15; VIII. 32; XXII. 29, 30; Exod. XXIX. 34.

[3] Lev. VII, 16, 17.

[4] Comp. Lev. VII. 11—13.

[5] Lev. XXII. 23; see p. 93. Worthless is the distinction between נדר and נדבה proposed by Talmudical writers (comp. *Maimon*. Maas. Hakkorban. c. 14; *Abarban*. Intr. to Lev. c. III), that the former was dedicated by using the formula הרי עלי (sancte in me recipio), the latter by בהמה זו עולה or the like, so that a particular animal or gift was singled out and fixed; or that the former was obligatory under all circumstances, while the latter needed not to be offered if the appointed animal had in the mean time died or been injured.

[6] So Abarbanel, a. o; comp. Lev. VII. 12—16.

[7] Comp. Judg. XI. 30—34; Jon. II. 10; 2 Sam. XV. 7, 8; Ps. CXVI, 18; LXVI. 13—15.

[8] *Hengstenb*. Opfer, p. 39; comp. also Authent. d. Pent. II. 85, 86.

[9] *Baumgarten*, Comm. on Lev. p. 132.

often been represented. The flesh of an animal piously slaughtered before God, was to be clearly distinguished from ordinary meat; the repast was, therefore, not to be separated from the act of sacrificing by an interval so long as to efface the connection between the one and the other, and what remained beyond the second day was fitly removed by fire, though of course, as it had ceased to bear any relation whatever to the sacrifice or its rites, not by the fire of the altar. The legislator insisted upon this point with almost surprising rigour, "If any of the flesh of the thank-offering be eaten at all on the third day, it shall not be accepted; nor shall it be imputed to him that offers it; it shall be an abomination (פִּגּוּל), and the soul that eats of it shall bear its iniquity"—[10] a rigour prompted by the anxious zeal of maintaining the sacred character of everything appertaining to the sacrifice.[11] These conclusions are confirmed by some other precepts. If the flesh by chance came into contact with any unclean thing, it was to be burnt. Clean persons only were allowed to eat of it; but if any one partook of it who was in a state of impurity, whether this lay in his person or was occasioned by touching impure objects, the Law declared "that person shall be cut off from among his people",[12] because "he has profaned the holiness of the Lord."[13] Various are the reasons proposed by others in explanation of the law under discussion. Philo strangely believes that one day was allowed to remind the offerer of the salvation of his soul, and one to remind him of the health of his body, and as no third end was aimed at by sacrifices, they could not be eaten on the third day,[14] which fanciful opinion does not even attempt to account for the *one* day to which the meals of praise-offerings were confined. Again, it has been observed that as he who prays for some future boon generally prolongs his devotion more than he who offers thanks and praises for some past blessing, the flesh of the שלמים offered for vow or free-will gift, could be kept for two days, that of the תודה for one day only;[15] but that distinction is not correct, since the proper or Biblical זבח תודה is not a voluntary but a compulsory sacrifice; besides, the delay in eating the flesh does not mark superior sanctity, but just the reverse. There is some specious plausibility in the view that as in the warm eastern climates the meat begins on the third day to show symptoms

---

[10] Lev. VII. 18.

[11] The Egyptian custom of eating the whole pig offered to Bacchus and the moon on the day of the sacrifice, without leaving anything (*Herod.* II. 47), is no real analogy, since the Egyptians considered the pig utterly unclean, except on the day of the full-moon on which it was offered.

[12] Lev. VII. 19—21.

[13] Comp. also Lev. XIX. 8. See in general notes on VII. 11—21.

[14] *Philo*, De Victim. c. 8.

[15] So *Abarb.* Introd. to Lev. c. IV sub fin.

of putrefaction which was deemed an abomination in connection with sacrifices,[1] it was not to be eaten beyond that time.[2] But such considerations are foreign to the subject. If the Hebrews knew from experience that the flesh becomes foul after two days, they might be expected to dispose of it before; and if they yet left anything over after that time, they would not have required a vehement and emphatic warning not to eat putrid meat which they might well be supposed to eschew spontaneously. But it is futile to conjecture that the ordinance intended to compel the rich to make the Levites partakers of the feast,[3] or to inspire the Israelites with confidence in God's goodness, and to remove pusillanimous anxiety for their future sustenance, or — curious to note — to prevent them from drying or preserving the meat, and thus "eating the flesh in a sparing manner, or communicating only a small portion of it to their particular friends."[4]

This is the character of the שְׁלָמִים as it appears in the laws of the Pentateuch; but in early times they seem to have been offered also when blessings were not thanked but prayed for;[5] and during long periods, they were, besides, employed for the ratification of solemn covenants, treaties, and alliances,[6] for which purpose, according to eastern notions and customs, the common meals which followed rendered them peculiarly appropriate.[7]

---

[1] See pp. 133, 136.

[2] So *Philo*, De Vict. c. 8 (ὅτι τὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς τραπέζης πάντα καιρίως δεῖ προσφέρεσθαι, σπουδὴν ποιουμένους ὡς μὴ μεταβάλῃ μήκει χρόνου, κρεῶν δὲ ἑώλων εὔσηπτος ἡ φύσις, καὶ ἂν ἡδύσμασι παραρτυθῇ); see *Maimon*. Mor. Nevoch. III. 46; *Bähr*, Symb. II. 375; a. o.

[3] Theodoret (Quaest. 6 in Lev.), Cleric., Michael., Rosenm., Scholl, a. o.; see also *Philo*, l. c. (ὅτι τὰς θυσίας ἀταμιεύτους εἶναι προσήκει καὶ πᾶσιν εἰς μέσον προκεῖσθαι τοῖς δεομένοις).

[4] *Harmer*, Observ. I. 394, 396; *Rosenm*. Morgenl. II. 159; comp. *Michael*. on Lev. VII. 15—18.

[5] 1 Sam. XIII. 9; 2 Sam. XXIV. 25.

[6] Comp. Judg. XX. 26; XXI. 4; see also Exod. XXIV. 5.

[7] Comp. pp. 36, 37. It is as idle to deny the occurrence of "supplication-offerings" in Hebrew *history* as to assert their authorisation in the Levitical *law*: the thank-offerings promised as a vow (נדר), were also presented *after* the event (the long explanations given by Kliefoth, l. c. pp. 77, 78, and by Kurtz l. c. §§ 129, 130, obscure rather than elucidate the simple subject), and the free-will offerings were from their nature independent of personal successes; therefore the division of שלמים into those offered as הודאה על העבר and those offered as הפלה על העתיד, in unjustified; comp. *Abarban.* on Lev. VII. 11—22, p. 20*a* ...שלמי נדר ונדבה שיקריב אדם כדי שיצליחו מעשיו (Ps. CXVI. 16—19 certainly does not support this view); *Outram*, De Sacrif. I. xi. 1, p. 115 (sacrificia salutaria ... semper de rebus prosperis fieri solent, impetratis utique aut impetrandis); *Hengstenberg*, Authent. des Pentat. II. 86 (Die Schelamim werden entweder als verkörperter Dank für das ertheilte, oder als verkörperte Bitte um das zu ertheilende Heil dargebracht); *Kurtz*, Opferc. §§ 127, 130; *Öhler*, l. c. p. 637;

### 2. The mode of sacrificing.

The first ceremonies — the imposition of the hand, the slaughtering, the receiving and sprinkling of the blood — were precisely identical with those observed at holocausts of quadrupeds:[8] but then the offerer presented to the officiating priest all the fat and the fat parts — namely the fat that is on and round the bowels, the two kidneys with the fat that is upon them by the flanks, together with the great lobe of the liver to be taken off by the kidneys; and if the victim was a sheep of that peculiar species termed "long-tailed",[9] he added to them its fat tail (אַלְיָה);[10] he was not permitted to send them or to order them to be fetched, but had to take them himself to the altar "with his own hands",[11] that they might visibly appear as his personal and ready free-will gift offered with a grateful heart; he then handed over the breast and the right shoulder to the priest who "waved" the former and "heaved" the latter,[12] after which he burnt all the fat and fat parts as a fire-offering to God on the altar.[13] Now, if the thank-offering were presented in the name of the whole people, the priests received all that remained after the burning of the fat; but if presented by a private individual, they claimed as their portions the right shoulder and the breast, the former to be assigned to the officiating functionary, the latter to be reserved for all Aaronites in common; while the rest was allowed to the offering Israelite to be eaten by him and his guests on the same or the following day.[14]

## XV. THE SIN-OFFERING AND THE TRESPASS-OFFERING (חַטָּאת[15] and אָשָׁם).

The consciousness of moral frailty, the most unfailing source of truly religious impulses and the surest indication of an ideal yearning

*Ewald*, Alterth. p. 53 (Der Dank geht von selbst in ein Flehen um die Fortsetzung der göttlichen Gnade über); and on the other hand, *Bähr*, Symb. II. 385; *Kliefoth*, l. c. p. 79. Both vague and incorrect is the remark, "every repast that was held before God in a solemn manner and with prescribed rituals was called שלמים" (*Saalschütz*, Mos. R. I. 313).

8 See p. 240.

9 Ovis laticaudata.

10 Lev. III. 3, 4; comp. IV. 8, 9; see notes on Chapt. III, and Comm. on Exod. p. 555.

11 Lev. VII. 30, ידיו תביאינה.

12 See Sect. X. 11, 12.

13 Similarly the Phoenicians burnt upon the altar chiefly, if not exclusively, the fat of the victims (comp. the inscription of Marseilles, line 14, ועל חלב ועל חלב; *Virg*. Aen. IV. 62, Aut ante ora deûm *pingues* spatiatur ad *aras*; *Movers*, l. c. pp. 107, 108).

14 See Sect. X. 14; comp. in general Lev. III. 1—16; VII. 30—34; and on the מנחה which accompanied the praise-offering, Sect. XI. 2.

15 Or חַטָּת (Num. XV. 24), and poetically חֲטָאָה (Ps. XL. 7).

after moral improvement, strongly pervaded the character of the Hebrews. "There is not a righteous man upon earth that does good and sins not",[1] is a sentiment which recurs in the most varied shades and modifications.[2] A sufferer overwhelmed by anguish, breaks forth in the desponding cry, "O Lord, rebuke me not in Thy wrath, nor chasten me in Thy hot displeasure... There is no rest in my bones on account of my sin; for my iniquities have passed over my head; as a heavy weight they are too burdensome for me."[3] One of Job's friends knows no stronger reason for patient endurance under trial and distress than the general truth, "How can man be justified with God, or how can he be clean that is born of a woman? Behold, even the moon shines not and the stars are not pure in His eyes: how much less man, the worm, and the son of man, the maggot."[4] The humble feeling of sinfulness cannot be felt more deeply, nor expressed more earnestly. It traces spontaneously suffering to trespass. "Innumerable evils", exclaims the Psalmist, "encompass me; my iniquities take hold of me, and I cannot survey them; they are more abundant than the hairs of my head, and my heart fails me."[5] It longs after deliverance from its own oppressive torments, "Have mercy upon me, o God", prays an unhappy sinner, "according to Thy loving kindness; according to the multitude of Thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions; wash me thoroughly from my iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin."[6] It is irresistibly prompted to frank and lowly confession, "I acknowledge my sin to Thee, and I hide not my iniquity; I say, I will confess my transgression to the Lord."[7] It finds the most soothing relief, the sole rescue from moral despair, the only safeguard against hardened recklessness, in the hope of Divine pardon and atonement, which are accorded as the result or reward of internal regeneration: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered, and blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputes not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile."[8] And it finally recognises as the most acceptable offering which God never rejects, "a broken spirit, a broken and contrite heart."[9] — Simultaneously with these noble notions, the Hebrews developed the conception of the merciful attributes of God, who, though unable to

---

[1] Eccl. VII. 20.

[2] Comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 46; 2 Chr. VI. 36 (כי אין אדם אשר לא יחטא); *Philo*, De Vict. c. 14 (*καὶ ἂν γὰρ ὁ τέλειος ᾖ γεννητός, οὐκ ἐκφεύγει τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν*).

[3] Ps. XXXVIII. 1, 3, 4.

[4] Job XXV. 4—6; comp. IV. 17—19; comp. also Gen. XXXII. 11; 2 Sam. VII. 18.

[5] Ps. XL. 13.

[6] Ps. LI. 3, 4; comp. XIX. 13.

[7] Ps. XXXII. 5; comp. XXXVIII. 19 (עוני אגיד אדאג מחטאתי); LI. 5 (כי פשעי אני ארע וחטאתי נגדי תמיד).

[8] Ps. XXXII. 1, 2.

[9] Ps. LI. 19.

efface the evil deed, can "pass over" it,[10] remember it no more, and blot it out,[11] or annul its direful effects upon the mind and the fate of the offender; and who is slow to wrath and willing to pardon, "The Eternal is merciful and gracious, longsuffering and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin."[12] They commonly accepted the doctrine, "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return to the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for He pardons abundantly":[13] in harmony with which view a later Jewish writer justly observed, "The most precious benefit attending the expiatory offerings is this that the sinner becomes aware and is sure in his mind, that his transgressions have been remitted; for if he were not persuaded of God's readiness to pardon him, he would despair of mercy, and add iniquity to transgression."[14]

But long periods of religious education are required to arrive at similar ideas and convictions.[15] The sense of awe, of dependence, and of gratitude in relation to an all-powerful, all-wise, and all-loving Ruler of the World, precedes by long epochs the dawning notion that purity of the heart is, in a great measure, the source of our happiness, that it is certainly the end of all religious life, and the indispensable condition of peace and serenity and every true blessing. At first, no doubt, the belief prevailed that sin demanded the death of the sinner. "David said to Nathan, I have sinned to the Lord: and Nathan said to David, Indeed the Lord has passed over thy sin, thou shalt not die."[16] "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? says the Lord God: and not that he should return from his ways and live?"[17] Next the notion was entertained that the sinner's life might be saved if another life was surrendered in its stead, whether that of a human being[18] or of an animal.[19] Thus the doctrine of substitution or vicarious suffering gained

---

[10] העביר חטאת or עון (2 Sam. XII. 13; XXIV. 10); עבר על פשע (Mic. VII. 18); comp. Ps. LI. 11 (הסתיר פנים מחטא).

[11] Jer. XVIII. 23; XXXI. 34; Isai. XLIII. 25; XLIV. 22; Ezek. XVIII. 22; XXXIII. 16; comp. Isai. XXXVIII. 17; Jer. L. 20; Mic. VII. 19; Ps. LXXXV. 3.

[12] Exod. XXXIV. 6, 7; comp. XXXIII. 19; Num. XIV. 18—20; Deut. XXX. 1—3; 1 Sam. XII. 19; Isai. LVII. 15, 16; Joel II. 13; Jonah IV. 2; Ps. LXXXVI. 15, 16; CIII. 8; CXI. 4; CXLV. 8; 2 Chr. XXX. 9; Neh. IX. 17, 31.

[13] יַרְבֶּה לִסְלוֹחַ, Isai. LV. 7; comp. Mic. VII. 19; 2 Chr. XXX. 8. On the Jewish notions of repentance or "return" (תשובה), see *Hamburger*, Real-Encycl. für Bib. und Talm. I. 201—204.

[14] *Abarb.* Introd. to Levit. sub fin.

[15] Comp. *Vatke*, Theologie des A.T. I. 355.

[16] 2 Sam. XII. 13; comp. 1 Sam. XII. 19.

[17] Ezek. XVIII. 23; comp. 30, 31; XXXIII. 10 *sqq.*

[18] Mic. VI. 7; 2 Sam. XII. 14; comp. XXI. 9.

[19] Gen. XXII. 12, 13; see, in general, Sect. XVIII.

ground; and after the lapse of new and long intervals, the death of the victim came to be regarded as a symbol of atonement wrought by repentance and inward reform. Therefore the Book of Genesis thoughtfully refrains from introducing sin-offerings; it seems justly to regard them as bespeaking a stage decidedly in advance of patriarchal simplicity; and it employs, in their place, the burnt-offerings, which indeed involve the general notions of unworthiness and expiation, but more distinctly convey the homage due to the Divine sovereignty, and hence express not so much an internal as an external relation between God and man. Thus a grand sin-offering would have been most appropriate when Noah had been saved from the universal destruction caused by the wickedness of the human race; but he is described as having presented a magnificent holocaust.[1] The compilers and revisors of the Pentateuch were evidently guided by the principle that an intimate and direct communion between the Israelites and Jehovah was justified or even possible only after the nation had been elected and appointed as "a kingdom of priests and a holy people";[2] when the demand had been proclaimed, "You shall be holy, for I am holy";[3] when a mutual covenant had been concluded on the basis of a special revelation; when, therefore, the trespasses of the individual, though they could not destroy, were considered to defile the sacredness of the community. After these remarks we need not point out the perversity of the opinion that sin-offerings were the earliest or fundamental class of the bloody sacrifices, while holocausts marked the next, and thank-offerings the last and highest link in the sacrificial system; and that the worshipper was allowed to eat of the flesh of thank-offerings alone, because, in that stage only, he had reached a degree of purity entitling him to a share in the holy food; or that a part only of every sin-offering was burnt on the altar, because, in that phase of religious life, the spiritual elevation was not sufficiently advanced to warrant the burning of the entire victim.[4] If this view were correct, every thank-offering ought to have been preceded by a sin-offering and a holocaust as a necessary preparation; and in the same manner, every holocaust by a sin-offering, which is a paradox. The reason why the offerer was excluded from the flesh of the expiatory sacrifices, and why only a part of it was consumed on the altar, is unconnected with considerations like those alleged and will be stated below. The fortieth Psalm is indeed acquainted with sin-offerings, which it couples with holocausts;[5] but according to

---

[1] Gen. VIII. 20.

[2] Exod. XIX. 5, 6.

[3] Lev. XI. 44; XX. 26; Deut. VII. 6.

[4] *Kurtz*, Opfercult. §117, comp. § 79, pp. 133, 134.

[5] עולה וחטאה, ver. 7.

internal evidence, it was not, as the title intimates, composed by David,[6] but by a much later poet living in the time of Jeremiah, and perhaps by Jeremiah himself;[7] and even this late production mentions sin-offerings not as fixed by Divine command, but like the other classes of sacrifice as founded in custom, "Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire; my ears hast Thou opened; burnt-offering and sin-offering hast Thou not required" — a significant hint respecting the date of the sacrificial legislation of the Pentateuch.

As the Hebrew sin-offerings were based upon the consciousness of human weakness and corruption, they were, as a rule, admitted only in cases of *inadvertent* and *unintentional* transgression,[8] but were not accepted for reckless and wanton impiety manifesting itself in deeds of wicked defiance;[9] concerning any one guilty of such iniquity the Law ordained, "he shall be cut off from among his people; he has despised the word of the Lord and broken His commandment; his iniquity shall be upon him."[10] David was not permitted after his deliberate crime against Uriah, to present a sin-offering, but he was to expiate his guilt by Divine punishment.[11] The knowledge that "the cogitation of man's heart is evil from his youth"[12] was to afford no pretext for leniency to premeditated malice, but was, on the contrary, to stimulate to enhanced vigilance and self-control. Divine forgiveness should be granted to the imperfection, but not to the perversion of human nature.[13] The precepts of the Law being the emanation of Divine wisdom, they bore the stamp of holiness; they could not, without offence to their all-wise Author, be violated under any circumstances or in any manner whatever; they required, therefore, atonement even if transgressed involuntarily, unconsciously, and accidentally: their absolute sanctity marked every trespass as a deplorable guilt to be expiated by a sacrifice of self-humiliation. It may be for this reason that the term "to his" or "to your acceptance before the Lord",[14] which

---

6 De Wette observes cautiously, "it may be doubted whether the Psalm is attributable to David"; and Delitzsch, more decidedly, "it disclaims, by its style and form, the authorship of David."

7 So Seiler, Bengel, Delitzsch, Hitzig, a. o.

8 שְׁגָגָה, Num. XV. 22—26; see notes on Lev. IV. 1, 2.

9 בְּיָד רָמָה, Num. XV. 27—29, *ἑκουσίως* in Hebr. X. 26.

10 Num. XV. 30, 31; comp. Hebr. X. 26, "for if we sin wilfully, after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remains no more sacrifice for sins"; and the Rabbinical canon מזיד לאו בר קרבן הוא (see Rashi and Bartenurah on *Mishn.* Horayoth I. 4).

11 Comp. *Hengstenberg*, Opfer, p. 18; *Kurtz*, Opferc. pp. 151, 152.

12 Gen. VIII. 21; comp. VI. 5.

13 How the law in Lev. V. 21—26 is to be reconciled with this broad principle, is pointed out below p. 272, and in the notes in loc.

14 לרצנו לפני יהוה or לרצנכם.

occurs so frequently with respect to other offerings,[1] is never employed in reference to expiatory sacrifices; these were prompted by occasions which could not be pleasing in the eyes of God; for though He delights in true repentance, He must look upon its necessity with mingled feelings of grief and pity. Hence the sin-offering, if an animal, was unaccompanied by a מִנְחָה and a libation of wine,[2] and if a cereal oblation, it was presented without oil and frank-incense;[3] in the former case, it was evidently to be deprived of the character of social and domestic enjoyment, since it was "no food of the Lord";[4] and in the latter, it was not to recall the ideas of cheerfulness and festive serenity, of abundance and ornament, of spiritual enlightenment and elevation, wherefore it is not designated as "a sweet odour to the Lord":[5] the flesh of those animal sin-offerings whose blood did not come into the Holy, was indeed eaten by the male Aaronites,[6] but the repast was serious and severe, devoid of genial conviviality, and forming a part of the ritual of expiation;[7] and the trespass-offering presented by the leper after his recovery, was exceptionally coupled with oil,[8] for though disease was regarded as a Divine retribution, it differs in its moral estimation essentially from a sin directly and palpably committed; moreover that sacrifice was presented by the convalescent in a state of purity, after having been pronounced clean by the priest,[9] whence it partook more properly of the character of a burnt-offering, designed to convey the admission of general sinfulness and dependence. From all this it is manifestly erroneous to contend that the commands with respect to sin-offerings apply only to transgressions of the ceremonial law or to "theocratic sins", but not "to moral offences in a stricter sense":[10] are not fraud, abuse of trust, theft, perjury, and the like, for which expiatory offerings were ordained,[11] "moral offences in a

---

[1] Lev. I. 3, 4; XIX. 5; XXII. 19, 20, 21, 29; XXIII. 11; comp. Exod. XXVIII. 38; Lev. VII. 18; XIX. 7; XXII. 27; Isai. LVI. 7; LX. 7; Ezek. XX. 41; Am. V. 22; Mal. I. 10, 13.

[2] Comp. Num. XV. 1—13 (where holocausts and thank-offerings, עלה וזבח, are alone mentioned), 27—29; XXVIII. 15, 22; XXIX. 16, 19, 22, etc.; *Maimon*. Maas. Hakkorb. II. 2.

[3] Lev. V. 11; Num. V. 15.

[4] See pp. 218, 229.

[5] Except in Lev. IV. 31, see Comm. in loc. (comp. pp. 7, 8, 116, 119).

[6] Lev. VI. 19, 22, 23.

[7] See p. 210. Yet at the initiation of the priests, and also on the first day after its completion, all the flesh of the sin-offerings was burnt, although the blood came only upon the brazen altar in the Court (Exod. XXIX. 11—14; Lev. VIII. 14—17; IX. 8—11, 15), from reasons explained in the proper place (see notes in locc.).

[8] Lev. XIV. 10—12.

[9] Ibid. vers. 7—9.

[10] So *Bähr*, Symb. II. 388; comp. pp. 402, 403, 405, 409; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 151; *Kurtz*, Opferc. § 92.

[11] Lev. V. 21, 22.

stricter sense"? and do the words which almost uniformly introduce the precepts concerning sin-offerings, "if a person sin in one of all the commandments of the Lord, which ought not to be done, and he does one of them",[12] do these words not imply the moral injunctions which form so important a part of the Pentateuch, and constitute the second half of the Decalogue? The opinion that the word "Law"[13] is identical with "ritual law",[14] is an assertion unsupported by the usage of the language, and repudiated by the spirit of the Pentateuch, which code alone, not the life of the Hebrew people as mirrored in their history, can in this question be considered. It is true that any direct opposition to God, as the king of the holy community, or to any of the fundamental institutions of the theocracy, was regarded as a most heinous crime, as high treason and impious revolt; but such disobedience was so viewed only because it implied a contempt and rejection of the whole religious and moral edifice deemed essential for the virtue and happiness of the Israelites.[15] It must, on the contrary, be maintained that sin-offerings were expected to be presented for all the multifarious moral aberrations to which man is liable, and not only if these consisted in actual deeds, but if they were merely sinful thoughts and feelings: for as every unintentional sin required a sacrifice, and as evil intentions and designs were so clearly regarded as reproachful that even the Decalogue prohibited them, they demanded undoubtedly the atonement of expiatory offerings.[16] It is equally manifest that the sacrifices did not aim at an external purification only,[17] much less at "a conciliation with the offended Deity by means of a present":[18] opinions which betray nothing less than an utter misconception of the spirit of the sacrificial laws; for what, for instance, did the symbolical act, performed at the rite of initiation, of sprinkling with the blood of the sin-offering an ear, a hand, and a foot of the High-priest and the priests, signify, if it was not intended as an allegorical exhortation to piety of heart and conduct?[19] Those objectionable views seem to be advanced and defended chiefly in order to establish a more striking contrast between the theo-

---

[12] Lev. IV. 2, 13, 22, 27; V. 17; etc.

[13] תורה or מצות.

[14] *Bähr*, l. c. p. 389.

[15] It cannot be surprising to find that the unfounded view alluded to misleads to the strangest errors of interpretation (comp. *Bähr*, l. c. p. 405).

[16] Comp. Ps. LXXIII.

[17] *Ἁγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα* (Hebr. IX. 13), in opposition to the blood of Christ ὅς ... *καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ* (Hebr. X. 13, 14); comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. 213.

[18] *Hengstenberg*, Christologie, I. p. 264; *Welker*, Letzte Gründe, p. 288; comp. *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 171—173.

[19] Comp. Lev. VIII. 15, 23, 24, 30, and notes in locc.; see also XIV. 13—18, 25—29.

cracy of Israel[1] and the creed of the New Testament.[2] But the two systems do not involve such a contrast on the subject. The great principle itself — the atoning power of the sacrifice — is identical in both; the distinction consists mainly in the nature of the victim and in the extent and degree of its efficacy; and that distinction does not concern the vital point of the notion: sacrifice is, in the New Testament, not rejected, but differently interpreted.[3] The sin-offerings were intended not to appease God but to "cover" or remove the sin itself, although naturally the satisfaction and favour of God were hoped for and expected from the expiation of the offence: in harmony with which views the Talmudical maxim was propounded, "Sin-offerings and trespass-offerings have no efficacy unless they are prompted by penitence of the heart."[4] Expiatory offerings were frequently, if they were not regularly, accompanied by a confession of the sins for which they were designed as an atonement;[5] they were therefore meant to release the heart from the burden of guilt by which it felt itself oppressed, and which it hoped to conquer not by concealment but by ingenuous and humble avowal; and they were hence aptly termed "a reminder" of trespasses rather than their oblivion or annihilation.[6] Sin was not to be pardoned without an earnest effort and an active co-operation on the part of the sinner himself; it was not to be rendered innocuous without an inward and external act of repentance.[7] This is clearly the doctrine of the Old Testament.[8]

---

[1] *Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα.*

[2] Comp. Hebr. l. c.

[3] Comp. pp. 59, 60, 165; Sect. XIX.

[4] Comp. *Siphra* p. 252*a*; *Maimon.* Yad Chazakah Hilch. Teshuvah I. 1. Comp. *Philo*, Vit. Mos. III. 10, *εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀγνώμων καὶ ἄδικος, ἄθυτοι θυσίαι καὶ ἀνίεροι ἱερουργίαι καὶ εὐχαὶ παλίμφημοι, παντελῆ φθορὰν ἐνδεχόμεναι ... Εἰ δὲ ὅσιος καὶ δίκαιος, μένει βέβαιος ἡ θυσία κτλ.*; comp. p. 59.

[5] Lev. V. 5; XII. 21; Num. V. 7; Ps. XXXII. 5.

[6] Comp. Hebr. X. 3, *ἀλλ᾽ ἐν αὐταῖς — ταῖς θυσίαις — ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτόν*; the words of Philo (De Vita Mos. III. 10) *οὐ λύσιν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀλλ᾽ ὑπόμνησιν ἐργάζονται*, refer to the remembrance of the sin by *God*, not by the *offender*; and so also the remark of the same writer (De Victim. 7), *εὔηθες γὰρ τὰς θυσίας μὴ λήθην ἁμαρτημάτων ἀλλ᾽ ὑπόμνησιν αὐτῶν κατασκευάζειν.*

[7] Comp. *Mishn.* Yom. VIII. 9 (עבירות שבין אדם לחבירו אין יום הכפורים מכפר עד שירצה את חבירו); *Maimonid.* Hilch. Teşhuv. c. 1 (וכן בעלי חטאות ואשמות בעת שמביאין קרבנותיהן ... אין מתכפר להן בקרבנם עד שיעשו תשובה ויתודו ודוי דברים וכ׳), 2 *sqq.*

[8] We can hardly understand the meaning of Rosenmüller's remark that sin-offerings were not at all meant to secure forgiveness (Excurs. I. in Lev. p. 196, per sacrificia veniam peccatorum vel sperari vel impetrari potuisse, nulla probabili ratione effici poterit), especially as he observes even with regard to holocausts, "videntur hujus modi sacrificia simul etiam fuisse symbolicae significationes interni doloris de peccatis commissis (l. c. p. 198); comp., however, *infra*.

But, on the other hand, the atonement was a gracious gift of God granted by His love and paternal compassion; while therefore holocausts and thank-offerings, if spontaneously presented, might consist of several animals, one victim only was prescribed for any expiatory sacrifice; in the former case, the offering of man or his self-abnegation, in the latter, the mercy of God and the atonement wrought by the blood, predominated; there the oblation itself, here its symbolical effect was chiefly considered.[9]

Moreover, any one who had fraudulently or unlawfully appropriated foreign property, whether it belonged to the Sanctuary and its ministers or to private individuals, was obliged, upon confessing his misdeed, to restore his unrighteous gain increased by one fifth of its value; and then only, after having "shown the sincerity of his repentance not by declarations but by works, taking with him no contemptible intercessor, namely, that conviction of the soul which has delivered him from his incurable misfortune, healed him of the deadly disease, and entirely changed it into good health",[10] then only was he permitted to present a ram as a trespass-offering: he had thus to obtain the pardon both of his wronged fellow-man and of God; and so invariably was this law enforced, that if the defrauded person was no longer alive at the time of the offender's confession, and left no legal heir, the amount itself together with the addition was to be made over to the priests, the representatives of God.[11] Thus the spirit of the ordinance disclaims the supposition that the increase of one fifth was a kind of interest due to the owner for the temporary loss of his property;[12] but much more objectionable is the view that the sin-offerings in general, as enjoined in the Pentateuch, were devised as a civil or criminal punishment, or as a pecuniary fine calculated to deter the sinner from future neglect,[13] since even inadvertent contamination, illness, and similar

---

9 Ewald (Alterth. p. 63) explains curiously, though in harmony with his entire conception of the sin-offerings, "das einzelne Thier muss der Opfernde zwar bringen, aber auch dasselbe ganz einzeln, wie in trauriger Einsamkeit und Öde" etc.; comp. *Hengstenb.* l. c. p. 24; *Kurtz* l. c. p. 156.

10 *Philo*, De Victim. 11.

11 See Lev. V. 15—26; Num. V. 6—8; comp. Lev. XXII. 14—16; see notes on Lev. V. 14—16.

12 *Kurtz*, Opferc. § 121.

13 As a mulcta, abolitio criminis, or quasi poena, as Michaelis (Mosaisches Recht, §§ 189, 244) describes it; wherefore De Wette (De Morte J. Christi expiat. p. 14) justly censures Michaelis because "ad politica omnia torquentem neque sacra sacra mente tractantem"; yet Rosenmüller, following his predecessor, characterises sin-offerings as "*mulctae* quibus solutis poena peccati aut plane remittebatur, aut... mutabatur in poenam minus severam", for which unhappy opinion he most inappropriately adduces Lev. XIX. 20—22 (see *infra*); and similarly Abarbanel (Introd. to

mischances never happen to the pious, but to the wicked only who deserve to be taxed with the penalty[1] — an application of the principle which alone suffices to disclose the absurdity of the principle itself. The end of the sin-offering could not be a remission of *punishment* involving the satisfaction of God's justice as avenging Judge: for, from a religious point of view, such punishment was utterly out of the question in connection with unintentional offences, for which alone expiatory sacrifices were prescribed. The term "he or they shall be forgiven"[2] sometimes employed with reference to them,[3] implies properly that the intimate relation between God and the Israelite which had been temporarily disturbed by an involuntary sin, was restored by the sacrifice. The expiatory offerings had no political or social but a purely personal and religious character; they were not presented to Jehovah as the Ruler of Israel, but as the Searcher of hearts; they were indeed the oblations of theocratic citizens bound to give an account to their invisible King of their most secret thoughts; but this resulted necessarily from the theocratic organisation of the commonwealth. Hence even crimes which could not be traced to their perpetrators, were to be expiated by confession, sacrifice, and prayer.[4] — The solemnity in the mode of expiation was varied in accordance with the position occupied by the offender in the theocratic community; for it was more significant in transgressions of the High-priest or the whole people of Israel than in those of a chief, and it was more significant in transgressions of a chief than of a common Israelite. And on one day in every year, on the Day of Atonement, Israel was purified as a united body, as the holy nation and the kingdom of priests; and the expiation did not concern special offences, but the human weakness in general which cannot be admitted into a communion of God except by an act of grace and mercy.[5]

Hence the sin-offerings were naturally placed in the class of "most holy" sacrifices;[6] they were to be scrupulously shielded from every, even the slightest profanation; if any of their blood had fallen upon a garment, the latter was to be washed in the holy place, in the

---

Lev. c. IV, רצה יתברך להענישם בדבר ממונם כדי שיתפעל רוחם ונפשם בו (וישארו נזהרים ולא ישגו עוד); and Saalschütz (Mos. R. p. 320) calls expiatory offerings at least "an element of criminal justice." Kitto (on Lev. IV. 3) speaks vaguely of a "process of commuted punishment" which "operated only when a man's conscience prompted him to a voluntary acknowledgment of his offence."

[1] *Abarban.* l. c.

[2] ונסלח לו or להם.

[3] Lev. IV. 20, 26, 31, 35; V. 10, 13, 16, 18, 26; XIX. 22; Num. XV. 25—28.

[4] Deut. XXI. 1—9; see *infra*.

[5] Lev. XVI. 16, 30; see *infra* and Comm. in loc.

[6] קדשי קדשים, p. 76.

Court of the Sanctuary;[7] their flesh could be touched by holy persons or priests only;[8] it was burnt entirely whenever the blood had been sprinkled on the vail and put upon the horns of the altar of incense in the Holy;[9] it was eaten, with the exception of the fat and the fat parts, by the male Aaronites in the holy place, whenever the blood had been put upon the horns, and poured out at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering in the Court,[10] and then symbolised that the priests were appointed "to remove the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord",[11] and that the expiation, which had been prepared and commenced by the sprinkling of the blood, was now accomplished by a last and crowning act of God's holy ministers;[12] if the flesh was boiled in an earthen vessel, the latter was to be broken, if in a brazen vessel, it was to be carefully scoured and rinsed with water.[13] For the blood of sin-offerings was brought into the Holy or Holy of Holies only in cases of atonement of the High-priest himself or of the whole people which was represented by him; therefore the officiating High-priest, who was as much the offender as the mediator, could not eat the flesh, which could neither be permitted to a priest of a lower grade. But the blood came upon the altar in the Court in cases where priests acted as intercessors for chiefs or private Israelites, when therefore the priests were not concerned in the sins to be expiated,

---

7 The Mishnah (Zevach. XI. 1) justly extends these commands to *all* kinds of sin-offering, although it works them out with futile playfulness (ibid. 2—5).

8 The opinion that the flesh and the blood of sin-offerings were *impure*, requires no refutation (comp. *De Wette*, Opusc. p. 24; *v. Cölln*, Bibl. Theol. I. 270; *Scholl* in Klaiber's Stud. V. 2, pp. 154 *sqq.*; VIII. 2, pp. 29 *sqq.*; *Bähr*, Symb. II. 396 *sqq.*; *Knobel*, Levit. p. 405; *Ewald*, Alterth. pp. 72 *sqq.*). The washing of hands or garments sometimes prescribed in connection with offerings (Lev. XVI. 24, 26, 28; Num. XIX. 7, 8, 10; comp. also *Mishn.* Zevach. XII. 5) affords no proof or support; for it refers to the scape-goat and the red cow, which were no sin-offerings in the proper sense, and exceptionally bore the *sins* of the Israelites (comp. Lev. XVI. 21, 22), in a manner different from ordinary sacrifices.

9 Lev. IV. 5—12, 16—21; XVI. 27; comp. Hebr. XIII. 10—13; such victims were called by Talmudical writers החטאות הפנימיות or הח' הנשרפות (comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. V. 2; XII. 5, פרים הנשרפים and שעירים הנשרפים).

10 Lev. VI. 19, 22, 23; VII. 6; which victims were termed החטאות החיצונות or הח' הנאכלות; see *infra*.

11 Lev. X. 17; comp. Exod. XXVIII. 38.

12 On the erroneous meaning attributed to the meals by those who advocate the *poena vicaria* in sin-offerings, see *Öhler*, l. c. p. 649; comp. the fanciful exposition of Ewald (Alterth. pp. 68—71), and of Deyling (Observ. Sacr. I. lxv. 2, nam hoc pacto quum ederent *incorporabant* quasi peccatum populique reatum in se recipiebant, ut indicaretur, aliquando sacerdotem et victimam unam fore personam).

13 Comp. Lev. VI. 18, 20—22; see Comm in locc.; comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. XI. 4—8.

and then they could be allowed to consume the victim. In the former instances, the flesh was burnt, not because it was unclean, but because there was no one to whom it could rationally and lawfully be assigned; while in the latter instances, it could be eaten by the priests, because the victim, not laden with the sins, but having taken upon itself the punishment of the suppliant, was almost like the priest himself a sacred mediator between God and the worshipper, and a restorer of peace and purity, and the eating of its flesh on the part of the priests was a symbolical act, not belonging to the sacerdotal *privileges*, like the eating of the flesh of thank-offerings, but to the sacerdotal *functions*, which demanded them to consume a part of the sacrifice as the intercessors between God and the worshipper.[1] But in no case was the flesh of sin-offerings, like that of holocausts, burnt entirely *on the altar*; it was no "food of the Lord", but served merely to implore His forgiveness and to avert His anger; it was designed to *remove* the offerer's guilt, as the victim bore his punishment;[2] the fat only and the fat parts, the portions of God's sacrifice that belonged to Him as a due tribute, were there consumed; the rest of the animal was burnt without the camp, which represented the holy community of Israel, "in a clean place."[3]

The importance of the blood, properly typifying the life of the animal, and especially possessing the power of atonement, is self-evident in connection with these rites: more directly than any other victims, those killed as sin-offerings were considered to die as substitutes for the offerers; and therefore the ceremony of sprinkling the blood was in sin-offerings pre-eminently significant; it was varied according to the peculiar character of the occasions; it was even in the least solemn sin-offerings more significant than in the noblest burnt-offerings; for though the blood of a sin-offering presented for a chief or a common Israelite was put on the brazen altar in the Court, it was not, as was the case with all holocausts, sprinkled on the altar "round about", but put on the horns of it;[4] but if the sin-offering was slain in the name of the people of Israel or of the High-priest, the blood was put, not on the brazen, but on the golden altar of frank-incense in the Holy itself, and more properly on its horns, while a part was sprinkled seven times

---

[1] Yet it would be too much to assert that the eating of the flesh by the priests was the indispensable condition of atonement; for if so, the most important sins, those committed by the whole people or the High-priest, and therefore destroying the theocracy as such, would have had no expiation.

[2] The reason, "it does not behove a sinner to prepare a meal for God and to have Him as it were for his guest" (*Knobel*, p. 386), would militate against the burning upon the altar of the flesh of holocausts also.

[3] See pp. 205, 206.

[4] Lev. IV. 25, 30, 34.

on the vail at the western side of the Holy,[5] evidently pointing, though indirectly and distantly, to the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies, which was the proper source of expiation; and on that most sacred implement the blood was indeed sprinkled, likewise in sevenfold repetition, at the most awful ritual of the whole year, on the Day of Atonement, when the High-priest entered the Holy of Holies to seek forgiveness for his own sins and those of the people.[6] These ceremonies intelligibly and pointedly indicate the various degrees of sanctity existing in the relation between God and the whole people or its different elements and sections. The burnt-offerings also, as indeed all sacrifices, possessed in a certain sense expiatory power, and they were during many generations so employed;[7] but they bore that character neither in the same directness nor with the same depth as the sin-offerings;[8] the sense of sinfulness was still merged in the feelings of awe and submission; the mind of the worshipper was directed to the grandeur of God, rather than his own littleness; he was more anxious to conciliate his Master than to be justified before his conscience; atonement was a collateral consequence rather than the exclusive end of the sacrifice; hence the principal characteristic of the holocaust was its entire consumption by the flames, that of the sin-offering the sprinkling of the blood in the most striking manner that could be devised, so decidedly so that the mode of proceeding with the blood was different even with pigeons and turtle-doves when burnt-offerings and when sin-offerings; in the former case, the blood was merely pressed out on the side of the altar,[9] in the latter, a part of it was sprinkled on the side of the altar, and the rest pressed out at the base; thus the act was purposely divided, and the sprinkling, bearing the character of distinctness and individuality, was significantly added.[10] In many and not the least momentous cases, especially of purification, an expiatory offering was joined to a holocaust,[11] and this combination aptly expressed that the mind must first be tuned to a religious disposition generally, before it can effectually expiate an individual transgression — only after the ground has been

[5] Lev. IV. 6, 7, 16, 17.

[6] See *infra*; comp. pp. 191—194; see also *Mishn.* Zevach. IV. 1.

[7] Comp. Lev. XVII. 11 (where the blood sprinkled on the altar is generally endowed with the attribute לכפר על־נפשתיכם), and Ezek. XLV. 15, 17 (למנחה ולעולה ולשלמים לכפר עליהם).

[8] The latter, referring to a special error, could therefore not be *voluntary* sacrifices, like the עולה (comp. *Mishn.* Kerith. VI. 3).

[9] Lev. I. 15.

[10] Comp. also *Mishn.* Zevach. VII. 1; X. 2 (דם חטאת קודם לדם עולה מפני שהוא מרצה), 4 (חטאת העוף קודמת לעולת העוף).

[11] Lev. XII. 6—8; XIV. 10, 12, 19; Num. XV. 24; XXVIII. 15, 22, 30; XXIX. 5, 16, 19, 22, *sqq.*; comp. Lev. VIII. 14,

prepared by humility, the seed of regeneration can be safely entrusted to it. However, the Law was so anxiously intent upon securing the expiation of sin under all circumstances that it was induced to deviate from the fundamental principle of the atoning force of blood; for, lest the poorest be excluded from the priceless benefit of a restored peace of mind, they were permitted to present, as a sin-offering, a cereal oblation consisting of a tenth part of an ephah of fine flour,[1] unadorned by oil and incense,[2] of which the priest took off a handful as a memorial (אַזְכָּרָה) and burnt it on the brazen altar, while the rest belonged to the priest, and then the poor man's "sin was atoned for, and he was forgiven."[3] Again, not the whole sin-offering was burnt on the altar, but precisely those parts which in thank-offerings were delivered to the holy flames, because an expiatory sacrifice also might not inappropriately be called an "offering of safety", and perhaps with greater justice even than the thank-offering; for the victim having taken upon itself the punishment of the offerer, thereby rescued him from misfortune or death, and his deliverance from the miseries of a guilt-laden mind was a cause of even greater rejoicing than the possession of external boons and blessings.[4]

The Pentateuch distinguishes two kinds of expiatory sacrifices, the *Sin-offering* (חַטָּאת) and the *Trespass-offering* (אָשָׁם). It is impossible to doubt that they were indeed two distinct classes, not subordinate but co-ordinated to each other.[5] For the precepts concerning the one are followed by separate regulations concerning the other.[6] In several cases, a trespass-offering is prescribed in addition to a sin-offering.[7]

---

18; IX. 3, 12, 15, 16; Ps. XL. 7; Ezra VI. 17; 2 Chron. XXIX. 21, 31—33.

[1] That the ancient Hebrews were strangers to the idea of *life* or *soul* in plants, has been observed above (p. 219). [2] See *supra* p. 221.

[3] See Lev. V. 11—13. The sin-offering identical for rich and poor was termed by Talmudists חטאת קבועה (or *fixed* sin-offering); that which was graduated in accordance with the means and position of the offerer ח' עולה ויורד (or *ascending and descending* sin-offering); comp. *Mishn.* Kerith. II. 3; Horayoth II. 7; *Maimon.* De Noxiis, c. X; see also Sect. XXI.

[4] Comp. *Philo*, De Victim. c. 11, *Τρόπον γάρ τινα καὶ ὁ μετανοῶν σώζεται, τὴν χαλεπωτέραν τῶν ἐν τῷ σώματι παθῶν νόσον ψυχῆς ἐκτρεπόμενος*. That the thank-offering also was calculated to rouse feelings of humility and repentance, has been observed above (see p. 244).

[5] *Clericus* believes that both, often confounded "pro linguae Hebraicae ambiguitate" (on Lev. V. 6), are in reality not distinct from each other, "divisionem hanc esse nominis, non rei" (on V. 16).

[6] Compare Levit. IV. 1—V. 13 and V. 14—26; or Lev. VI. 18—23 and VII. 1—7; see especially VII. 7 ("As the sin-offering is, so is the trespass-offering; there is one law for them"); and also XIV. 13; Num. XVIII. 9.

[7] Lev. XIV. 12 and 19, 21 and 31; Num. VI. 11 and 12.

They are in various parts of the Old Testament mentioned together as two kinds of sacrifice.[8] The rituals of the sin-offering were, in no case, identical with those of the trespass-offering.[9] The flesh of the one was, in some instances at least, burnt entirely, while that of the other belonged, in all cases, to the priests. The animals ordained for the former were much more varied than those permitted for the latter, which were limited to rams and male lambs, neither of which were accepted as sin-offerings. The one differed, as regards the victim and the ceremonies, in accordance with the particular position or dignity of the offerer, while the other was precisely identical for all classes of the people. The one could, in cases of poverty, be reduced to two pigeons or turtle-doves, and even to one tenth of an ephah of flour, while the other was required to be of a certain and defined legal value. And, lastly, the one could be offered for the whole nation or a larger portion of the community, the latter only by private persons. Accordingly, the ancient versions render both by two different terms.[10] Yet it is not easy to indicate the exact nature of the difference. Both Hebrew words (חטאת and אשם) are properly synonymous.[11] The terms employed

[8] See 2 Ki. XII. 17; Ezek. XL. 39; XLII. 13; XLIV. 29; XLVI. 20.

[9] See *infra*.

[10] So translates the Septuagint חטאת usually by *τὰ (τὸ) περὶ* or *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας* (Lev. VI. 23; VII. 7; XIV. 13, 19; Ezek. XLV. 17; XLVI. 20), or simply *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* (Lev. XIV. 31; i. e. *θυσία περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, as in 2 Macc. XII. 43; comp. Hebr. X. 6, 8; Josephus *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτάδων*), or *τὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας* (Lev. VI. 18), rarely by *ἁμαρτία* (Lev. IV. 21, 24; VI. 18; Num. VI. 14; comp. Hos. IV. 8), and once by *ἁμάρτημα* (Lev. IV. 29); while it renders אשם, where it occurs in the sense of trespass-offering, by *τὸ περὶ τῆς πλημμελείας* (Lev. VII. 1, 5), or *τὸ τῆς πλημμελείας* (Lev. VII. 7; XIV. 13, 14, 17), or *πλημμέλεια* (Lev. V. 16, 18; VII. 2; XIV. 12, 24, 25; XIX. 21; Num. VI. 12), or by *πλημμελεῖν*, using a paraphrase as *περὶ οὗ* or *περὶ ὧν ἐπλημμέλησε* (Lev. V. 6, 15, 19), or by *τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀγνοίας* (Ezek. XI. 39; XLII. 33; XLIV. 29; XLVI. 20), and once only by *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* (Isai. LIII. 10). Suidas explains *πλημμελεῖν* by *ἀτακτεῖν καὶ ὑβρίζειν καὶ ῥαθυμεῖν*, and quotes passages where *πλημμέλημα*, interpreted by him as *πταῖσμα*, has the meaning of trespass or mistake (e. g. *ὁ δὲ διὰ τὸ οἰκεῖον πλημμέλημα ὑπ' ἐμοῦ παυθήσεται τῆς ἀρχῆς*; Hesychius defines *πλημμελές* by *ἐκμελές, οὐ συνῳδὰ λέγων, ἁμαρτάνων*; and *πλημμέλημα* is by Isocrates and later writers, as Lucian, used in the sense of unlawful advantage or gain (*Lucian*, Hermotim. 81; comp. *Aeschin*. Contr. Ctesiph. 106, Orator. Att. ed. Becker). The Vulgate translates חטאת by *sacrificium pro peccatis*, and אשם by *sacrificium pro delictis*, and later writers by *sacrificium pro reatu* or *pro noxa*. In the Mishnah both classes are strictly separated (comp. f. i. Zevach. VIII. 2, הכל יכולין להתערב חוץ מן החטאת ומן האשם); whereas Onkelos does not always distinguish them (comp., for instance, Lev. V. 6 and 19, etc.).

[11] Comp. Gen. XX. 9 with XXVI. 10; XLII. 21 with 22; Lev. V. 17, 23; and as אָשָׁם is both *guilt* or *debt* and *guilt-offering*, so is חַטָּאת both *sin* and *sin-offering*: it is unwarranted to lay the

in reference to either are frequently identical. There seems scarcely one characteristic clearly traceable to either of them exclusively. The statements of the Pentateuch are, in fact, so singularly vague and perplexing, that the matter has been hopelessly abandoned by earnest critics and antiquarians;[1] while others have groundlessly asserted that the distinction, originally clear and decided, has been greatly obliterated in our present Hebrew text dating from a much later time; or that "the account in Leviticus is full of confusion";[2] or that the legislator prescribed the one class or the other capriciously and without design;[3] or that the writer failed from "unskilfulness" to make the difference clear;[4] or that both, originally adopted in different parts of the land and by different tribes, as two distinct forms of sin-offering, were co-ordinated by the compilers of the Pentateuch.[5] But all these conjectures are repudiated by the thoughtful character of the laws of Leviticus, which neither justify the reproach of "confusion", nor of "capriciousness", nor of unmeaning conglomeration of heterogeneous materials. Nor are the numerous opinions proposed to explain the distinction generally more fortunate; and few

---

principal stress in the notion of אשם upon *debt*, which man has contracted towards God, and which he pays by the אשם or *debt-offering*; for the אשם is not simply a debt, but generally an unjust, iniquitous debt, and the chief idea is therefore not *debt*, but *sin*, so that, finally, אשם would, like חטאת, be sin-offering. The Arabic usage according to which אשם in Conj. IV. means *to sin by error*, as חטא *to incite to evil deeds*, is not decisive, as no analogous distinction can be established and proved in Hebrew. The verb אָשַׁם denotes, in the O. T., *to become* or *to be guilty* (Jer. II. 3; Hab. I. 11; etc.) or *to bear the guilt*, that is, *to be punished* for it (Isai. XXIV. 6; Hos. V. 15; Zech XI. 5; Ps. V. 11; etc.). Hengstenberg's distinction (see *infra*) is artificial (Auth. des Pent. II. 217).

[1] Comp. *Gussetius*, Com. L. H. ad vocem אשם, p. 100; *Outram*, De Sacrif. I. xiii. 8; *De Wette*, De Morte Jes. Ch. expiatoria, p. 14 ("Mihi quidem de discrimine hoc constituendo plane desperandum videtur"); *Dereser* in Brentano's Comm. p. 21; etc.

[2] Scholl; comp. *De Wette* l. c. ("Cogitari potest, discriminis quod inter illa sacrificia ab initio intercesserat veram rationem seriore tempore in oblivionem venisse et neglectam fuisse, discrimine tamen ipso non prorsus abolito"); Einleit. § 149 ("the indistinctness in defining the sin- and trespass-offerings must be attributed to a compiler who knew the sacrificial legislation from usage only"); *Winer*, Real-Wörterb. II. 433 ("it would not be surprising if, in the later parts of the Law, the Mosaic principle were occasionally neglected or inaccurately applied.")

[3] Carpzov (Apparat. Hist. Crit. pp. 707, 708), Gesenius ("omnis ista differentia ex mero legislatoris arbitrio perpendisse videtur"), a. o.

[4] *Gramberg*, Relig. Id. I. 124; though he charitably adds, "we shall not be so unfair as to suppose that he designedly expressed himself with such vagueness, in order to render the services of the priests the more indispensable."

[5] *De Wette*, Stud. und Krit. 1837, p. 974.

of them are supported by the Biblical text. A survey of the most plausible or most widely adopted of these views will justify this remark. The חטאת has been referred to offences of commission, the אשם to sins of omission, while their meaning has sometimes been reversed:[6] but both חטאת and אשם are used not only with regard to positive trespasses, such as theft, violence, abuse of trust, or perjury,[7] but also with regard to negative sins, such as suppression of evidence or withholding of holy property.[8] On the one hand, חטאת has been assigned to sins committed against men, אשם to transgressions in reference to dedicated and sacred things;[9] on the other hand, חטאת has been restricted to offences against God, if thereby no injury is caused to men, and אשם to injustice done to our fellow-men,[10] or to violation of the rights of treaties and compacts.[11] Or it has been maintained that trespass-offerings were presented for such contraventions of "the precepts of the covenant" as were at the same time contraventions of "the rights of the covenant",[12] and sin-offerings for simple contraventions of "the precepts of the covenant"[13] — a very unsafe distinction which necessitates a most strained explanation of several leading ordinances of the Law.[14] Or "the חטאת was destined to purify and expiate the Sanctuary itself, the אשם to purify the individual who had disgraced himself by perjury, fraud, or the like, quite irrespective of the Sanctuary",[15] which definition is overthrown by this fact alone that an אשם was prescribed for "committing a misdeed and sinning unawares by taking from the holy things of the

---

6 *Maimon.* (De Noxiis I. 2), *Abarban.* (Introd. to Lev. c. III), Grotius, Michaelis (comp. Comm. on V. 17), Warnekros, Jahn, a. o.; comp. *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 146—148.

7 Lev. IV. 2, 13, 22, 27; V. 21—26; comp. ver. 17, and notes on V. 14—26.

8 Lev. V. 1—9, 15.

9 *Εἰς ἱερὰ καὶ ἅγια*, *Philo*, De Victim. 11; and similarly Hengstenberg (Auth. des Pent. II. 214) who defines חטאת as destruction of man's harmony of mind or desertion of his better nature and internal dissolution, אשם as revolt against the holiness of God and His Law: a distinction utterly untenable if applied to the actual precepts of the Law (Lev. V. 1—3, etc.), and very precarious in a code which makes even the inward emotions of heart and soul objects of moral legislation.

10 Comp. *Outram*, De Sacrif. I. xiii. 8; Brentano (Lev. p. 22).

11 Violatio foederis; *Cremer*, Antiqq. Sacr. Poec. II. pp. 75 *sqq.*

12 "Bundesgebote" or "Bundessatzungen", and "Bundesrechte".

13 *Riehm*, Über das Schuldopfer, Stud. und Krit. 1854, p. 110; comp. *Rinck*, Ibid. 1855, pp. 370 *sqq.* (the אשם, he observes without force, bears the same relation to the חטאת as *satisfactio* to *expiatio*); *Keil*, Arch. I. 221, 266; *Delitzsch*, Comm. zum Hebräerbr. p. 743 ("the fundamental idea of the חטאת is *expiation*; of אשם *mulcta*"); comp. *Kurtz* l. c. §§ 94, 95.

14 For instance concerning the אשם of the leper and of the Nazarite (see *infra*).

15 *Philippson*, Commentar zum Pentateuch, p. 558.

Lord",[1] and a חטאת for withholding judicial evidence, for personal impurities and for heedless oaths.[2] — Some again contended that a חטאת was required if the offence, unconsciously committed, proved afterwards indisputably certain, an אשם, if it remained doubtful;[3] others averred that a חטאת was forfeited by ignorance, an אשם by forgetfulness, of the Law;[4] or the former by an inadvertent fault, and the latter by acts of violence and premeditated malice.[5] And both in ancient and modern times it has been frequently supposed, that a חטאת was commanded if the offence was seen by an eye-witness, an אשם if it was known only by the sinner's confession, to which he was prompted by the warnings and dictates of his conscience,[6] or[7] "a חטאת if an offence against the Divine Law had actually been committed by oversight or might with certainty be supposed, and an אשם if a person became conscious of having done, or had really done, some wrong of which he could not be convicted; trespass-offerings seem to have referred to subjective, sin-offerings to objective offences; he who presented a trespass-offering, accused himself in his conscience, he who presented a sin-offering, had been convicted of a distinct, yet unconscious sin, and was, according to general principles, regarded as guilt-laden." But what is here attributed to the אשם exclusively, applies to the various kinds of חטאת also,[8] which was commanded for sins not only committed unawares, but known later to the sinner only;[9] while violence against a betrothed bond-woman to be expiated by an אשם,[10] can scarcely be said to have been prepetrated without a witness.

---

[1] Lev. V. 15, מקדשי יהוה.

[2] Lev. V. 1—4.

[3] Ebn Ezra, Abarbanel, Venema, Carpzov, Lightfoot (Op. I. 708—710, who calls both "oblationes consimiles ut gemellae videantur", and "tantum gradu distinctae"): hence the Talmudical distinction between ודאי (certain) and תלוי (doubtful); comp. *Mishn.* Kerithuth I. 2; III. 1; IV. 1, 2; V. 1—8; VI. 1—4; Horayoth II. 4, 7; *Maimon.* Shegig. c. VIII; comp. c. II.

[4] Ebn Ezra (on Lev. V. 17). St. Augustin (Quaest. super Levit. XX) deduces this view from the word *πλημμέλεια*, by which the Septuagint renders אשם, and which he explains *quod sit praeter curam* (*πλὴν μελείαν*) or *ex negligentia.*

[5] *Saubert*, De Sacrif. c. 3.

[6] Philo (De Victim. 11, *ἐάν τις ψεύσηται ... δόξας ἐκπεφευγέναι τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν κατηγόρων ἔλεγχον, αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ γένηται κατήγορος, ἔνδον ὑπὸ τοῦ συνειδότος ἐλεγχθείς*), Josephus (Antiqq. III. ix. 3, *ὁ δὲ ἁμαρτὼν μέν, ἑαυτῷ δὲ συνειδὼς καὶ μηδένα ἔχων τὸν ἐλέγχοντα, κριὸν θύει*), Reland, Venema, Buddaeus, Iken (Antiqq. Sacr. I. xiii. 24, the object of the חטאת was to avert punishment, that of the אשם to restore the tranquillity of conscience); Bauer, Ewald (pp. 61, 62, "the חטאת was more a public matter, the אשם a private affair of the individual"), a. o.

[7] As Winer (Real-Wörterb. II. 432) states it.

[8] Comp. Lev. V. 1—13.

[9] V. 3, 4, ונעלם ממנו והוא ידע; comp. V. 17—19 and IV. 27.

[10] Lev. XIX. 21.

However, by faithfully following the Biblical statements, we may hope to arrive at some satisfactory conclusion. Trespass-offerings were enjoined in the following cases: if a person inadvertently (בִּשְׁגָגָה)[11] appropriated to himself any portion of the sacred property,[12] for instance, if he failed to bring the firstlings and tithes, or to give up to the priests any of their appointed emoluments, or if he ate holy food which belonged to them;[13] if he abused a trust or deposit committed to his charge, or robbed or defrauded his fellow-men; if he had found lost property, and denied it; if he tried to obtain advantages by false oaths;[14] if a free-man cohabited with an unredeemed bond-woman betrothed[15] to another man;[16] if unconsciously any of the Divine precepts had been contravened;[17] if a leper was restored to health;[18] and lastly if a Nazarite had unawares defiled himself by contact with a corpse.[19]

It is obvious, at the first glance, that with a few exceptions, all these cases are connected with the *rights of property*,[20] and that the אשם was commanded for their unintentional violation. In most instances this is so manifest that it requires no proof or illustration. As regards illicit intercourse with a betrothed bond-woman, it must be remembered that the slave was the *property* of the master; the same offence, if

---

[11] See notes on IV. 2.

[12] Lev. V. 15, 16; comp. Josh. VII. 1 *sqq*.

[13] Lev. XXII. 14—16; comp. also 1 Sam. VI. 3.

[14] Lev. V. 21—26; comp. Num. V. 6—10.

[15] We adhere to this meaning of the word נֶחֱרֶפֶת (Lev. XIX. 20), which is supported by the usage of the Talmud (see *Talm*. Kiddush. 6*a*, שכן...קורין לארוסה חרופה; comp. Ex. XXII. 15; Deut. XX. 7; XXII. 23, 25; Targ. Jonath. מְתָאַרְסָא לִגְבַר; Targ. Onkel. אֲחִידָא לִגְבַר; and Ebn Ezra observes, על דעת רבים יעודה), and we prefer it to the more general sense *surrendered* (Hofmann, Ewald, Bunsen, Kurtz l. c. p. 168, a. o.), and certainly to that of *despised* (Ebn Ezra, המלה מגזרת חרפה, a. o.).

[16] Lev. XIX. 20—22; see Comm. on Exod. XXII. 15, 16.

[17] Lev. V. 17—19.

[18] Lev. XIV. 12, 21.

[19] Num. VI. 12. The Mishnah (Zevach. V. 5) enumerates the following kinds of אשם — א׳ גזילות, א׳ מעילות, א׳ מצורע, א׳ נזיר, א׳ שפחה חרופה, א׳ תלוי. The Talmudical regulations see in *Maimon*. De Noxiis, c. IX.

[20] The text employs, with regard to the אשם, the word מָעַל (Lev. V. 15, 21), which implies faithless or reckless appropriation (comp. Josh. VII. 1; XXII. 20; 1 Chr. II. 7; X. 13) and disregard to pledge or promise, and is therefore figuratively used of conjugal infidelity (Num. V. 12, 27) and heedless trespass of the Law, whether consisting of idolatry or acts of illegality (Lev. XXVI. 40; Num. XXXI. 16; Josh. XXII. 16, 22, 31; Ezek. XVII. 20; 1 Chr. V. 25; X. 13; 2 Chr. XII. 2; XXVIII. 19, 22; XXIX. 6, 19; Ezra X. 10; Neh. I. 8; XIII. 27). More characteristic still in connection with אשם is the term בְּעֶרְכְּךָ *according to thy estimation* or *valuation* (Lev. V. 15, 18; comp. Num. V. 5—8), evidently relating to property and its restitution.

committed with a free woman was, according to circumstances, visited with death of one or of both parties.[1] Respecting the general law of contravention "of any of the Divine precepts",[2] it is obvious that, preceded as well as followed by regulations connected with property, it was meant to refer to the same category; though the comprehensive wording, "If a soul sin, and commit any of the things that are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord",[3] leads to important historical inferences tending to prove that the law had originally a very different meaning.[4] There remain, therefore, only the two instances of the leper and the Nazarite; but it is remarkable, that, in both of them, a חטאת was coupled with the אשם,[5] and it is, therefore, impossible to deduce therefrom the true character of the one or the other class.[6]

Now, offences against property were naturally considered lighter than those committed against the principles of monotheism or the foundations of the theocratic commonwealth; they were indeed by the code of the Pentateuch punished with a leniency the more striking if compared with the corresponding legal enactments of other ancient

[1] Deut. XXII. 23—27; see Comm. on Exod. XXII. 15 16.

[2] Lev. V. 17—19. [3] Ver. 17.

[4] Comp. Comm. on V. 14—26.

[5] Comp. Lev. XIV. 12 and 19, 21 and 31; Num. VI. 11 and 12. To declare that a sacrifice may at the same time deserve the name of חטאת and of אשם, and even of עולה, on the one hand on account of the occasion on which it was offered, and on the other hand with respect to the ritual observed at its performance (*Saalschütz*, Mos. Recht, 315, 325), would bring the utmost confusion into enactments in themselves sufficiently complicated; and the definitions derived from such premises (l. c. p. 326) are as unsatisfactory as might be expected (comp. l. c. pp. 329, 330, 334, and Archäol. I. 208—216).

[6] Attempts have been made to reduce these two cases also to the principle of violation of property or of Divine claims; but they are necessarily strained and artificial in the extreme; for instance, it has been maintained, that the Nazarite who had dedicated and legally vowed his time to God, by his impurity caused a damage or מעל to Him; and the leper, excluded from the theocratic community, did not devote to God that worship which the latter could lawfully demand, and thus also was guilty of מעל (*Riehm*, l. c. pp. 101, 102) — casuistic subtleties forced upon their author by the desire of defending his preconceived opinion on the nature of the אשם and its distinction from חטאת (see *supra*); yet those subtleties occur, in various shades, in subsequent works; comp. *Kurtz*, l. c. pp. 171, 172 (those cases imply "a privation and injury done to Jehovah", in as much as they render the *service of God* impossible, and are therefore analogous to the מעל מקדשי יהוה, Lev. V. 14—16), pp. 163, 164 (where he endeavours to establish a fictitious distinction between מעל and בגד); *Öhler*, l. c. p. 644; *Knobel*, Levit. p. 394 (the leper as well as the Nazarite was prevented from doing his duty towards his relatives and the community, and thus injured their rights and interests); the latter goes so far as to explain the אשם of the priests who had married foreign wives (Ezra X. 19) by

nations.[7] However frequent, varied, or daring, they could not endanger the purity of faith in the same degree as a contempt for Divine authority, or for religious worship, or even for the purely ceremonial obligations. Nay an encroachment upon the property of a priest was not deemed a graver offence than injustice done to the property of a common Israelite;[8] and a theocratic gradation was out of the question. We could, therefore, not be surprised, were we to find that unconscious offences against property were expiated by a kind of sacrifice regarded as less solemn and less severe.[9] And this character of the אשם in relation to the חטאת, which we are *a priori* prepared to expect, is indeed manifest from the nature of the rites which attended its performance.

The blood of the אשם was, in all cases, merely sprinkled *round about* the altar,[10] while that of the חטאת, even of the least important description, was put *on the horns* of the altar — a difference in itself significant enough to suggest a distinct conclusion.[11] Let it besides be remembered that the אשם was identical for all offenders, while the חטאת was carefully modified according to their rank and theocratic position; that the חטאת consisted frequently of bullocks, the אשם, at the utmost, of rams (see *infra*); and that the אשם could only be offered by individuals, but the חטאת for larger communities or the whole nation both on week-days and festivals, — and the inference above stated will appear irresistible;[12] while the opposite opinion assigning a higher degree of holiness to the אשם than to the חטאת[13] is utterly untenable.[14] We may, therefore, not be justified in adopting the Tal-

arguing that thereby the rights and prospects of the Hebrew maidens and women had been curtailed! comp. *infra*.

[7] See Comm. on Exod. pp. 414, 415.

[8] Lev. V. 14—16, and 20—26.

[9] "The offender has not forfeited his life, and his blood was not to be shed: the אשם is not a substitution of the offender but rather a fine to be paid to God, after which God is appeased, and the guilty person becomes free from punishment" (*Knobel*, l. c. p. 395), in which view the correct and the erroneous elements will be easily discovered; see *supra* pp. 257, 258.

[10] Lev. VII. 2. [11] See *supra* p. 193.

[12] The Mishnah (Zevach. X. 2) proposes the rule, "the sin-offering has precedence over the trespass-offering (חטאת קודמת לאשם); comp. X. 5 (כל החטאות שבתורה קודמות לאשמות וכ׳).

[13] So Bonfrère, Saubert, Nachmanides (on Lev. V. 19), Abarbanel (Introd. to Lev. c. IV.), Bochart (Hieroz. I. ii. 33, who remarks carelessly, "a conscio enim אשם perpetratur, cum alterum fiat per errorem"), Magen Abraham (ad Orach Chayim § 607); comp. *Maimon.* Mor. Nevoch. III. 46; *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. p. 323; *Hengstenb.* Auth. d. Pent. II. 214—220, where he observes strangely (p. 219) that the אשם is more serious than the חטאת only *in abstracto*, not *in concreto*, a distinction equal in value to another of the same author that the transport of the Ark "belonged *principaliter* to the priests and only *materialiter* to the Levites" (l. c. p. 403).

[14] It cannot even be admitted that both have an *equal* degree of sanctity (*Philippson*, Pentat. p. 558, although he on the same page is inclined to

mudical rule that a חטאת was offered for such unintentional offences as, if committed advisedly, would have caused the awful penalty of excision;[1] while an אשם was accepted for slighter offences not relating to the holiness of God, His Sanctuary, or His Law. But this distinction, though too sweeping and too vague, is not incorrect in principle. For if we consider that a more rigorous application of the Levitical views occasionally caused a חטאת to be ordained, where an אשם might have been sufficient, and that the weakness and sinful propensities of man were supposed inevitably and even without his knowledge to engender offences which required a periodical expiation,[2] we shall be able to account for the cases in which a חטאת was prescribed. It was to be presented, in the name of the people, on all the great festivals and days of solemn convocation, on Passover, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles,[3] on the Day of Memorial, or the first day of the seventh month,[4] and on the Day of Atonement;[5] for rejoicing no less than contrition was to remind the holy community of its unworthiness and its failings; and hence a חטאת was offered on the days of the new-moon also[6] which, marking a fresh period in the cosmic cycle of time, invited to pious reflection. For similar reasons, a sin-offering accompanied the inauguration of important public functionaries or their services, as the consecration of Aaron and his sons by Moses,[7] and seven days later, the commence-

---

place the חטאת above the אשם "because the sanctuary is infinitely above the individual"); see *supra* p. 265.

1 כָּרֵת; see Num. XV. 22—31; comp. Lev. VII. 20, 21; Num. XV. 31; XIX. 20; *Mishn.* Kerith. I. 1, 2 (על אלו חייבים על זדונם כרת ועל שגגתם חטאת); VI. 3 (אין מביאים אשם תלוי אלא על דבר שזדונו כרת ושגגתו חטאת); Horayoth. II. 3. Talmudical authorities (comp. *Mishn.* Kerith. II. 1) enumerate 36 (or 43) sins which are threatened with the punishment of excision, for instance, 26 cases of incest or criminal intercourse (comp. Lev. XVIII), reviling the name of God, idol-worship, sacrificing to Moloch, indulging in magic and witchcraft, desecrating the Sabbath, entering the Sanctuary or eating sacred food in an unclean state, eating anything leavened on Passover, not fasting on the Day of Atonement, etc. Several of these sins, however, viz. reviling God, neglecting circumcision and the paschal sacrifice, entering the Sanctuary or eating holy food in a state of impurity, even if committed unintentionally, were supposed, for very unsatisfactory reasons, not to be expiable by a sin-offering; *Mishn.* Kerith. II. 2; comp. *Maimon.* De Noxiis, cc. I, VII; *Lightfoot*, Opp. I. 705, 706, and in general pp. 705—711, 715, 716; *Abarban.* Introd. to Levit. c. III. Ebn Ezra (Comm. on Lev. IV), however, believes, though he is singular in this view, that a חטאת was to be offered for such involuntary sins also as, if done designedly, were punished by stripes, that is, in 207 cases; comp. *Maimon.* in Sanhedr. c. 19.

2 Comp. Job. I. 5.

3 Num. XXVIII. 22, 30; XXIX. 16.

4 Num. XXIX. 5.

5 Lev. XVI. 9, 15; Num. XXIX. 11.

6 Num. XXVIII. 15.

7 Exod. XXIX. 14, 36; Lev. VIII. 14—17.

ment of their new duties,[8] on which occasion the people, for whose sake the priests had been installed, likewise presented a sin-offering;[9] again, at the initiation of the Levites[10] and the dedication of a new Sanctuary;[11] it hence preceded momentous religious acts, as the expiation of Israel by the High-priest on the Day of Atonement, when he began by presenting for himself a bullock as a sin-offering.[12] It was connected with deliverance from serious perils or diseases, as with the purification of a woman after childbirth,[13] of a leper after his recovery,[14] or of a house that had been infected with leprosy,[15] of a man who had suffered from a "running issue",[16] or of a woman who had recovered from an unusually long or irregular flow of blood,[17] since disease and all physical infirmities of man were regarded either as the consequence of some transgression[18] or as resulting from the general imperfection of his nature. It was commanded for intentionally withholding judicial evidence,[19] or for swearing in rash needlessness,[20] or even for touching an unclean body or object unaware, whether this happened to a common Israelite or a Nazarite,[21] who had to offer a similar sacrifice likewise at the end of his time of seclusion.[22] — On the whole, therefore, חטאת was the more comprehensive or general term; for every חטאת involved an אשמה or *guilt*,[23] and the חטאת occasionally included the אשם also;[24] though this does not justify the assertion that אשמות and חטאות were often *confounded* with each other.[25] It may be that sometimes the choice between the one and the other was left to the option of the offerer or the decision of the priest; but a severe piety or Levitical strictness must naturally have inclined more to the חטאת than the אשם.

All these facts force upon us the conclusion that no precise and exact definition of the two kinds of expiatory offerings can be based upon the statements made in the Pentateuch in respect to them, if

---

8 Lev. IX. 2—15.

9 Lev. IX. 3.

10 Num. VIII. 8, 12, 21.

11 Num. VII. 16, 22, 28, etc., 87; see Ezra VI. 16, 17; comp. VIII. 35.

12 Lev. XVI. 3, 6, 11.

13 Lev. XII. 6, 8.

14 Lev. XIV. 19, 22.

15 Lev. XIV. 49.

16 זוב, Lev. XV. 14, 15.

17 Lev. XV. 29, 30. See the Rabbinical stipulations in the last named cases in *Maimonides*, De Indigentibus Piaculi (ed. De Veil, pp. 183—201).

18 Leprosy especially seems to have been viewed in this light from early times, as appears from the narrative concerning Miriam's leprosy (see Num. XII. 10; Deut. XXIV. 9); it is so stated in the laws of Manu (III. 159), and by many Jewish writers who connect leprosy with calumny.

19 Lev. V. 1.

20 Lev. V. 4.

21 Lev. V. 3; Num. VI. 10, 11.

22 Num. VI. 14.

23 Lev. IV. 3, 13, 22, 27; V. 2—5.

24 Lev. V. 6—9, 11, 12.

25 So *Rosenmüller*, Schol. in V. 6.

these statements be all referred to the same time and to one author; for they prescribe both sin-and trespass-offerings in cases of Levitical impurity, and they command both the one and the other for moral offences; thus taken, they must appear confused, arbitrary, and unintelligible; and all devices attempting to establish palpable distinctions must inevitably fail. The only possible solution of the embarrassing question seems to lie in an historical survey of the origin and progress of expiatory offerings; and we believe that such analysis may satisfactorily account for the two separate kinds, and help to remove all essential difficulties.

We have proved that expiatory offerings were the latest and last class of sacrifice developed in ancient systems of religion, and especially in that of the Hebrews.[1] It is not improbable, that offences at once the most common and the most dangerous in primitive and imperfectly organised societies, offences against property, were the first to be atoned for by expiatory offerings, or by the אשם. It will be expected that originally *intentional* offences of that nature were particularly, though not exclusively, expiated by a trespass-offering, not only because they are the most frequent and the most fatal to the safety of the community, but because they are most apt to rouse compunction and repentance; and as they were regarded as political not less than moral transgressions, the אשם was naturally accompanied not only by restitution of the property unjustly acquired, but by an additional compensation to the owner, which might indeed have been regarded as a deterring fine against similar cases of misdemeanour. History has preserved to us the account of the Philistines, who had violently taken from the Hebrews the Ark of the Lord, and who, roused to the consciousness of their guilt by a terrible calamity, were instructed by their priests and sooth-sayers indeed to return the Ark, but by no means to return it "empty", but to send with it, as an אשם, golden presents symbolically pointing to the offenders and the deserved infliction. The Pentateuch itself contains some enactments regarding the אשם, which would be utterly inexplicable except on some supposition like that just stated, because they stand in absolute contradiction to the fundamental rule concerning expiatory sacrifices, the rule of *unintentional* and *inadvertent* transgression; for the Law prescribes an אשם in various cases of open or premeditated fraud and violence, for theft and abuse of trust, for unlawful keeping of found property, and even for daring robbery and shameless perjury[2] — laws which must date from a comparatively early period, when expiatory offerings, though suggested by religious impulses, were made

[1] See Sect. I. [2] Lev. V. 21—26.

subservient to the security of the state, and when the restoration of the property together with the fifth part of its value, was prompted by principles of civil or criminal legislation.[3] A similar sacrifice may, in the same periods, have become usual in cases of recovery from serious illness, such as leprosy so frequent and distressing in the East, and of striking forms of impurity, such as the defilement of a God-devoted Nazarite,[4] since disease was looked upon as the punishment for some sin, and contamination was apprehended as provoking the anger of the Deity.[5] However, these latter applications of the אשם proved the transition to a higher and more specific form of expiatory offerings, the חטאת. For when the Hebrews, or rather the nobler and more earnest minds among them, advanced in religious education and purity, it was deemed necessary to atone not only for intentional but also for involuntary offences, not only for defraudment of property but for all sins committed against God or men, not for a few cases of disease or impurity merely but for every misfortune or pollution; for not the state merely, but above all the *theocratic* state, was to be shielded; Israel was considered not simply as a political, but as a *holy* community; and every transgression of whatever kind defiled its purity and disturbed its relations towards God. In the mean time, the social organisation of the people also had greatly improved; the worldly authorities had become strong enough to enforce order and to protect the life and property of subjects; the Pentateuch could, therefore, boldly come forward with the principle that all intentional offences must be rigorously punished in accordance with the criminal code; while misdeeds involving a rejection of the Divine authority or of the promulgated Law were to be visited by "excision" (כָּרֵת), and an expiatory offering was accepted for inadvertent or unconscious sins only. The old אשם was certainly retained, but was deprived of its judicial or penal character; it was indeed chiefly reserved for derelictions connected with the rights of property; but the restitution and addition, likewise kept as of old, ceased to bear the character of a *fine;* for all such derelictions were viewed as frauds and iniquities perpetrated against God;[6] hence when the restitution was not feasible, it was symbolically replaced by the value of the victim[7] or by some other retribution.[8] Thus the אשם was regarded as an expiation for a

---

[3] The attempts at proving "mitigating circumstances" in the intentional misdeeds here mentioned, and of thus referring them, however indirectly, to the category of inadvertent sins (*Kurtz*, Opferc. § 90; *Riehm*, l. c. p. 103) are necessarily unsuccessful evasions; and all speculations based on such questionable opinions, fall at once to the ground (*Kurtz* l. c. § 91).

[4] Lev. XIV. 12, 21; Num. VI. 12.

[5] Comp. *supra* pp. 257, 258.

[6] Lev. V. 19, 21.

[7] Lev. V. 17—19.

[8] Lev. XIX. 20.

guilt contracted at once against man and God; it conciliated the Deity, the holy and theocratic King, and satisfied the defrauded fellow-being; it involved both a material and an ethical element.[1] It was, on the whole, confined to involuntary offences, in conformity with the principle then sanctioned; and one statute only resting on a different foundation was allowed to be incorporated with the sacred code,[2] because it had probably been so fixed at a much earlier date. It appears, however, that the principle of pecuniary fine so long connected with the אשם, the old-established kind of expiatory offerings, was for some time preserved in connection with the new class of חטאת; for we read in the historical Books not only of "money of אשם" but also of "money of חטאת", which, the offence being committed against God, was of course holy and therefore assigned to the priests. Such was the case at least in the reign of Joash, king of Judah (B. C. 877—838).[3] But even this slight external admixture was afterwards deemed incompatible with the deeper nature of the sin-offerings; the pecuniary addition was wholly abolished; it was, in Leviticus, never enjoined in connection with the חטאת; it was wisely and thoughtfully abandoned by the priestly framers of the sacrificial laws, evidently anxious to facilitate, as much as possible, the sin-offerings, the very crowning stones of their ceremonial edifice;[4] and they could well afford to bear the material loss, because simultaneously with it their revenues had been very considerably enhanced and more firmly settled. Therefore, the new class of expiatory sacrifices, or the חטאת, being both more comprehensive and more solemn than the older אשם, was naturally made more exalted in its application, and surrounded by more striking and more solemn ceremonies; it was not restricted to individuals, but wrought atonement for the whole people; it was not merely a private, but a public offering regularly performed on days of festival; it was varied in accordance with the dignity of the worshipper; and hence arose all the distinctions in the ritual that have above been pointed out, and which are in no

[1] Thus the old Germanic law ordained, besides restitution of unlawfully acquired property, the payment of the *bannus* or *fredus* to the community or the king or the temple (comp. *Wilda*, Strafrecht der Germanen, I. 439, 469, 470, 528; *Grimm*, Deutsche R. A. p. 656).

[2] Lev. V. 20—26.

[3] 2 Ki. XII. 17. It is indeed not altogether unlikely from the passage quoted, that both the אשם and the חטאת were, for a long time, simply replaced by money, to be handed over, in the first case, to the injured owner, and in the second, to be paid into the sacred treasury. One law simply ordains pecuniary re-imbursement for unlawful appropriation of sacred food (Lev. XXII. 14); another adds a trespass-offering (V. 14—16). It is gratuitous to assert that the one refers to small, the other to graver embezzlements (*Knobel*, Lev. p. 316).

[4] Comp. Lev. V. 11—13.

feature more significant than in the mode of disposing of the blood of the victim. It will, moreover, be understood why the legislators added a חטאת in a few cases, in which they had found an אשם as an adopted custom. As they saw fit to enjoin a חטאת for any ordinary defilement by contact with an unclean body or object,[5] they could not consider an אשם sufficient for the pollution of a Nazarite invested with peculiar holiness;[6] and as they prescribed a חטאת even for the purification of a house that had been infected with leprosy[7] and for other less serious lustrations, they were naturally induced to superadd one in the case of a convalescent leper,[8] especially as in the course of time the idea was more distinctly developed that illness is the result of moral guilt;[9] but they judiciously modified, they did not lightly or recklessly destroy, the ancient usage which had possibly taken deeper root; for not only did they, in either case, retain the אשם, and allowed it to remain the *principal* of the two expiatory sacrifices, but they ordered even the poorer man at any rate to bring a lamb as an אשם, while a turtle-dove or a pigeon was deemed sufficient for the חטאת and the holocaust.[10] In this manner we may try to harmonize history and the legislation of the Pentateuch both within themselves and with each other.[11]

But what protracted periods were required before the expiatory offerings could pass through the numerous and decided stages that lay between the primitive אשם of the Philistines consisting of "five golden emerods and five golden mice", and the highly refined חטאת of the Pentateuch, beyond which the Hebrews did not advance during the ages of their national existence! To contend that the sin-offerings, as prescribed

5 Lev. V. 3.

6 Num. VI. 11 and 12.

7 Lev. XIV. 19, 22.

8 Lev. XIV. 12 and 19, 21 and 31.

9 But it is hardly justifiable to extend the same consideration to the accidental pollution of the Nazarite, and thus to account for the sin-offering prescribed in that case, as is done by Kurtz (l. c. p. 171) against Keil (Archäol. I. 221).

10 It is therefore erroneous to assert that the אשם was a "eigenthümlich modificirte *Nebenart* or *Unterart* des Sündopfers", and that the former was distinguished from the latter as משפטים is from מצוה (*Kurtz* l. c. p. 173; *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 61; on the parallel with מצוה and משפטים see esp. *Riehm*, l. c. pp. 107—109): the אשם is older than the חטאת, and though it was later eclipsed in solemnity by the חטאת, it retained its own and independent sphere of operation.

11 In Ezra X. 19, those who had married foreign wives were pledged to dismiss them, and to offer a ram as an אשם; for alliances with heathen tribes were regarded as a contamination; and this view was clearly taken by Ezra himself (IX. 11—14), who referred to commandments previously proclaimed through the prophets (see Comm. on Exod. pp. 422, 423); but though the sin was very grave from a theocratic point of view, it could not well be atoned for by a חטאת which, from the outset, had invariably been restricted to *unintentional* transgres-

in Leviticus, were introduced in the time of Moses,[1] implies an utter perversion of the history of religious institutions among the Hebrews: "the money of sin-offerings" mentioned even in the time of Joash and so entirely at variance with the regulations of the Levitical code, suffices alone to prove how gradually and how late the latter received its final seal and revision.[2] The fact that sin-offerings are never alluded to in the earlier historical Books of the Old Testament, has been met by the assertion that they are generally included in the burnt-offerings, and that, though not named, they were in the period of the Judges well-known and extensively performed:[3] but this view bears too much the character of an apologetic artifice to be conducive to historic truth. Why were they never mentioned by the earlier *prophets?* Yet they might almost surely be expected in the grand picture drawn by Joel (B. C. 810) of the devastations of the locust-plague, and among the acts of penitence to which the prophet exhorts for conciliating the Divine anger.[4]

In cases of man-slaughter no expiatory offering of any kind was ordained;[5] the sad exile of the homicide in the distant cities of refuge, till the death of the High-priest restored him to his relations and his usual abode, was evidently deemed an atonement commensurate with a deplorable accident. Nor was one prescribed in lighter cases of defilement by contact, such as carrying the carcase of an unclean animal,[6] when bathing and washing of the garments was sufficient; while, in other instances, merely sprinkling with "the water of purification" (מֵי נִדָּה) was commanded.[7]

The animals appointed for *sin-offerings* comprised nearly every species of clean domestic beasts legally permitted for sacrifices, namely the bullock and the calf, the kid of the goats, whether male or female, the female lamb, the turtle-dove and pigeon, or "birds" (צפרים): the cow, the ram, and older goat were alone excluded.[8] The choice was not,

---

sions, while even the Pentateuch retains some cases of *intentional* offences to be expiated by an אשם.

[1] *Knobel*, Levit. p. 343; *Keil*, Lev. p. 32; *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 60 ("wir haben hier eine der schöpferischen Anordnungen vor uns, welche von dem eigenen Geiste Mose's ausgegangen sein müssen"; comp., however, p. 58); a. o.

[2] See *supra* p. 274. Gramberg (Relig. Id. I. 151) observes justly, "we are entitled to the conclusion that the historian derived that genuinely historical statement (regarding "the money of sin-offerings") from his source which was older than Leviticus and Numbers."

[3] So *Hengstenb.* Auth. d. Pent. II. 86, 87.

[4] Joel I. 13, 14; II. 15, 16; etc.

[5] Num. XXXV. 10—15; Deut. XIX. 1—10.

[6] Lev. XI. 24, 28.

[7] Num. XIX. 19, 20.

[8] The view that *female* victims were originally taken for expiatory offerings, because they express well

as in burnt-and thank-offerings, left to the option of the worshipper, but the victims were prescribed and regulated by the Law in accordance with the nature of the occasion and the character of the suppliant; namely, 1. *a bullock* for the High-priest or the whole congregation to expiate a public offence unconsciously committed and later made manifest;[9] at the consecration of the priests and Levites;[10] and on the Day of Atonement to ensure forgiveness for the High-priest and his house;[11] 2. *a calf*, for Aaron at the installation into his sacred functions;[12] 3. *a male kid of the goats*, in the name of the whole nation, on the days of festivals and new- moons,[13] or on solemn occasions, as on the first day after the inauguration of Aaron and his sons;[14] for a chief in case of unconscious guilt;[15] and at the consecration of the Sanctuary;[16] 4. *a female kid of the goats*, for a common Israelite, when he became aware of an involuntary trespass;[17] for suppression of judicial evidence, for inadvertent contact with unclean bodies or objects; and for a heedless oath[18] — in all which cases could also be offered 5. *a female lamb*,[19] and the same animal was sacrificed at the end of the Nazarite's term of seclusion,[20] and at the recovery of a leper living in prosperous circumstances;[21] while 6. *turtle-doves* or *pigeons* were accepted in the last mentioned case, if the convalescent was poor;[22] or if a person guilty of withholding judicial evidence, of contact with unclean bodies or objects, or of a heedless oath, was unable to afford a kid of the goats;[23] moreover, at the purification of a woman after childbirth,[24] or after a protracted or an unusual issue of blood;[25] at the recovery of a man affected with "a running issue";[26] and when a Nazarite had defiled him-

---

"the night-side of the old sacrificial practices" (*Ewald*, Alterth. pp. 64, 65), is not probable, considering the singular holiness attributed to sin-offerings from the beginning; and not happier is Riehm's conjecture (l. c. p. 117), that the אשם, implying violation of rights, bears more the character of masculine aggression, the חטאת, involving sin or impurity, more that of passiveness and seduction, and that therefore the former was to be atoned for by a male, the latter as a rule by a female animal.

[9] Lev. IV. 3, 14. On Num. XV. 24, where a kid of the goats is prescribed as a sin-offering of the whole community, see p. 40: the explanation of Öhler (l. c. p. 646) a. o. is not satisfactory.

[10] Exod. XXIX. 14, 36; Lev. VIII. 14—17; Num. VIII. 8.

[11] Lev. XVI. 3, 6, 11.

[12] Lev. IX. 1—8.

[13] Lev. XVI. 9, 15; XXIII. 19; Num. XXVIII. 15, 22, 30; XXIX. 5, 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38.

[14] Lev. IX. 3, 15.

[15] Lev. IV. 3.

[16] Num. VII. 16, 22, 34, etc.; comp. Ezra VI. 17; VIII. 35.

[17] Lev. IV. 28.

[18] Lev. V. 1—6.

[19] Lev. IV. 32; comp. Num. XV. 22—29.

[20] Num. VI. 14.

[21] Lev. XIV. 19.

[22] Ibid. ver. 22.

[23] Lev. V. 7—10.

[24] Lev. XII. 6, 8.

[25] Lev. XV. 29, 30.

[26] Lev. XV. 14, 15.

self by the proximity of a corpse;[1] and 7. in one case, *two birds* (צִפֳּרִים), when a house had been freed and purified from leprous infection.[2] In a few extraordinary emergencies, a red cow and a heifer (עֶגְלָה) were employed for purposes of purification.[3]

The animals killed for *trespass-offerings* are not so distinctly specified; they were males in all cases; most commonly a *ram* (אַיִל) seems to have been chosen,[4] because, as has been supposed, sheep and especially rams constituted the primitive medium of currency, chiefly for paying fines, and were, therefore, peculiarly appropriate for trespass-offerings originally presented as penalties for defraudment of property:[5] but a lamb was ordained for a convalescent leper, or a Nazarite contaminated by the presence of a dead body.[6] Indeed, as the אשם related to material damage done to another, it could not consist of anything less than an animal, be it only a lamb, because the compensation was at least to have a material character; but the חטאת, being offered mainly for theocratic offences against God, could be lowered to fowls, and even a small quantity of flour, for a symbol sufficed.

---

1 Num. VI. 10, 11.

2 Lev. XIV. 4, 49.

3 Num. XIX. 2—22; Deut. XXI. 1—9; see notes on ch. XI.

4 Lev. V. 15, 16, 18, 25; XIX. 21; Num. V. 8; called איל אשם (Lev. V. 16) or איל הכפרים (Num. V. 8).

5 Bochart (Hieroz. I. ii. 33) ventures the whimsical explanation "contraria contrariis esse curanda", the offences of self-willed contumacy being best atoned for by the animal distinguished for gentleness and tractable meekness, which qualities the offender should strive to imitate!

6 Lev. XIV. 12; Num. VI. 12. These exceptions are by Riehm (l. c. p. 116) explained by the supposition that as here the אשם was offered merely for the מעל which necessarily resulted from the impurity, the least valuable male sheep was appointed; but, in these cases, no מעל was to be expiated at all (see *supra*). According to the Mishnah (Zevach. X. 5), all victims employed for trespass-offerings must be two years old and be worth two shekels of silver (comp. Lev. V. 15, see notes in loc.; see also *Mishn.* Kerith. VI. 6), except the trespass-offering of the Nazarite and the leper, which was to be a lamb one year old and might be of smaller value (Num. VI. 12, כבש בן־שנתו; comp. Sept. XIV. 10, ἀμνοὺς ... ἐνιαυσίους, with regard to the sacrifice of a leper); though there seems to be no reason why the age of one year distinctly stated in one case (Num. l. c.) should not have applied to all. Abarbanel (Introd. to Lev. c. IV) supposes that rams were chiefly commanded for the אשם because the offender might be induced to consider his trespass, doubtful in itself and certainly committed unintentionally, as very slight, if not deserving entire exemption from punishment, and that therefore a heavier "fine" was imposed, in order to cure him of such dangerous self-complacency: but this opinion is based on the double misconception of the expiatory offerings in general and of the אשם in particular (see *supra*), and it would moreover require bullocks, as being more valuable still than rams.

The following ceremonies were observed at the performance of *sin-offerings.*[7]

1. If the High-priest, having sinned "to the guilt of the people", that is, whether in his official capacity as spiritual chief of the nation or privately,[8] presented a חטאת for himself, he selected a faultless young bullock, brought it to the door of the Sanctuary, imposed his hand upon its head, and killed it at the place where the holocaust was killed, that is, on the northern side of the altar of burnt-offerings;[9] he then took a part of the blood into the Sanctuary, sprinkled with it seven times the vail which separated the Holy from the Holy of Holies, and put some of it upon the horns of the golden altar of incense;[10] he next poured out the rest of the blood at the bottom[11] of the altar of burnt-offering in the Court; laid all the fat and the fat parts of the victim upon the same altar, while the rest of the animal, namely, the skin, all the flesh, the head, the legs, the inwards, and the dung, were carried without the camp, and burnt in a clean place, on the spot where the ashes were usually poured out.[12]

2. When a sin-offering was presented for the whole community of Israel, the proceedings differed from those just stated only in a few particulars. The *congregation* brought the young bullock to the door of the Sanctuary; the *elders* imposed their right hands upon its head, and *one of them* killed it; then the High-priest acted in every respect as if the victim were offered for himself.[13]

3. When a sin-offering was presented by a single Israelite, whether a chief[14] or a private individual, the rituals were identical, except that in the former case the animal required was a male kid of the goats, in the latter either a female kid of the goats or a female lamb — a gradation in the choice of the victim the significance of which is self-evident.[15] The offerer brought it before the door of the Sanctuary, imposed his hand upon its head, and killed it at the usual place; then a priest — not as in the preceding instances, the High-priest — put some of its blood upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, poured the rest at the bottom of it, and burnt upon it all the fat and fat parts,

---

7 See Lev. IV. 1—V. 13. The account of Josephus (Antiqq. III. ix. 3) is both incomplete and inaccurate.

8 See notes on IV. 3—12.

9 Comp. I. 11; IV. 24; VI. 18; VII. 12; see p. 174.

10 *Τῶν γωνιῶν τὰς ἐξοχάς, Joseph.* Ant. III. ix. 3.

11 On the south-western side, according to Jewish tradition.

12 See Levit. IV. 3—12; comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. V. 2.

13 See Lev. IV. 13—21.

14 נשיא, denoting according to tradition (*Mishn.* Horayoth III. 3) the king also, or rather exclusively (ואיזהו הנשיא זה המלך; comp. Ezek. XLVI. 16—18), which acceptation of the term is, however, too narrow.

15 See pp. 83, 84.

while he was permitted, together with other male Aaronites,[1] to consume the flesh; but the meal was required to be held in the Court of the Sanctuary,[2] in the sacred place,[3] to guard against any possible defilement of the holy offering.[4]

These observances were necessarily varied in special cases whose peculiar character and tendency required the modification.

4. When Aaron and his sons were initiated into their holy offices, they placed indeed their hands upon the sin-offering then presented, but Moses performed all the other ceremonies above described;[5] for he officiated on that exceptional occasion as High-priest;[6] and though the blood of the victim was not brought into the Holy, yet the entire animal was burnt, partly on the altar and partly without the camp.[7] The ceremonial of the Day of Atonement which comprised several anomalous features suggested by the solemnity of the festival, will be explained in its proper place.[8]

5. If, in cases of poverty, two turtle-doves or two pigeons were presented as a sin-offering, instead of a female lamb or goat, the priest offered one of them as an expiatory sacrifice, wringing its head,[9] behind the neck (מִמּוּל עָרְפּוֹ)[10], without, however, severing it,[11] sprinkled some of its blood upon the side of the altar, and pressed out the rest at the bottom;[12] and then, after having removed the crop with its excrements, and thrown them on the place of the ashes,[13] he retained the bird for himself, to eat it in the holy place:[14] after which he offered the other bird as a holocaust in the usual manner.[15]

6. The rites adopted at the presentation of *trespass-offerings* were

---

1 Even such as were afflicted with some physical defect (Lev. XXI. 22).

2 According to Josephus (Ant. III. ix. 3), on the same day (*ὁ γὰρ νόμος εἰς τὴν αὔριον ἀπολιπεῖν οὐκ ἐᾷ*).

3 *Ἐντὸς ὅρων ἱερῶν, ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡ κάθαρσις γέγονεν εἶναι*, *Philo*, De Victim. 11.

4 The reason assigned by Philo (l. c.) is futile, "lest if the sacrifice be brought out of the Temple, the offerer may not be overwhelmed by envious and malicious men lying in wait for reproach and false accusation"; comp. p. 210. See Lev. IV. 22—35.

5 See Lev. VIII. 14—17.

6 See Comm. in loc.

7 Vers. 16, 17; see *supra*.

8 See notes on ch. XVI.

9 With his right hand (comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. VII. 5).

10 At the south-western corner of the altar; *Mishn.* Zevach. VI. 2.

11 Whereas, if the bird was a burnt-offering, the head was wrung *off*, and burnt separately on the altar (Lev. V. 8; see p. 241).

12 According to Jewish tradition, the side of the altar was sprinkled with the blood which spontaneously flowed from the neck of the bird, while the rest of the blood was pressed out at the base of the altar; comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. VI. 4.

13 Comp. Lev. I. 16, 17.

14 VI. 19, 22; comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. VI. 4 (אין למזבח אלא דמה וכלה לכהנים), 6, 7.

15 Lev. V. 7—10; see p. 241.

identical with those of sin-offerings brought by a chief or a common Israelite,[16] and the flesh was likewise given over to the priests for consumption: but there was this one important distinction, that the blood was not, as was done with sin-offerings, put on the *horns* of the altar, but "upon the altar round about", not, however, a portion of it only, but all the blood, as was the case with holocausts and thank-offerings, no part being, as in the sin-offerings, poured out at the bottom of the altar.[17]

---

As we survey the expiatory offerings of the Hebrews, which for purity stand unrivalled in the ancient world,[18] we are bound to admit that they were pre-eminently calculated to keep alive among the nation those feelings on which all religious life depends, and from which it flows as its natural source, the feelings of human sinfulness and the conviction of the Divine holiness, by the standard of which that sinfulness is to be measured; they fostered, therefore, at once humility and an ideal yearning; and they effectually counteracted that sense of self-righteousness natural indeed to the pride of man, but utterly destructive of all nobler virtues. They were well suited to secure in the directest and completest manner that singleness of life and heart, which is the true end of all sacrifices. Their division into the two classes of חטאת and אשם contributed much to maintain and to enhance the conviction of moral insufficiency; the more so as such a division was scarcely a necessity, since the חטאת and the אשם both referred to kindred offences, and indeed differed so little in their nature and tendency that the discovery of a broad and palpable distinction almost defies the antiquarian's research. Every Israelite was to feel his transgression personally and individually; hence the sin-offerings were carefully and designedly varied according to the sinner's rank and position, both with regard to the choice of the victim and the mode of the ceremonial; whereas the holocausts, symbolising as they did merely a general admission of the common frailty inherent in human nature, were uniform for all persons.

But the religious legislation was not to be brought into collision with the civil and political enactments; it was, on the contrary, meant to support and to strengthen them; so far from endangering the safety of the state by an ill-advised leniency, it helped to eradicate the natural propensity to crime and lawlessness; its operation was therefore limited to involuntary trespasses; while the secular authorities were left free to deal with pre-meditated offences; it even abstained from inter-

16 The imposition of the hand, though not stated in the text, formed unquestionably a part of the ceremonial; see notes on VII. 1—6.

17 See notes on VI. 17—VII. 6, and Philolog. Remarks.

18 See Sect. XX, the comparison between the sin-offerings of the Hebrews and pagans.

fering in some important cases of unintentional misdeeds, such as homicide, for which it prescribed no sacrifice, but admitted a worldly punishment: satisfied to act as a silent instrument in the reformation of the hearts, it indeed effectually contracted the application, but did not injudiciously weaken the authority of the criminal code. Hence, though bearing the character of vicariousness, the sin-offerings were far from encouraging an external worship by lifeless ceremonies; in themselves the spontaneous offspring of religious repentance, and thus naturally helping to nourish the same beneficent feeling, they were the strongest guarantee for a life of honesty and active virtue.

## XVI. THE OFFERING OF JEALOUSY.[1]

If a man believed that he had well-founded grounds for suspecting his wife of conjugal infidelity, without being able to prove the charge legally by witnesses or otherwise, and thus to make her amenable before the ordinary tribunals, or, as the Pentateuch expresses it, "If a man's wife go astray and commit faithlessness against him, and another man lie with her carnally, and it be hidden from the eyes of her husband and be kept secret, and she be defiled, and there was no witness against her, neither she be taken in the act, and the spirit of jealousy come upon him and he be jealous of his wife, whether she be defiled or not",[2] the law prescribed or sanctioned a very singular mode of ascertaining her guilt or innocence, a proceeding rooted in rude and primeval notions of a direct interference of the Deity in the operation and natural properties of matter,[3] and analogous to ordeals still employed in similar cases by barbarous and untutored tribes.[4] If an oblation so antagonistic to the general spirit of the sacrificial laws of the Pentateuch can at all be classified among them, it falls under the category of sin-offerings, though in the case of the woman's innocence no atonement

---

[1] מנחת קנאות or מנחת זכרון or מנחת סוטה, *θυσία ζηλοτυπίας*, Num. V. 11—31.

[2] The Mishnah (Sotah IV. 1) justly limits this ordinance to women who had lawfully been married to their husbands, and denies its application to a widow who had married a High-priest, a divorced woman who had married a common priest, etc.; and gives besides (Sot. II. 6) this rule זה הכלל כל שתבעל ולא היתה אסורה לו לא היה מתנה עמה, i. e. if a woman had intercourse with a man, but thereby did not become forbidden to her husband (as if he had sent her away without a divorce), she could not be tested by the water of jealousy; comp. also ibid. IV. 2—5; VI. 1—4.

[3] Hence Philo (De Speciall. Legg. III. 10) says, "the affair was brought before the tribunal of nature" (*εἰς τὸ τῆς φύσεως δικαστήριον*).

[4] Comp. *Rosenmüller*, Morgenl. II. 226—228, where several striking parallels are quoted; and Sect. XXVI.

was required, and in the case of her guilt none was granted. For the ceremonies, manifestly devised at once to terrify the conscience and to excite the imagination, were as follows. The husband[5] took his wife to the place of the national Sanctuary[6] before "the priest",[7] and handed over to him[8] an offering on her account,[9] which consisted simply of an omer of the common flour of the inferior grain of barley, to signify the baseness and infamy which must attach to the accused, should the suspicion prove well-founded,[10] and to which he added neither oil nor frank-incense, the emblems of spiritual life and elevation;[11] for "it was an offering of memorial, bringing iniquity to remembrance" (מַזְכֶּרֶת עָוֺן), and the person for whom it was presented was possibly guilty of moral worthlessness and unholy conduct. An offering was necessary, because the husband forced his wife to appear before God to receive from Him, the Searcher of hearts and the Revealer of secrets, her judgment; and he could therefore not make her appear empty-handed; and a bloodless oblation was preferred to an animal sacrifice, because, as we have ob-

[5] After his warnings had proved fruitless, ordains a Rabbinical restriction (*Mishn.* Sot. I. 2).

[6] *Εἰς τὴν ἱερόπολιν*, or *εἰς τὸ ἱερόν*, *Philo* l. c.

[7] Probably the High-priest, or the presiding priest of the day (*παρόντος τοῦ κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν ἱερωμένου*), to whom, as Philo observes, he had to state his suspicions and his grounds for them; Josephus (Ant. III. xi. 6) simply *τὴν γυναῖκα στήσας τις τῶν ἱερέων*; hardly to "the one specially entrusted with such cases" (*Selden*, Uxor Ebraica, III. 15, sacerdos huic rei praestitutus), nor "the judges" (*Philo* l. c). According to later Jewish usage, the husband brought her in the first instance before the judges of his own place, who appointed two well-educated men (תלמידי חכמים) to accompany both parties to Jerusalem and to take care that they did not cohabit on the way. In Jerusalem, he conducted his wife to the great ecclesiastical Court (לבית דין גדול, *Mishn.* Sot. I. 3, 4), which assembled in the "stone-cell" (לשכת הגזית), where every means of deterring and friendly persuasion was adopted to induce her to confession: the priest said to her, "My daughter, perhaps an excess of wine has done it, or of unguarded mirth, or youthfulness, or wicked neighbours bear the guilt; show honour to the great name of God which is written in holiness, that it be not blotted out by the water." If she then avowed her sin, she had to tear her marriage-contract, and went away free; but if she persisted in declaring her innocence, she was led to the eastern door of the Temple or the gate of Nicanor, to undergo the ceremonies which followed (*Mishn.* l. c. I. 4, 5).

[8] According to the Mishnah (l. c. II. 1; III. 1) in a basket of wicker-work (בתוך כפיפה מצרית), from which it was put into a vessel used in the Temple-service (כלי שרת).

[9] עָלֶיהָ, ver. 15; Ebn Ezra עמה או בעבורה.

[10] It is futile to suppose that the *barley*-flour was prescribed in order to save the husband as much expense as possible, since the wife might after all be innocent, and therefore needed no offering whatever (so *Knobel*, Comm. on Num. p. 22); comp. p. 121.

[11] Comp. *Mishn.* Sot. II. 1.

served, expiation was out of the question, whatever the issue of the trial.[1] The priest[2] then placed her "before God", that is, before the altar in the Court of the Sanctuary,[3] poured "holy water",[4] namely water kept in the laver which stood in the Court,[5] into an *earthen* vessel[6] or the most common and least valuable sort of utensils,[7] and strewed upon the water dust (עָפָר),[8] to indicate the despicable meanness of the offence to be tested,[9] though he was to take that dust from the floor of the Sanctuary,[10] since everything appertaining to the sacred ceremonies was to be associated with the holy place, sanctified by the presence of God.[11] He kept the vessel in his own hand, while he gave the מנחה to

[1] Kurtz (l. c. p. 235) supposes that a *minchah* was prescribed because it specially represents the "berufs- und bundesmässige Leben and Wirken", and the woman insisted upon having lived and acted "berufs- und bundesmässig"—an explanation based upon a playful double-sense of the words "Beruf" and "Bund".

[2] Who was neither the advocate or council of the man nor of the woman (*Kurtz* l. c. § 236; *Keil*, Arch. I. 362), but the impartial minister and interpreter of the Law.

[3] The Mishnah (Sot. I. 6) observes that all who liked were permitted to be present except the woman's servants, "because her heart might be elated and hardened by their sight" (מפני שלבה גס בהן).

[4] מים קדשים, ver. 17.

[5] Exod. XXX. 18; comp. Lev. I. 9. So distinctly Targ. Onkel. מי כיור and Targ. Jonath. מיין קדישין מן כיורא בנטלא; Rashi, שקדשו בכיור; Ebn Ezra, מהכיור שכבר נקדשו; Selden, l. c.; Kurtz, l. c. § 234; a. o. Philo renders without plausibility "pure water drawn from a fountain" (*καθαρὸν ὕδωρ, ἐκ πηγῆς ἀφυσάμενος*); according to some Jewish doctors, half a log, or three egg-shells full, according to others, only a quarter of a log; *Mishn.* Sot. II. 2.

[6] Not into one of metal or wood; the Mishnah (Sot. II. 2) "a new earthen phial" (פיילי של חרס חדשה).

[7] Comp. Lament. IV. 2; Sir. XIII. 3. Some believe it to correspond with the *dust* put into the water (so *Knobel*, l. c.); while according to Philo (l. c.) "the earthenware vessel was appropriate because it is easily broken, and death is the punishment appointed for adulterers"; he argues moreover, "the earth and the water are suited to the purging of the accusation, since the origin, and increase, and perfection of all things, take place by them"; and he contends that the "*holy* water and the dust taken from the *Temple* both point to the purity of life of a modest woman!

[8] So that it was visible on the surface, says the Mishnah (Sot. II. 2), and was therefore not mixed with the water. Philo explains עפר by "a lump of earth" (*βῶλον γῆς*).

[9] Comp. Gen. III. 14; Mic. VII. 17; Isai. XLIX. 23; Ps. LXXII. 9.

[10] The Mishnah (Sot. II. 2) observes, "the priest entered the Temple, and turned to his right hand; there is a well-known spot, one yard long and one broad, and over it a marble slab, in which a ring is fastened; he lifted the slab and took from the dust underneath." Josephus remarks inaccurately *προκομίσας τε ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ γῆς εἴ τι προςτύχοι*.

[11] Philo (l. c.), true to his usual method of interpretation, believes this injunction to have "a symbolical reference to the search after truth."

**the woman, who was properly considered to present it as a means of appealing to God's propitious intercession, because it was she who had come before Him for judgment or vindication;[12] he uncovered her head[13] as a symbol of her public accusation and open trial, and also as a mark of degradation, since the veiling of the head was a sign of chastity and female propriety and especially indicative of the married state;[14] and passing to the most important part of the memorable ritual, he addressed to her this solemn adjuration,[15] designed to rouse and, under circumstances, to torture her conscience into anguish and confession, "If no man has lain with thee, and if thou hast not gone astray to un-**

---

[12] The view that it was the *man's* offering (*Bähr*, Symb. II. 446), is undoubtedly erroneous; the woman held the *minchah* during the most significant and most solemn part of the ceremony, the adjuration; the words את־קרבנה עליה (ver. 15) are decisive; it was the man's oblation only in so far as everything that the wife offered properly belonged to the husband. It suffices to allude to the view of the Mishnah (Sot. II. 1) that the object in giving her the מנחה was to fatigue her (כדי ליגעה), and thus to move her to a confession!

[13] ופרע את־ראש האשה, which words we believe, in this context, to have the sense indicated (so also Philo l. c. τὸ ἐπίκρανον ἀφελὼν, and later, ἀκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ; Josephus l. c. τῆς κεφαλῆς τὸ ἱμάτιον ἀφελών; the Talmud, Kethuv. 72*a*, where our passage is quoted in support of the teaching of the Mishnah, Kethuv. VII. 6, that a man may divorce his wife if she walks about in the streets with her head uncovered, וראשה פרוע; Ebn Ezra יגלה; Selden l. c. solemnibus capitis operculis spoliatam; Kurtz l. c. §§ 234, 236); although they admit, in themselves, also the translation "he shall loosen her hair" (סותר את שערה, *Mishn.* Sot. I. 5, Rashi, a. o.; see notes on X. 6), so that it falls down disorderly, to show her to be in the sad position of a defendant. Jewish interpretation finds in those words, moreover, the intimation that the priest had to tear open her garments till he laid bare her heart (עד שהוא מגלה את לבה, *Mishn.* l. c. 5), and then to fasten them above the bosom with an "Egyptian cord" (to remind her of the Egyptian miracles!) — without any reasonable supports, and adds ludicrously אם היה לבה נאה לא היה מגלהו ואם היה שערה נאה לא היה סותרו.

[14] Similarly Philo (l. c.) ἵνα ἐπικρίνηται γεγυμνωμένη τῇ κεφαλῇ, τὸ τῆς αἰδοῦς περιῃρημένη σύμβολον ᾧ ταῖς εἰς ἅπαν ἀναιτίαις ἔθος χρῆσθαι (see, however, Comm. on Gen. p. 432); perhaps also, as has been conjectured (*Michael.* Mos. R. § 263) to be able to observe any change in her face which during the ceremony might betray her emotions. According to the Mishn. (Sot. I. 6), she had also to exchange her white garments for black ones, and was divested of all golden rings, chains, and other trinkets, "in order to make her look ugly" (כדי לנוולה).

[15] According to Jewish tradition (*Mishn.* Sot. VII. 1—4), it might be pronounced in any language familiar to the woman, not necessarily in the holy tongue, as was permitted also with regard to the confession at the oblation of tithes, the שמע, the daily prayer, the thanks-giving after meals, the oath of witnesses, and the oath concerning property held in trust, while other formulas were to be said in Hebrew only, as that prescribed in presenting the firstfruits (Deut. XXVI. 5), in taking

cleanness from thy husband, be thou free from this bitter water[1] that causes the curse. But if thou hast gone astray from thy husband, and if thou be defiled, and some one has lain with thee beside thy husband...then the Lord make thee a curse and an oath among thy people,[2] so that the Lord shall make thy thigh to rot and thy belly to swell,[3] and this water that causes the curse shall enter into thy bowels, to make thy belly to swell and thy thigh to rot": — to which the woman shall say, "Amen, amen."[4] The priest next wrote down[5] on a scroll[6] this curse and oath,[7] which implied a strict retaliation or measure for

off the shoe of a brother-in-law (XXV. 9), the blessing and curse to be spoken on Mount Ebal and Gerizim (XXVII. 12—16), the benediction of the priests (Num. VI. 23—27), etc.

[1] מֵי הַמָּרִים, i.e. water of bitterness and curse (hence with the addition הַמְאָרְרִים, vers. 18, 28; comp. 22, 27), woeful, calamitous water, producing grievous disease, Rashi on ver. 18 סופן שהם מרים לה, on ver. 24 להיות לה רעים ומרים; Ebn Ezra on ver. 18 less aptly האלות הנקראות המאררים ישימו המים מרים אחר היותם מתוקים; Vulg. aquae amarissimae (this literal sense is not required by the context, see also *Selden* l. c., commistis etiam quae amaritudinem adderent, veluti absinthio, id genus aliis); Sept. freely *ὕδωρ τοῦ ἐλεγμοῦ*; and so Philo (l. c.) *ποτὸς ἐλέγχου*, draught of conviction.

[2] That is, as a proverbial example of fearful misery to be quoted, when an awful curse is to be conveyed (Isai. LXV. 15; Jer. XXIX. 22; Zech. VIII. 13; comp. Gen. XLVIII. 20; *Talm.* Sot. 18; Shevuoth 24).

[3] I. e. He shall destroy thy organs of conception and childbirth, the organs which have chiefly sinned (comp. *Theodoret.* Quaest. 10 in Num.), whether by *hydrops ovarii* (*Michael.* Mos. R. § 263) or by the ordinary *hydrops ascites*, or some other disease (comp. *Joseph.* Ant. III. xi. 6, *τὴν κοιλίαν ὑδέρου καταλαβόντος*); Philo (l. c.) describes the effect vaguely as "a great weight and bulk coming upon her, on account of her belly swelling and becoming full, and a terribly evil condition of her womb" (*γαστρὸς ὄγκος οἰδούσης καὶ πιμπλαμένης κτλ.*); while Josephus is too detailed in declaring, that "her right thigh would be put out of joint (*τοῦ δεξιοῦ σκέλους ἐξάρθρον γενέσθαι*), her belly swell, and thus cause her death."

[4] The repetition of the word אמן was meant to enhance the emphasis or force of the protestation (comp. Gramm. § 75. 9; Ebn Ezra פעמים חזוק); whereby all conjectures of the Mishnah (Sot. II. 5, אמן מאיש זה אמן מאיש אחר וכ׳, על האלה אמן על השבועה אמן) become untenable.

[5] The Mishnah (Sot. II. 4) says, not with ink prepared with gum or vitriol (לא בקומוס ולא בקנקנתום, chalcanthium) nor any other corroding matter (ולא בכל דבר שרושם) which leaves traces of the writing behind if washed off with water (ver. 23, ומחה), but with ordinary ink (דיו; comp. *Mishn.* Megill. II. 2).

[6] סֵפֶר ver. 23; or מגילה (*Mishn.* Sot. II. 3), which is thus explained, "it must neither be a wooden tablet (לוח), nor paper (נייר), nor a hide imperfectly prepared (דפתרא, *διφθέρα*), but parchment (מגילה, Barten. קלף); yet Josephus (l. c.) has *διφθέρα*.

[7] The Mishnah (Sot. II. 3) declares that the writing on the scroll included vers. 19 ("if no man has lain with thee" etc.), 20 ("but if thou hast gone astray" etc.), 21 (beginning from "the Lord make thee a curse" etc.), 22 (leaving

measure, in harmony with the penal enactments of the Pentateuch generally,[8] and then blotted the words out with, or rather in, the bitter water,[9] probably by dipping the scroll into the vessel,[10] to put, as it were, the curse symbolically into the water, and thereby to impart to the latter the power of destruction; he took the מנחה from the woman's hand, waved it before God, burnt a handful of it upon the altar as a memorial (אַזְכָּרָה) meant to call forth a manifestation of God in her favour if she were innocent, as she contended to be,[11] and then gave the woman to drink from the water.[12] And the Hebrew text adds gravely,[13] that

out the words "and the woman shall say, Amen, amen"): the Bible (ver. 23) mentions only that "the curses (vers. 21, 22) were to be written on the scroll (וכתב את האלת האלה הכהן בספר); and this was indeed the view taken by some Jewish doctors (*Mishn.* l. c.), although the method by which either view was arrived at or supported involves many of the worst and strangest features of Talmudical interpretation. One lays stress on the ה in האלת, another on ה in האלה, or on the particle את, etc.

[8] Comp. *Mishn.* Sot. I. 7, במדה שאדם מודד בה מודדין לו; *Theodoret.* Quaest. 10 in Num. (*δι᾽ ὧν γὰρ ἡ ἁμαρτία, διὰ τούτων ἡ τιμωρία*).

[9] אֶלְמֵי הַמָּרִים.

[10] Josephus describes the method, not quite plausibly, thus, *τῆς διφθέρας ἀπολείψας τὸ ὄνομα εἰς φιάλην ἐκπιέζει.*

[11] See pp. 206, 207; comp. also *Kurtz* l. c. § 236: Ebn Ezra explains, מה שיהיה לה לזכרון לטוב כפי מעשה; but there is no reason to deviate from the usual meaning of the term אזכרה in reference to the minchah. The Mishnah (Sot. III. 1, 2) thus describes the ceremony, "the husband takes the מנחה from the basket, puts it into a holy vessel (see *supra*), and places the latter into his wife's hand, under which the priest puts his own, waves the offering, takes a handful of it to the altar and burns it there, after which the rest may be eaten by the priests."

[12] Comp. Ps. CIX. 18, וילבש קללה כמדו ותבא כמים בקרבו וכשמן. After having drunk the water, the woman had at once to leave the sacred precincts, which were not to witness her possible inflictions, or as Philo observes, "awaiting the reward for her modesty or the extreme penalty of her incontinence." According to some Jewish teachers, the drinking preceded the oblation of the מנחה (*Mishn.* Sot. III. 2, היה משקה ואחר כך מקריב את מנחתה) which is against the plain injunction of the Bible (ver. 26, ואחר ישקה וכ׳; comp. *Rashi* in loc.): only after the woman had pleaded her cause before God by the אזכרה of the *minchah*, she was to expect her judgment in the effect of the water. If she then, after the writing had been blotted out from the scroll, refused to drink, either on her own account or by direction of her husband, confessing to be impure or convicted of her offence by witnesses, the *minchah* was put on the "place of the ashes" in the Court (Lev. I. 16), and there burnt; but if she objected to drink without proffering any avowal, she was made to drink by force (*Mishn.* Sot. III. 3, 6); in this case, and if she was the wife of a priest, she was for ever excluded from the prerogative of eating the sacred food of her husband (תרומה; ibid. I. 3; comp. also III. 3, 6). On the other hand, the virtuous wife naturally claimed the ceremony as a right and a privilege (comp. *Mishn.* Sot. VI. 2 *sqq.*), since it helped to free her from unmerited slander, and to restore her to an honourable position.

[13] "A very impolitic measure" ob-

**if she were guilty, the water would "make her belly to swell and her thigh to rot", that is, vitiate or destroy the organs of conception and thenceforth condemn her to the curse and shame of barrenness;[1] but if she were innocent, "she would be free and conceive seed."[2] In the former case, she "bore her iniquity"; the disgrace, the separation from her husband,[3] and the disease that befell her, were deemed sufficient punishment;[4] in the latter case, the mutual and conjugal confidence was fully restored, and the husband could not be blamed for having exposed his wife to so awful an ordeal;[5] for he did not act, as Philo observes, "like a false accuser or treacherous enemy, seeking to gain the victory by any means whatever, but as a man may do who wishes accurately to ascertain the truth without any sophistry", and had accused his wife "not out of insult, but with an honest intention", and perhaps from the ardour of his love.[6] The water was, therefore, not merely a *symbol* of the expected punishment of God,[7] but — by means of the curse which had passed into it bodily — a positive and material agent in producing the terrible effects described;[8] yet decidedly objectionable is the supposition that the "bitter water", specially prepared and for this reason called "holy", possessed such medicinal properties as *naturally* produced the effects described in cases of incipient pregnancy, since the regular repetition of miracles wrought for individuals**

serves Michaelis (Mos. R. § 263), "for a lawgiver, unless he was absolutely certain of his Divine legation."

1 The Mishnah (Sot. III. 4) thus describes and enlarges the matter, "She had hardly drunk the water when her face turned yellow, the eyes protruded from her head, and the sinews began to swell. Then the priest commanded, Lead her away, lead her away, lest she defile the Court" (in becoming a נדה). "If she has a merit of good works" — continues the same Mishnah — "her punishment might possibly be delayed; for some good works secure a respite of one year, others of two, others again of three years": and these superstitions, partly combated and partly aggravated by other Rabbis (l. c. 5), afford an occasion for the absurdest remarks on the worth and propensities of women; f. i., כל המלמד בתו תורה כאלו לומדה תפלות, or רוצה אשה בקב ותפלות מתשעה קבין ופרישות.

2 Josephus contends, she would bear a male child in the tenth month; comp. Targ. Jonath. ותתעבר בבר דכר.

3 For she was thenceforth forbidden to live with her husband, and even to marry her seducer (*Mishn.* Sot. V. 1).

4 She was not put to death as an adulteress, as this could, according to the Law, be done only, if she was discovered in the act, in which case both parties suffered the extreme penalty (Deut. XXII. 22; comp. Lev. XX. 10; Philo, l. c. *μοιχείας αὐτοφώρους*); see Comm. on Exod. XXII. 15, 16.

5 Ver. 31, ונקה האיש מעון.

6 Comp. *Joseph.* l. c. *ὑπὸ πολλοῦ τοῦ ἔρωτος*.

7 So *Bähr* l. c. p. 447; *Kurtz* l. c. § 237.

8 Keil (Arch. I. 301, 303) observes, "The curse was communicated to the woman in a real or *sacramental* manner"; though the comparison between this rite and a sacrament is unsafe.

is not in harmony with the Mosaic Law:[9] this view not only militates against the entire spirit of the Biblical account, but is necessarily unavailing; for granted even that water of a similar quality can be prepared and was known to the Hebrews, it would act alike whether the woman was pregnant by her husband or her seducer. It cannot be denied that the procedure here prescribed falls virtually into the category of *ordeals;* the fact that, after its completion, the human judges took no action in the matter, while this was usually done after ordeals, constitutes no essential difference:[10] the principal point is the supernatural mode of discovering the *guilt;* this was perfectly analogous in both cases, while the *punishment* was in our instance left to God, in other ordeals carried out by human tribunals. The Talmud[11] believes that the test was applicable only if the husband had been absolutely faithful to his wife — of which condition the Biblical text is altogether silent; and that it ceased to be effectual when adulterers increased — which may be a convenient mode of accounting for constant failures of an experiment dangerous to the authority of the Pentateuch. The rite was abolished by Jochanan ben Saccai about the beginning of the Christian era[12] — a commendable measure whether suggested by enlightenment or prudence. From that time, divorce alone was customary among the Jews in cases of manifest and well-proved faithlessness.[13]

## XVII. THE PASCHAL SACRIFICE.[14]

It requires no proof that the paschal lamb, even that killed in Egypt, was in reality a *sacrifice;*[15] the designation זֶבַח פסח is alone

---

[9] So *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. pp. 573, 574.

[10] As is contended by Bähr (l. c. I. 447) and Kurtz (l. c. § 237); see, however, *Keil*, Arch. I. 298.

[11] Sot. 28*a* בזמן שהאיש מנוקה מעון המים בודקין את אשתו וכו'.

[12] *Mishn.* Sot. IX. 9; comp. *Talm. Jerus.* 24*a*; and on Jochan. b. Sacc. see Sepher Yuchasin p. 68 ed. Filipowski.

[13] Comp. *Leo Mutinensis*, De Ceremoniis et Consuetudinibus hodie Judaeos inter receptis, IV. vi. 1. According to Jewish doctrines derived from very futile interpretations, the conjugal fidelity of man was ascertained and judged by the same process (*Mishn.* Sot. V. 1, כשם שהמים בודקין אותה כך המים בודקין אותו; comp. Protevang. Jacob. c. 15): but this is against the plain injunction of the Pentateuch, which allows men not only several wives, but also concubines, and no single wife could, therefore, accuse him of a breach of his pledged troth: the reason is not, because "according to the Hebrew law husband and wife were not parties with equal rights, the latter being the property of the former" (*Michael.* Mos. R. § 263) — which view is utterly unfounded (see Comm. on Gen. pp. 90, 115; on Exod. p. 370).

[14] זֶבַח פֶּסַח (Exod. XII. 27; comp. XXIII. 18) or זֶבַח חַג הַפָּסַח (Exod. XXXIV. 25); and the meal simply פֶּסַח (Exod. XII. 11).

[15] See *Lundius*, Jüd. Heiligth. V. xii. 80; *Carpzov*, Appar. pp. 396, 397; *Hof-*

U

decisive; the Pesach is in the Pentateuch distinctly called "an offering of the Lord",[1] and "service" or "worship";[2] it was prescribed to be male and faultless,[3] the ordinary requirements of the holiest sacrifices; it was to be eaten at once and entirely, or if anything remained it was to be burnt the same night;[4] in later times, it was to be killed at the common Sanctuary, and consumed in the holy town,[5] and the blood was to be sprinkled upon the altar.[6] Nor can it be doubted that the paschal sacrifice, though in some respects entirely singular and exceptional, must be classed among the *thank-offerings* (שְׁלָמִים), to which it is analogous not only in the name[7] and in the disposal of the portions left on the morrow of the sacrifice,[8] but its flesh, even including the breast and right shoulder, was eaten by the Israelites who offered it, and was thus marked as distinct both from the holocausts and the expiatory offerings. Some have indeed laboured to represent it, either fully or conditionally, as a sin-offering designed to atone for the idolatry practised by the Hebrews during their sojourn in Egypt:[9] but the term פֶּסַח never signifies *absolution* or *expiation*, whatever its meaning in Arabic; and the blood of the lamb, which in Egypt was put on the lintels and the door-posts, did not symbolise the unworthiness of the Hebrews of being exempted from the calamity that was to afflict the Egyptians, but it signified the occupation of the houses by Hebrews and the belief of the latter in God's promise of rescue.[10] And in the later form of the Passover sacrifice,[11] the blood, so eminently essential in sin-offerings, was of such subordinate importance, that its use and application were not even specified in the Law.[12] Jewish tradition distinctly marked the Pesach

---

*mann*, Weissag. und Erfüll. I. 123; Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 177; comp. *Reland*, Antiqq. III. vi. 14; *Kurtz*, l. c. pp. 312—316.

1 קרבן יהוה, Num. IX. 7, 13 (comp. 1 Cor. V. 7); and in later Jewish writings usually קרבן פסח; comp. *Mishn.* Pesach. V. 1 *sqq.*; *Joseph.* Ant. XI. iv. 8, τὴν Πάσχα προςαγορευομένην θυσίαν ἐπιτελέσαντες; Mark XIV. 12, τὸ πάσχα θύειν.

2 עֲבוֹדָה, Exod. XII. 25, 26.

3 Exod. XII. 5. 4 Exod. XII. 10; comp. p. 247. 5 Deut. XVI. 5—7.

6 Comp. 2 Chr. XXXV. 11; see Comm. on Exod. p. 182.

7 זֶבַח, see p. 74 note 6.

8 Comp. Exod. XII. 10 and Lev. VII. 15—17.

9 So *Bechai*, notes on Lev. II. 11; *Hengstenberg*, Opfer, p. 24; Passah, pp. 138, 139; Christol. III. ii. 110; *Harnack*, Christl. Gemeindegottesdienst, pp. 191, 192; *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 359; *Keil*, Arch. I. 384 (who believes it to combine the meaning of the thank- and sin-offerings).

10 Tholuck (l. c. p. 97) calls the lamb, on the whole correctly, an ἀποτρόπαιον, "not a means of expiation for past sins, but a means of averting imminent misfortune."

11 On פסח דורות, in contradistinction to the פסח מצרים, see Comm. on Exod. p. 183, and the references there quoted; comp. also *supra* p. 25.

12 Comp. on the other hand, Lev. IV. 7, 18, 25, 30, 34.

as a thank-offering by declaring that while it was killed the Israelites chanted the great hymn (הַלֵּל) consisting of the Psalms CXIII to CXVIII.[13] The rites by which it was attended differed indeed from those observed in ordinary שלמים; but these very deviations serve to recall its true character more strikingly. It was by the Hebrew historian, who placed its origin in the time of the exodus from Egypt, evidently conceived as a *sacrifice of covenant* in a double sense — to typify the alliance between God and the people of Israel, and to cement the union between the members of the Hebrew households. For it was to be killed by the head of every family; its blood, to be put on the lintel and the door-posts, was to sanctify the house to God; it was to be roasted entire, without any part or member being cut off; for which reason nothing, not even the fat, was burnt on the altar;[14] nor did the priests receive any portion; it was to be eaten in family groups, and to be consumed completely in the night of the fourteenth day of Nisan, without anything being left to the following day.[15] But this character which the paschal sacrifice bore at its first institution, was naturally modified in subsequent periods of Hebrew history, and especially after the settlement in the promised land. Then the Israelites properly presented it as a *thank-offering* for the miraculous redemption of their ancestors from Egyptian bondage, and in grateful remembrance of the mercy which God had manifested in choosing and accepting them as His own people;[16] they considered it indeed as an annual renewal of the national convention between God and themselves;[17] but joy and gratitude obtained a chief, if not predominant share in its performance. Thus the history of the paschal sacrifice exhibits the same change in its nature, which the שלמים generally seem to have undergone in the course of centuries. How and for what reasons the sacrifices of the firstborn were, from holocausts, converted into thank-offerings, will be explained elsewhere.[18]

## XVIII. THE DOCTRINE OF VICARIOUS SACRIFICE.

It is impossible to doubt that the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice was entertained by the Hebrews, as it was held by other nations, both ancient and modern. If the principle of substitution be not at once

---

13 Comp. *Mishn.* Pesach. V. 7.

14 Comp. Exod. XXIII. 18; see, however, *Talm.* Pesach. 64*b*, 65*b*.

15 See Comm. on Exod. pp. 178, 179, 196; and generally pp. 178—187. "It was from the beginning", observes the Mishnah (Pesach. VII. 4), "destined for eating" (שלא בא מתחלתו אלא לאכילה).

16 Comp. Exod. XIII. 14—17.

17 The פסח has, therefore, justly been described as קרבן היחיד הדומה לקרבן צבור, "a sacrifice of an individual that resembles a sacrifice of the community" (*Abarban.* Introd. to Levit. c. III).

18 See the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. 3.

apparent in holocausts and thank-offerings presented as an acknowledgment of God's sovereignty and beneficence, it is plainly obvious in expiatory sacrifices. It is unmistakably implied in that important passage which some have even regarded as the very foundation of all sacrificial laws, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls (על־נפשתיכם); for it is the blood that makes an atonement by the soul (בנפש)",[1] where the soul of the offerer is clearly placed in juxtaposition with the soul of the victim employed as a means of expiation. That principle is also certain and manifest in the imposition of the hands as commanded with regard to the scape-goat, "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over it all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, and shall put them upon the head of the goat, and send it away by the hand of an appointed man into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon it all their iniquities into a land not inhabited";[2] wherefore the messenger who had driven away the goat was unclean and forbidden to come within the camp till he had bathed and washed his garments.[3] It is at least supported by the fact that כִּפֶּר, the proper term for atonement, is occasionally used as a synonym of תַּחַת *instead*.[4] It is embodied in the narrative of the intended sacrifice of Isaak, instead of whom a ram was offered as a holocaust,[5] and in the law concerning the heifer killed at or near the place of an undiscovered murder;[6] and it is symbolised by the dissected animals at the conclusion of covenants, foreshadowing the deserved fate of the transgressor.[7] It involves a deep consciousness of sin and guilt, and marks a decided progress in the path of spiritual religion.

---

[1] Lev. XVII. 11, and notes in loc.

[2] Lev. XVI. 21, 22; see Comm. in loc.

[3] Ibid. ver. 26; comp. ver. 28.

[4] Isai. XLIII. 3; Prov. XXI. 18; comp. *De Wette*, De Morte Jes. Ch. expiat. p. 18; *Hengstenb*. Christol. II. 375.

[5] Gen. XXII. 13; comp. *Kurtz*, l. c. p. 81; see *infra* Sect. XXI. 3.

[6] Deut. XXI. 1—9; comp. *Delitzsch*, Comm. zum Hebräerbr. pp. 742, 743.

[7] See p. 197, note 16. On Exod. XXXII. 32, 33, see Sect. XVIII. Similar in import was the Greek symbol of killing a victim and throwing it as food before animals, to indicate the punishment of faithlessness or perjury (comp. *Hom*. Il. XIX. 258—268; *Eustath*. ad Hom. Iliad. III. 273; *Liv*. I. 24, tu... Jupiter, populum Romanum sic ferito, ut ego hunc porcum hic hodie feriam; see also *Schömann*, Griech. Alterth. II. 239, 240). It is still the custom of orthodox Jews, on the day preceding the Day of Atonement, to turn a fowl — the men a cock, and the women a hen — (or a fish) round their head and to say, "This is my substitute, this is my deputy, this is my atonement; this cock (or hen) shall go to death, but I shall be gathered in and go to a long and blessed life and to peace" (זה חליפתי זה תמורתי זה כפרתי זה התרנגול

**The doctrine of vicariousness[8] has been acknowledged and adopted by many Rabbins and Fathers of the Church, who held that the Bible sanctioned the principle of "life for life",[9] and supposed the killing and burning of the victim to imply that the blood of the offerer ought to have been shed, and his body burnt, on account of his sins, had not the mercy of God accepted from him, as a substitute and atonement, the life and the blood of the animal;[10] and it has been defended by the majority of orthodox writers and critics,[11] though it has by some been either**

---

ילך למיתה ואני אכנס לחיים טובים ארוכים ולשלום).

[8] Or satisfactio vicaria.

[9] נפש תחת נפש, *ψυχὴ ἀντὶ ψυχῆς*; comp. Exod. XXI. 23.

[10] See *Ebn Ezra* on Lev. XVII. 11; *Bechai* and *Ralbag* on Lev. I; של"ה on I. 21; *Maimon*. Mor. Nevoch. III. 47; *Nachmanides* on Lev. I. p. 84*a* (יחשוב אדם ··· כי חטא לאלהיו בגופו ובנפשו וראוי לו שישפך דמו וישרף גופו לולא חסד הבורא שלקח ממנו תמורה וכפור הקרבן הזה); *Abarbanel*, Introd. to Lev. c. IV; ראשית חכמה on Lev. III ("Justice requires the death of the sinner, but the mercy of God says, 'let him bring the life of the animal instead of his life'"); *Isaac ben Arama* on Lev. I; *Theodoret*. Quaest. 61 ad Exod.; *Eusebius*, Demonstr. Evang. I. 10; *Aristaeus* ap. Euseb. Praep. Ev. VIII. 9 (*τῆς γὰρ ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῆς τοῦ παντὸς τρόπου προςφορὰν ποιεῖται ὁ τὴν θυσίαν προςάγων*); etc.

[11] Comp. *Outram*, De Sacrif. I. xxii. pp. 248—283; comp. pp. 337 (anima victimae piacularis sontis animae vice data dicitur), 349 (recte a Judaeis statutum esse, victimas illas piaculares, quas imperavit Lex Mosaica, sontium in locum surrogatas fuisse, ut quae idem poenae genus, nempe vitae exitium, passae fuerint, quo sontes ipsi liberati erant); *Michael*. Typ. Gottesgel. pp. 58, 59, 65, 66; *Buxtorf*, Synag. Jud. c. 25; *Lundius*, Jüd. Heiligth. III. xlvi. 19—25, pp. 724—726; *Bauer*, Theol. d. N.T. IV. 124 *sqq.*; *De Wette*, De Morte Jes. Ch. expiat. pp. 14—20; *Gesen*. Comm. über den Jesaia, c. LIII; *Scholl*, Stud. d. Würtemb. Geistlichkeit, V. 2, pp. 150, 153; *Hengstenb.*, Christol. I. i. 264, 265; II. 372—377; Opfer, p. 15 (who makes, however, the untenable distinction, "obgleich die Opfer in Bezug auf das Verhältniss zur inneren Theokratie nur bezeichnend waren, so waren sie doch in Bezug auf das Verhältniss zur äusseren Theokratie bewirkend oder eigentlich stellvertretend"; comp. p. 255, note 17); *Tholuck*, Das A.T. im N.T. pp. 85, 86, 94; *von Cölln*, Bibl. Theol. I. 270 *sqq.*; *Knobel*, Comm. zu Lev. pp. 380, 381; *Keil*, Archaeol. I. 192, 206; Comm. zu Levit. pp. 14, 35; *Delitzsch*, Bibl. Psychol. p. 201 ("Die satisfactorische Grundidee des Opfers ist nicht allein die orthodox kirchliche, sondern auch die orthodox synagogale"); Comm. zum Hebräerbr. p. 738; *Hofmann*, Schriftbeweis I. 1, pp. 141 *sqq.*; *Winer*, Real-Wörterb. II. 544, 545 (who calls this meaning of expiatory offerings the "most natural, most significant, and most harmonising with the notions of the ancients", and declares all the other explanations to be "far less natural, simple, and appropriate"); *Öhler*, l. c. pp. 630—632; *Thalhofer*, l. c. pp. 33 *sqq.*; *Kliefoth*, l. c. 53; *Stöckl*, l. c. pp. 248 *sqq.*; *Keil*, Arch. I. 228, 237; *Kahnis*, Lutherische Dogmatik, I. 270, 585; *Hermann Schultz*, Der Begriff des stellvertretenden Leidens (Basel, 1864), who however, greatly exaggerates the idea of vicariousness by extending it to the operations of nature (p. 5), the organi-

opposed or wrongly understood. Thus Bähr[1] indeed admits a certain relation of vicariousness between the life (נפש) in the sacrificial blood and the life of the offerer; but he refines and sublimates that relation to such a degree as hardly to leave a palpable notion; for he believes the substitution not to be external or real, but symbolical in this sense that the sacrificial act, unless that which is represented by it, be really carried out on the part of the offerer, is idle and invalid; he declares the surrender of selfishness (נפש) to Jehovah to be no absolute ceasing, but a dying which *eo ipso* becomes life, since sanctification is true life: a metaphysical view based on a figurative acceptation of the word נפש, which he understands as sin, selfishness, or passion (*ἐπιθυμία*), but which, wherever it is employed with reference to substitution, denotes quite literally the life or existence of the offerer, saved and expiated by the life of the victim.[2]

This doctrine is, however, widely different from the so-called *juridical* view, which considers the sacrifice as a penalty or fine;[3] for the Pentateuch cannot possibly be said to start from the principle, "man offers the sacrifice in order to escape from punishment, because without punishment the disturbed relation between God and man cannot be restored":[4] this would not be a *covering* (כפרה)[5] of the sin or *wiping out* of it,[6] no *pardon*[7] and no *mercy*, in which the sacrificial system is centred. Moreover, in expiatory offerings not the killing of the animal, but the proceeding with the blood was the principal act, which effected atonement. Hence the priest, the representative of God, did not necessarily execute the slaying, but he invariably performed the sprinkling of the blood. And though the victim gave up its life for

---

sation of society, and the ordinary occurrences of life (pp. 6 *sqq.*), and therefore considers the vicarious suffering of the Hebrew prophets and of Christ as pre-ordained from eternity, whereas it was, historically, the result of cruel persecution and inveterate blindness; comp. Sect. XIX.

1 Symb. II. 210, 211, 263, 278, 279.

2 Comp. also *Klaiber*, Stud. der Würtemb. Geistlichk. VIII. ii. 10; *Steudel*, Vorlesung. üb. d. Theol. d. A. T. pp. 329 *sqq.*; *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. p. 336; Archäol. I. 213; etc.; *K. Bähr*, Die Lehre der Kirche vom Tode Jesu etc., who, adopting a subtle distinction between expiation through the blood of Christ and satisfactio vicaria, admits the former, but rejects the latter, and attempts to prove that this was the view of the Fathers of the Church in the three first centuries. But the characteristics of the death of Christ (stated l. c. pp. 10, 11) apply nearly all to "the servant of God" (Isai. LIII), whose vicarious suffering is undeniable. See a review of the arguments put forth in opposition to the doctrine of vicariousness in *Kurtz*, Opferc. §§ 60—71.

3 Mulcta; see p. 257.

4 An opinion erroneously deduced from Rom. VI. 23; Hebr. IX. 22.

5 See Comm. on Lev. I. 1—9.

6 מחה, Jer. XVIII. 23.

7 ונסלח לו, Lev. IV. 20, 26, 31, 35, etc.

the life of the offerer, it was not laden with his sins;[8] hence the flesh, so far from being impure, became most holy,[9] and was, in certain cases, eaten by the priest who had been instrumental in the offering. The scape-goat alone, on the Day of Atonement, which bore the sins of the people,[10] was not "most holy", but was sent into a desert land to perish far away from the abodes of men.

The subject may, therefore, briefly be thus summed up. The animal dies to symbolise the death deserved by the offerer on account of his sins; while its blood which represents its life and existence, is put on the altar and on other parts of the Sanctuary to typify the Divine atonement solicited and granted. The death of the animal is far from unessential, for it involves the indispensable preliminary or the negative side of the sacrifice, the remission of the punishment; after which the sprinkling of the blood follows as the emblem of the positive effect or end, the remission of the guilt, the restoration of peace and grace, the sanctification or the re-union with God.[11] Thus understood, the sacrifice is not "merely an external, a formal, and mechanical act", and still less "an act of penal execution."[12] It is moreover obviously erroneous to deny all significance to the killing of the animal,[13] and to look upon it simply as an act of transition and a means for obtaining the blood: if so, it would not have been so regularly recorded in the text, nor would the *mode* have been so characteristically varied in different sacrifices.[14] The ceremony was entrusted, or rather left, to the offering Israelites, and not confided to the priests, because the former were to testify, in the most signal manner possible, their submission, their ready gratitude, or their death-deserving guilt. It could not well be performed on the elevated altar itself; it was sufficiently connected with this holy structure by being necessarily performed *near* it. And the sprinkling of the blood was lawful and effectual only if the blood was obtained by *killing* the animal, not if it flowed from a wound or even a vital organ.[15]

Simultaneously with the principle of substitution of *animals* for men, the notion of substitution of *men* for men began to gain ground. Traces of it are met with at different periods of Hebrew history. It is indirectly implied in the narrative concerning the seven descendants of Saul "hanged up before the Lord" as an atonement for the unjust war-

[8] This view, very extensively entertained, has been most strongly expressed by Ewald (Alterth. p. 68).

[9] קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, Lev. VI. 18.

[10] Lev. XVI. 21, 22.

[11] See Sect. XX.

[12] *Bähr*, Symb. II. 282; comp. *De Wette*, De Morte Jes. Ch. expiat. p. 20, note 44.

[13] So *Bähr*, l. c. p. 280; *Öhler*, l. c. p. 628; a. o.

[14] See Sect. X. 5.

[15] See pp. 124—126.

fare alleged to have been waged by Saul against the Gibeonites;[1] it renders intelligible the story of the death of the child of David and Bath-sheba, intended as an expiation for the king's crime;[2] it is almost distinctly expressed in the adages, "The wicked shall be a ransom for the righteous, and the transgressor for the upright",[3] and, "The righteous is delivered out of trouble, and the wicked comes in his stead";[4] it underlies the description of the servant of God "who has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, who was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities, who suffered chastisement for our salvation, and by whose stripes we are healed, upon whom the Lord has laid the iniquity of us all, and who was stricken for the transgressions of the people, who delivered up his soul to death, bore the sins of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."[5] In the time after the exile, it was developed with more and more distinctness;[6] and it gave birth to the idea of the Messiah or the son of God suffering death to secure atonement and salvation for mankind.[7]

---

1 2 Sam. XXI. 1—14; see Sect. XXIII.

2 2 Sam. XII. 13 *sqq.*; comp. also Mic. VI. 7, "shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?"

3 Prov. XXI. 18, כפר לצדיק רשע ותחת ישרים בוגד; comp. *Mishn.* Sanhedr. II. 1 (אנו כפרתך); Negaim II. 1 (אני כפרתן). On the other hand Philo (Sacrif. Ab. et Cain. 38) observes, "the good man is the ransom of the wicked one, so that they who have sinned will naturally come to those who have been hallowed, for the sake of being purified" (*σπουδαῖος τοῦ φαύλου λύτρον κτλ.*). The Aruch explains the term כפרה thus, כל מקום שהוא אומר הריני כפרתו והוא פירושו הריני במקומו לסבול עונותיו.

4 Prov. XI. 8, צדיק מצרה נחלץ ויבא רשע תחתיו. The explanations of Dr. Patrick (quoted by *Taylor*, The Scripture doctrine of Atonement considered, p. 67), denying the idea of substitution, are vague and one-sided; comp. also *Hengstenb.* Christol. I. ii. pp. 375, 376. The opinion that the death of the descendants or relatives is required for the sin of their ancestor or the representative of their house (comp. Exod. XX. 5, 6; 2 Sam. XII. 15—18; XXIV. 10—25; Josh. VII. 1 *sqq.*; Sir. XXIII. 24, 25; XLI. 5—7; Tob. III. 3, 4; Bar. III. 8; Judith VII. 28), is based upon a different association of ideas.

5 Isai. LIII. 4—12.

6 Comp. *Joseph.* De Maccab. §§ 6 (*σὺ οἶσθα, θεέ, ὅτι παρόν μοι σώζεσθαι ... ἀποθνήσκω διὰ τὸν νόμον. Τοιγαροῦν ἵλεως γενοῦ τῷ ἔθνει σου, ἀρκεσθεὶς τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δίκῃ, καθάρσιον αὐτῶν ποίησαι τὸ ἐμὸν αἷμα, καὶ ἀντὶ ψυχῶν αὐτῶν λάβε τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχήν*), 17 (*καὶ τὴν πατρίδα καθαρισθῆναι, ὥσπερ ἀντίψυχον γεγονότας τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἁμαρτίας· καὶ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐκείνων καὶ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῶν ἡ θεία πρόνοια τὸν Ἰσραὴλ προκακωθέντα διέσωσε*).

7 Comp. Matth. I. 21; XX. 28; XXVI. 28; Mark X. 45; XIV. 24; Luke I. 76, 77; VI. 51; XXII. 19, 20 (comp. Exod. XXIV. 8); John I. 29; X. 15; Acts X. 43; Rom. III. 24, 25; VIII. 32; V. 8, 10, 11; 1 Cor. V. 7; XV. 3; 2 Cor. V. 18, 19, 21; Gal. I. 4; Eph. I. 7; V. 2; Col. I. 14, 20, 24; 1 Tim. II. 6; Hebr. I. 3; IX. 13, 15; XIII. 11, 12; Tit. II. 14; 1 Petr. II. 21, 24; III. 18; 1 John I. 7; II. 2; IV. 10; Revel. I. 5; V. 9. See also

But this doctrine was not allowed to spread unopposed. The more enlightened leaders of the Israelites, perceiving the fatal dangers inseparable from such a view, began to combat it with every weapon of argument and eloquence. The Pentateuch relates that when Moses, after the sin of the golden calf, offered himself as a substitute for appeasing the Divine indignation, God replied, "Whoever has sinned against Me, him will I blot out of My book";[8] and that when God, after the revolt of Korah and his associates, determined to visit the Israelites with general annihilation, Moses and Aaron "fell upon their faces, and said, O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, shall one man sin, and wilt Thou be wroth with all the congregation?"[9] When a plague smote myriads of Israelites on account of David's supposed trespass in ordering a census of the people, the king exclaimed, "It is myself that have sinned and done evil indeed; but as for these sheep, what have they done? Let Thy hand, I pray Thee, o Lord my God, be upon me, and on my father's house, but not on Thy people that they should be visited by the plague."[10] The Law enjoins the general rule "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin";[11] and this rule is confirmed by prophetic teachers, "The soul that sins, it shall die."[12] The proceeding of David in delivering up Saul's descendants to the Gibeonites must be viewed as an act of injustifiable despotism probably suggested by political expediency;[13] and the picture of the servant of God "who was stricken for the transgression of the people, and found his grave with the wicked, although he had done no violence and no deceit was in his mouth",[14] this picture implies no approval, but the strongest denouncement of the impious treatment inflicted upon God's holy minister, most probably representing a class of zealous and public-spirited men, like Jeremiah, preaching and warning, oppressed, scorned, and even massacred:[15] these pious men did not take upon themselves the sufferings *spontaneously;* they remonstrated incessantly and most vehemently against the criminal persecutions;[16] and no thoughtful Israelite could expect happiness and blessing from godless cruelty perpetrated

*Michael.* Typ. Gottesgel. pp. 210, 211; Sünde u. Genugthuung, pp. 638—660; *Lundius*, Jüd. Heiligth. p. 726; *Tholuck*, l. c. pp. 100, 101; *Outram*, De Sacrif. pp. 318—351; *De Wette*, Dogmat. II. 71—74.

8 Exod. XXXII. 33; comp. Lev. XXVI. 39, 40.

9 Num. XVI. 22.

10 1 Chr. XXI. 17; 2 Sam. XXIV. 17.

11 אִישׁ בְּחֶטְאוֹ יוּמָתוּ, Deut. XXIV. 16; comp. 2 Ki. XIV. 6.

12 הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַחֹטֵאת הִיא תָמוּת, Ezek. XVIII. 4; comp. vers. 1 *sqq.*; XXXIII. 12—20.

13 See ch. XXI.

14 Comp. also Isai. LVII. 1.

15 We adhere to this acceptation of the "servant of God", for which the arguments will be given in the proper place.

16 Comp. Jer. XX. 11, 12, etc.

against the best and noblest of their generation, but feared the direst retaliation from an incensed Deity.

Other ancient nations entertained similar views with regard to substitution, though again significantly modified.[1] It is true that not all their sacrifices bore the character of vicariousness; many were offered to express their gratitude for benefits enjoyed, or to implore a continuance of Divine favours, or to appease the anger of the gods in times of trial and danger. Yet we find indisputable instances of true substitution. In Egypt, at the great bull-offering in honour of Apis, the head of the animal was cut off, and then[2] it was laden with imprecations by praying that "if any evil was impending either over those who sacrificed, or over universal Egypt, it might be made to fall upon that head"; in fact "these practices — the imprecations on the head and the libations of wine — prevailed all over Egypt, and extended to victims of all sorts, and hence the Egyptians would never eat the head of any animal."[3] The seal with which the victims were marked by the Egyptian priests as duly qualified[4] represented a kneeling man, with his hands tied to his back, and a sword put to his throat,[5] which can hardly be interpreted otherwise than that the animal suffered death instead of the offerer who had deserved that penalty. At Athens, a ram was sacrificed instead of the eldest member of the Athamantid family, who had forfeited his life on account of an ancient stain of blood resting on his house, but who was allowed to escape into another country.[6] In fact, ancient writers supposed, that primitively men were sacrificed, but were gradually replaced by animals, "the bodies of which they presented as offerings substituted for their own bodies."[7] The curious custom which obtained in Syria, that the offerer kneeled on the hide of the lamb he had sacrificed, and put the victim's head and feet upon his own head,[8]

[1] Comp. *Tholuck*, Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhner, pp. 290 *sqq.*; *Buttmann*, Ueber den Mythus des Herakles; *Hengstenberg*, Christol. I. i. p. 259 ("Durch alle heidnische Religionen zieht sich die Idee der Stellvertretung, hervorgehend aus ein und demselben wahren aber missverstandenen Bedürfniss, dessen Befriedigung von allen auf die verschiedenartigste Weise gleich vergeblich gesucht wird").

[2] According to Herodotus II. 39; comp. *Plut.* De Isid. c. 31.

[3] It is evident that this passage of Herodotus does not refer to "Typhonic animals" merely (*Bähr*, Symb. II. 282—288), but to "victims of all sorts"; the substitution was here certainly not "real" or "juridical", but symbolical, exactly as was the case with the Hebrew sacrifices; although the imposition of hand, not mentioned by Herodotus, formed probably no necessary part of the ritual (*Bähr*, II. 339, 340).

[4] See p. 94. [5] *Plut.* De Isid. c. 31.

[6] *Herod.* VII. 197; see Sect. XXI. 3.

[7] *Theophrast.* in Porphyr. De Abst. II. 27, *ἐντεῦθεν οὖν μεταβαίνοντες ὑπάλλαγμα πρὸς τὰς θυσίας τῶν ἰδίων ἐποιοῦντο σωμάτων τὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ζώων σώματα.*

[8] *Lucian*, De Syr. Dea c. 55.

evidently expressed that the man's death was averted by the victim which had died in his stead. It is related[9] that when the large ravenous birds called Stryges, attacked the infant Procas, they were scared away by the Nymph Cranae who, offering to them a young sow, said,

"Noctis aves, extis puerilibus ...
"Parcite; pro parvo victima parva cadit.
"Cor pro corde, precor, pro fibris sumite fibras;
"Hanc animam vobis pro meliore damus";[10]

which is certainly a substitution, though implying neither punishment nor fine.[11] And lastly, both private and public calamities were extensively believed to be averted by the sacrifice of a human being, whether the latter died by self-immolation or by the hand of a priest, as has been explained in another place.[12] The Gauls especially held the belief that "unless the life of a man be surrendered for the life of another, the divine majesty of the immortal gods could not be propitiated.[13] Whenever the town of Massilia was visited by an epidemic, a poor man who offered himself was for a complete year fed at the public expense in the best possible manner; after which he was decked with wreaths and holy garments, conducted round the town, and at last struck down with imprecations that the misfortunes of the community might fall upon him alone.[14]

It is scarcely necessary to express an opinion on the philosophical or religious value of the principle of substitution — a principle which is derived from most imperfect conceptions both of sin and of the divine attributes, and which is little different in dignity and truth, whether it refers to the vicarious death of an animal for a man, or of a man for a nation, or of a God for the human race. It has indeed been assailed and rejected at all times. Cato observes with simplicity and common sense,

"Cum sis ipse nocens, moritur cur victima pro te?
"Stultitia est, morte alterius sperare salutem."[15]

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews declared, "it is not possible

---

[9] By *Ovid*, Fast. VI. 131—168.

[10] Vers. 159—162.

[11] Comp. also *Virg.* Aen. V. 483, 484 (Hanc tibi, Eryx, meliorem animam pro morte Daretis Persolvo); *Porphyr.* Abst. IV. 15 (ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς αἰτουμένους). It is, therefore, undoubtedly incorrect to assert that the pagan nations were entirely unacquainted with the idea of substitution (*Bähr*, Symb. II. 282—288).

[12] See Sect. XXI. 1.

[13] *Caes.* Bell. Gall. VI. 16, pro vita hominis nisi vita hominis reddatur, non posse deorum immortalium numen placari arbitrantur; comp. *Cic.* Pro Fonteio X (31).

[14] *Serv.* on Virg. Aen. III., comp. *Suidas* s. v. *περίψημα — οὕτως ἐπέλεγον τῷ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ... συνέχοντι τῶν κακῶν· Περίψημα ἡμῶν γενοῦ, ἤτοι σωτηρία καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις καὶ οὕτως ἐνέβαλλον τῇ θαλάσσῃ ὡσανεὶ τῷ Ποσειδῶνι θυσίαν ἀποτιννύντες.*

[15] *Cato*, Distich. IV. 15.

that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins",[1] without, however, perceiving how fatal the consistent application of this view is to his whole argument.[2] Socinus declared that a beast cannot take upon itself the punishment of man, because there exists between the one and the other no manner of community.[3] Arnobius puts into the mouth of a sacrificial animal the following pathetic words, "Say, o Jupiter, or any other deity, is it right, and honest, and just withal, that if some one else has sinned, I am killed, and that thou art satisfied by my blood, although I have never, whether consciously or unconsciously, offended thy majesty; for I am, as thou knowest, a dumb brute, following the simplicity of my nature, and unable to deceive by changeful and versatile artifices; etc."; and he concludes an impressive appeal thus, "Is it then not savage, fierce, and ferocious, does it not appear to thee, o Jupiter, iniquitous and barbarous, that I should be killed and slaughtered to pacify thee, and to secure the impunity of the wicked?"[4] "Common sense will not allow us", observed Bishop Taylor,[5] "to imagine that sin, which can be truly imputed to the offender alone, whose alone it is, was ever *really* transferred to another; much less to a brute altogether incapable of sin"; and he insisted with rising earnestness that "vicarious punishment seems to be a contradiction in terms; for as there cannot be a vicarious guilt, or as no one can be guilty instead of another, so there cannot be a vicarious punishment; . . . punishment in its very nature connotes guilt in the subject which bears it"; and he had therefore recourse to the opinion that the victim presented the person of the offerer "in the symbolical, interpretative sense, to show him the demerit of sin in general, how he ought to slay the brute in himself, and devote his life and soul to God";[6] which symbolising view is kindred to that of Bähr above stated and objected to: many believe they have proved the non-existence of a doctrine in the Bible when they have proved its unreasonableness or its absurdity; but impartial interpretation must *study* the conceptions of ancient times from their own sphere of thought, though it may *judge* them by the standard of absolute reason. Kurtz confesses that the idea of vicarious suffering is "a conception contradictory to all human views of justice", but approves of it in the sacrificial ritual, because it is there "Divinely appointed"[7] — a distinction between human and Divine right suggested

---

[1] Hebr. X. 4.

[2] Comp. *Michael.* Sünde und Genugthuung, pp. 606, 607.

[3] Comp. *Outram*, De Sacrif. I xxi. 7, p. 255.

[4] *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 9.

[5] Scripture Doctrine of Atonement examined, p. 25.

[6] Ibid. p. 38; comp. pp. 39, 66—71.

[7] Göttlich legitimirt; *Kurtz*, l. c. p. 82;

by despair, and tending to a blind confusion of the notions of virtue and crime, of sense and folly.

Now the progress in the idea of atonement among the Hebrews may thus be sketched. At first that idea was confined to *intentional* offences, and especially to murder, the most heinous of all, which could be expiated only by the death of the murderer, since, "blood defiles the land."[8] For this reason an expiation was also required for a murder the perpetrator of which was unknown, and it was effected, with peculiar ceremonies, by the blood of an animal.[9] In course of time, misfortune or misery commensurate with the sin was regarded as an atonement,[10] and a voluntary gift devoted to God or His service was looked upon as an instrument for averting dangers or for securing future success.[11] Then the Hebrews, advancing another step, adopted the belief that God could be induced to pardon offenders through the devotion and prayer of pious intercessors, especially prophets: thus expiation was secured by the holy zeal of Phinehas which stayed a fearful pestilence and reconciled the people to God,[12] and by the supplication of Job who, though unjustly treated by his friends, had manfully upheld his innocence and vindicated the ways of God;[13] it was expected through the mediation of Abraham[14] and Moses,[15] of Samuel[16] and Elishah,[17] of Isaiah,[18] Jeremiah,[19] and others;[20] or through a national fast.[21] On one occasion, money was received as an atonement; namely, when the census was taken, every Israelite above twenty years of age gave half a shekel — the rich not more, the poor not less — as "a ransom for his soul (כֹּפֶר נַפְשׁוֹ) to the Lord, that there be no plague (נֶגֶף) among them", whence the money itself was called "atonement-money" (כֶּסֶף כִּפּוּרִים).[22] At last religious education advanced sufficiently to require atonement even for inadvertent sins. For this purpose a fit symbol was sufficient; for no real guilt, impossible without intention, was to be expiated; it was only necessary to restore the holiness of the

---

comp. also *Michaelis*, Sünde und Genugthuung, pp. 641—660.

8 Num. XXXV. 33; comp. 2 Sam. XII. 13.

9 Deut. XXI. 1—8.

10 Isai. XXVII. 9; comp. XLIII. 3, 4.

11 Num. XXXI. 50; Job. XXXVI. 18; Prov. XIII. 8; Ps. XLIX. 8; comp. also Ex. XXI. 29, 30.

12 Num. XXV. 11—13; comp. Ps. CVI. 30, 31.

13 Job XLII. 8, 10.

14 Gen. XX. 7.

15 Exod. VIII. 4, 5, 24, 25; IX. 28, 33; X. 17, 18.

16 1 Sam. XII. 19, 23.

17 2 Ki. VI. 20.

18 2 Ki. XIX. 4.

19 Jer. VII. 16; XI. 14; XIV. 11; XLII. 2.

20 Comp. Isai. LIII. 12.

21 Esth. IV. 15, צוּמוּ עָלַי "fast on my account" or "for me."

22 Exod. XXX. 12—16; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 562—564. According to the Talmud, the pontifical vestments also possessed the efficacy of atonement (see *Talm.* Erach. 16*a*; Zevach. 88*b*; *Talm. Jerus.* Yom. capp. I. VII; comp. Zechar. III. 4).

theocracy disturbed by the undesigned offence — a notion which, in the mean time, had been more fully worked out and practically acted upon: such a symbol was partially the flesh of expiatory offerings consumed by the priests in the holy place,[1] and more universally the blood of a victim put upon the altar or some other part of the Sanctuary;[2] though in earlier times the burning of incense seems also to have been employed as an emblem of atonement.[3]

It is obvious that some of the means of propitiation just sketched, involve the idea of vicarious substitution but very remotely, others not at all; and the conclusion offers itself that indeed every expiatory sacrifice embodied the notion of vicarious suffering, but that expiation, especially in remoter periods, was possible through other means besides sin-offerings.[4]

In the course of these explanations, we have been repeatedly led to touch upon the great Christian sacrifice, to which we shall now specially devote a few remarks suggested by an impartial and historical review of the subject.

## XIX. THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE.

It is vain to assert that the Christian doctrine is in harmony with the teaching of the Pentateuch. The principle of vicarious atonement is indeed common to both. But the Law permits solely the substitution of animals, the New Testament asserts the vicarious suffering of one whom it conceives at once as a "perfect man" and "perfect God" (θεάνθρωπος) — itself a notion utterly unhebrew. The former rejects the idea of hereditary sin and punishment, as has above been proved;[5] while the latter considers the transgression of the first man to exercise a fatal effect upon all posterity for ever, and to require atonement by the blood of the son of God; "by one man", declares the apostle Paul, "sin entered into the world, and death by sin; . . . death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression;...through the offence of one many are dead."[6] The Messiah of the Old Testament, a man[7] and not created supernaturally,[8] was not expected at all to work expiation of sins. The hopes of

[1] Comp. Lev. X. 17.

[2] Comp. Lev. XVII. 11.

[3] Comp. Num. XVII. 11, 12.

[4] Comp. also Isai. VI. 7; XXVII. 9; Prov. XVI. 6; Job. XXXIII. 23, 24.

[5] Deut. XXIV. 16 ("The fathers shall not be put to death for the children", etc.); see p. 297.

[6] Rom. V. 12—15; comp. IX. 3; see also *Michael.* Strafe und Genugthuung, pp. 384—420.

[7] Comp. Isai. VII. 14; XI. 1; Jer. XXIII. 5; XXXIII. 15.

[8] Comp. *Gesen.* on Isai. IX. 5; *Bretschneider*, Dogmatik, I. p. 429; *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Bibl. Theol. pp. 379

a deliverer were roused in times of public or political calamity; and as according to the commonly received law of retaliation, the misfortune was looked upon as the consequence of moral and religious depravity, so the rescue was deemed impossible without previous atonement through inward regeneration.[9] But this regeneration is never, in the Old Testament, represented as the work of the Messiah, but of the Hebrews themselves, who were trusted to abandon their evil and idolatrous ways, and to turn to God with all their hearts;[10] it was by the better and profounder minds not deemed to result from sacrifice or any ritual exercise;[11] though the indolent and frivolous may have looked forward to it as the spontaneous bestowal of the Messiah.[12] Again, the Old Testament never connects with the Messiah the notions of suffering, misery, or violent

---

*sqq.*; *De Wette*, Dogmat. I. § 200, who observes: "There are no proofs to show that, at the time of Jesus, the belief in a supernatural birth of the Messiah was entertained: no contemporary of Jesus and of the apostles utters such a view in the N. T.; neither do the apostles themselves do so." The laborious and singularly fallacious arguments set forth by Hengstenberg (Christol. I. i. pp. 215—251) to prove the contrary view, exhibit its erroneousness more strikingly than could be done by any direct refutation; but criticism and science are little concerned in the conclusions of a scholar who starts from the principle, "that depraved human reason is unable to form an opinion of the doctrines of revelation" (l. c. II. 373). Maimonides (De Rege Messia I. 3) contends even that the Messiah must not be supposed to do miracles (ואל יעלה על דעתך שהמלך המשיח צריך לעשות אותות ומופתים), since in his time nothing will happen out of the ordinary course of things or of nature (ibid. II. 1), for which purpose he explains passages like "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb" etc. (Isai. XI. 6—8) figuratively (as חידות or משלים) to point to peace between Hebrews and heathens; comp. also ibid. II. 2, אין בין העולם הזה לימות המלך המשיח אלא שיעבוד מלכיות בלבד.

[9] Comp. Lev. XXVI. 3—45; Isai. XL. 2; L. 1; Ps. I; XXXIV. 12—23; XCI; XCII; Prov. III. 1—10, 16, 17, 32—35; IV. 16—19; X. 3, 6, 9, etc.; XI. 3—8, 17; Dan. IX. 24; etc. etc.

[10] See Isai. I. 25—27; Ezek. XXXVII. 21—24; Zechar. III. 9; XIII. 1; Dan. IX. 24; comp. Matth. III. 2 (μετανοεῖτε, ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν). The expressions of Maimonides (De Rege Messia I. 4) ויכוף כל ישראל לילך בתורה ולחזק בצרקה, are therefore not quite correct; comp., however, l. c. II. 2, ואינו בא לא לטמא הטהור ולא לטהר הטמא ··· אלא לשום שלום; and II. 5, באותו הזמן ··· לא יהיה עסק כל העולם אלא לדעת את יהוה בלבד וכו'. Philo never mentions a Messiah at all, but expects a golden age from the general prevalence of virtue and the faithful observance of the Law; comp. *De Wette*, Dogmat. I. § 192.

[11] See Sect. IV.

[12] Even the Talmud (Sanhedr. 97*b*) teaches, "All the terms are completed; and the matter (of the advent of the Messiah) depends only on penitence and good works" (כלו כל הקיצין ואין הדבר תלוי אלא בתשובה ומעשים טובים); comp. ibid 98*a* (where it is promised that the Messiah would come that very day, if the people turn to God); Shabb. 118*b* (אלמלא משמרין ישראל שתי שבתות כהלכתן מיד נגאלין); *Targ. Jon.* Mic. IV. 8.

death;[1] on the contrary, it delineates him as the glorious and powerful king of a happy and virtuous world, the restorer of the former splendour of David's house,[2] at once ruler, law-giver, and prophet:[3] even so late a writer as Zechariah, when symbolically representing the High-priest Joshua as Messiah, places a golden and a silver crown upon his head, with the words, "Even he shall build the Temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory, and shall go and rule upon his throne."[4] The redemption was, indeed, like every well-secured felicity, to be preceded by heavy struggles and convulsions:[5] but these were the struggles and sufferings of the *age*, not of the *person* of the Messiah.[6] Indeed later

---

[1] The observations of Hengstenberg on the subject (Christol. I. i. 252—292) contain eloquent assertions ("Die Lehre von einem leidenden und büssenden Messias war bei den Juden von jeher vorhanden", p. 291) but no arguments or proofs; the passages adduced by him (Isai XI. 1; Ezek. XVII. 22; Zechar. IX. 9; XII. 9; XIII. 7; Isai. XLII. XLIX. L. LIII; Ps. XVI. 9—11, 22, 40; XXII. 17—19; Dan. IX. 26), either do not refer to the Messiah at all, or not to a *suffering* Messiah; and he incidentally admits some of the views he means to combat (l. c. pp. 268—272).

[2] In this sense, David's royalty was termed everlasting; comp. Sir. XLVII. 11; 1 Macc. II. 57.

[3] Isai. II. 2—4; IV. 2—6; IX. 3; XI. 1—16; Ezek. XXXIV. 23—31; XXXVI. 24—30; XXXVII. 21—28; Hos. II. 18—25; III. 5; Am. IX. 11, 15; Mic. IV. 6—8, 12, 13; V. 1—8; Dan. VII. 13, 14; etc.; comp. also Bar. IV. 21—V. 9; Tob. XIII. 7—18; XIV. 4—7; 2 Esdr. XIII. 32—40; Luke I. 71; II. 32; Acts I. 6 (the apostles asked Christ, "wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?").

[4] Zechar. VI. 9—13. Maimonides begins his treatise on the Messiah with the words, המלך המשיח עתיד לעמוד ולהחזיר מלכות בית דוד לישנה הממשלה הראשונה ובונה המקדש ומקבץ נדחי ישראל (*Leydecker*, R. Mos. Majemonid. Tractat. de Regib. Hebraeor. eorumque Bellis, praesert. de Rege Messia, Roterd. 1699, p. 175, and Leydecker's dogmatic remarks on this passage, pp. 176—178; comp. *Maimon.* l. c. I. 5).

[5] Zech. XII. 10; XIII. 7—9; Dan. XII. 1: they are called by the later Jews חבלי משיח "the throes of the Messiah"; comp. *Mishn.* Sot. IX. 15 ("at the approach of the Messiah, shamelessness will prevail... the world will turn to heresy, and no one will administer reproof... The wisdom of the sages will be slighted, and the pious will be despised"; etc.); *Talm.* Shabb. 118a; 2 Esdr. V. 1—13 ("the way of truth shall be hidden, and the earth shall be barren of faith; but iniquity shall be increased" etc.); XIII. 31 *sqq.*; Matth. XXIV. 3 *sqq.*; Mark XIII. 14—31; Luke XXI. 25—32; 2 Tim. III. 1—6 ("in the last days perilous times shall come; for men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud", etc.). All those evils were personified by the antichrist (ἀντίχριστος, 1 John II. 18); comp. *Hulsius*, Theol. Jud.; Emek Hameleeh, fol. 42, c. 4; *Schoettgen*, De Mess. Lib. V. c. 2, pp. 509 *sqq.*; *Eisenmenger*, Entdeckt. Jud. II. 711 *sqq.*

[6] Some passages have erroneously been explained in a different sense, as Isai. LII. 13—LIII. 12 (see p. 297; comp. *Vatke*, Theol. des A. T. pp. 528—533); Zech. IX. 9; XII. 10; comp. John XII. 15, 16; *Talm.* Sanhedr. 98a. — Even Targum Jonathan, though partially referring the description in Isaiah LIII to the

Judaism, though wavering on the subject, conceived the Messiah as undying,[7] and as having been born many generations before, openly to appear at the appointed time.[8] When after the destruction of the Temple, atonement was no longer possible through sacrifice, it was expected from the Messiah ready to take upon himself the suffering of the world;[9] which doctrine, therefore, in this form, cannot date from a time prior to the final overthrow of the commonwealth. Again, as on the one hand, the time of the Messiah's advent was believed to be fixed, and yet, on the other hand, to depend on the people's abandonment of all wickedness, the idea was naturally conceived that he himself would bear and annul the sins which at that glorious epoch might yet stain the world. It was, at this period, when the Jews began to understand many passages of the Old Testament as referring to a *suffering* Messiah — the same texts, on the whole, which were so interpreted by Christians.[10] Such views were indeed felt to involve a most glaring opposition to the teaching of the prophets; but in order to reconcile the one with the other, the singular expedient was, in the course of time, adopted, that "the Messiah, the son of David" would be preceded by another or an inferior "Messiah, the son of Joseph or Ephraim", who was considered as the deliverer of the ten tribes, and was supposed to fight against the enemies of Israel and defeat them, to restore a portion of the exiles to the holy land, but was at last to be killed in a war against Gog and Magog, in order to expiate the sins of the people by his blood:[11] which notion of a double Messiah was probably recommended, if it was not originally suggested, by the desire of typifying the future reconciliation of Judah and Ephraim, and their friendly concord in a happier age. But the Messiah the son of Joseph is not yet alluded to in the Mishnah,

Messiah, attributes to him no suffering, but on the contrary, the power of prostrating all hostile nations, and of delivering the Hebrews, to whom alone the Targum ascribes the suffering and the calamities, while the Messiah works their expiation, not by his death, but by his intercession in prayer, like Moses (Exod. XXXII. 32), and by his knowledge and wisdom (comp. especially *Targ. Jonath.* on Isai. LIII. 4—7, 11): and similarly later Jewish authorities, as R. Tanchum, R. Alschech, etc.

[7] John XII. 34 (Isai. IX. 5, אבי עד); comp. *Eisenmeng.* Entdeckt. Jud. II. 687, 812, 813; *Bertholdt*, Christol. § 28.

[8] *Talm. Hieros.* Berach. 5*a*; Taanith 64*a*; *Talm. Babyl.* Sanhedr. 97; 98*a*; 99*a*; comp. *Bertholdt*, l. c. § 25; *Hulsius*, l. c. p. 309; *Schöttgen*, l.c. pp. 50, 553 *sqq.*; *Glaesener*, Comm. de gemino Judaeorum Messia, pp. 15 *sqq.*, 24 *sqq.*; *Eisenmeng.* l. c. pp. 11, 320, 650, 653, 668, 677, 758; *Corrodius*, Krit. Gesch. des Chiliasm. I. 238, 269, 284, 287 *sqq*; *Buxtorf*, Synagog. Jud. p. 22.

[9] *Talm.* Sanh. 98*a*; Sohar II. 85.

[10] Comp. *Schoettgen*, l. c. p. 181; *Hulsius*, l. c. pp. 321 *sqq.*; *Eisenmeng.* l. c. p. 757; *H. Michael.* in Bibl. Hal. ad Isai. LIII.

[11] Comp. *Maimon.* De Rege Messia, II. 2, בתחלת ימות המשיח תהיה מלחמת גוג ומגוג.

nor in the Targum Jerusalem; he is first mentioned in the Babylonian Talmud[1] and the later Targums, as Pseudo-Jonathan[2] which was not written before the 6th or 7th century of the present era.[3] Certain it is that the Jews at the time of Christ and the Apostles did not expect a Messiah who by his suffering and death would expiate the sins of the people: such a notion occurs neither in the Apocrypha, nor in the works of Philo and Josephus, nor even in the Mishnah — nay more, it was not familiar to the contemporaries of Christ according to the New Testament itself,[4] which indeed hoped from Jesus expiation and remission of sins,[5] but also deliverance of the Jews from their enemies, and the inauguration of a glorious political era,[6] not through his degradation and death, but through his honour and victory.[7] When the disciples heard of his impending suffering, they were embarrassed and perplexed,[8] because they could not reconcile it with the current notion of a triumphant Redeemer.[9] Though he called himself the Messiah,[10] the character attributed to his mission by contemporary Jews differed widely from the Messiah described by earlier writers and expected in his time.[11] He renounced

1 Succ. 52*a* commenting on Zechar. XII. 12, האי הספידא מאי עבידתיה פליגי בה רבי דוסא ורבנן חד אמר על משיח בן יוסף שנהרג וחד אמר על יצר הרע שנהרג בשלמא למאן דאמר על משיח בן יוסף שנהרג היינו דכתיב והביטו אלי את אשר דקרו וספדו עליו כמספד על היחיד.

2 On Exod. XL. 11; Cant. IV. 5; VII. 4.

3 Comp. *Zunz*, Gottesdienstl. Vorträge, p. 65; *De Wette*, Einleit. § 62; *Glaesener*, l. c. pp. 46—49, 56, 57, 145 *sqq.*, 200 *sqq.*; *Schöttgen*, l. c. p. 359; *Bertholdt*, l. c. pp. 77 *sqq.*, 158; *Eisenmeng.* l. c. p. 720; *De Wette*, l. c. pp. 76 *sqq.*; *Sommer*, Theolog. Sohar. p. 91; *Hengstenb.* Christol. I. i. pp. 283—290.

4 See *De Wette*, De Morte Jesu Chr. expiatoria, pp. 50—57; but the author of this excellent treatise, in the preface to its reproduction in his Opuscula theologica (pp. 2—148), retracts or modifies some essential points; he especially allows a greater affinity of opinion concerning Christ's death between Christ himself and the apostles; and he all but contends that both the former and the latter attributed to that death an expiatory character; comp. also *Gramberg*, Rel. Id. II. 564—669, esp. p. 566.

5 Matth. I. 21; Luke I. 77; John I. 29; etc.; see p. 296.

6 Luke I. 68—75; II. 30—32.

7 See *supra*. The passage Luke II. 35 ("yea, a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also") cannot, in harmony with the context, refer to a vicarious and expiatory death of Christ (comp. *De Wette*, l. c. pp. 52 *sqq.*).

8 Mark IX. 31, 32; Luke XVIII. 32—34; XXIV. 20, 21; Matth. XVI. 21, 22; 1 Cor. I. 23; comp. also John XVI. 12.

9 Comp. also Acts VIII. 30—35, which, as de Wette observes, proves "loci classici Jes. LIII ad Messiam accommodationem illis temporibus inusitatam fuisse."

10 Matth. XVI. 13—20; XXVI. 23, 24; John IV. 25, 26; XVII. 1—26; XVIII. 37; comp. Matth. XI. 4 *sqq.* (Isai. XXXV. 5, 6; LXI. 1; Luke IV. 18).

11 Comp. Luke II. 25, 26, 38 ("she spoke of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem"); John IV. 25 ("I know that the Messiah comes who is called Christ"); *Joseph.* Bell. Jud. VI. v. 4 (τὸ δὲ ἐπᾶραν αὐτοὺς μάλιστα πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἦν χρησμὸς

the aspiration of worldly power, and confined himself to the sphere of morality, and to the task of spiritualizing the traditional faith. He was well aware of the persecutions which he and his adherents would have to endure on account of notions so strange and so unwelcome to his countrymen,[12] who, therefore, might well be exempted from blame if they failed or found it difficult to understand his Messianic mission, especially as he did not, at least at first, wish it to be divulged on any account.[13] But the desire of maintaining his influence, and of contributing, if possible, to greater holiness of life, made it appear to him expedient to promise a *second advent,* when he would realise all the predicted Messianic glory, and would judge the living and the dead. At last, deceived in his expectations and broken by resistance, he saw no hope but in his death, which, sealing his convictions, might rouse his disciples to abandon all worldly thoughts and to strive after the kingdom of heaven alone.[14] He easily found allusions to that death in the Hebrew Scriptures,[15] since his life and fate resembled in many points the life and fate of persecuted Hebrew prophets.[16] He was not unwilling to see his end accelerated by the fanatism of the powerful religious sects which he had embittered by his more liberal teaching; and he proclaimed that he gave up his life for the expiation, and therefore for the happiness, of the world — a doctrine repeated and expanded by his apostles and followers:[17] but it was, in some measure, inconsistent with his principle which, rejecting all external forms, declares "God is a spirit, and they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth";[18] for the sacrifice of a Messiah for the purpose of securing atonement is no less a sacrifice than an offering of "bulls and goats"; it is designed to effect by an outward act that which a truly spiritual faith works by the moral exertion of the sinner himself and alone.[19]

---

*ἀμφίβολος ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὑρημένος γράμμασιν, ὡς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας τις αὐτῶν ἄρξει τῆς οἰκουμένης*); *Sueton.* Vespas. c. 4 (percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis ut eo tempore Judaea profecti rerum potirentur); *Tacit.* Hist. V. 13 (pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret oriens profectique Judaea rerum potirentur).

12 Matth. X. 23; comp. V. 11, 12.

13 Matth. XVI. 20 ("then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ"); comp. *Cohen*, Les Déicides.

14 Comp. Matth. XXIII. 37—39.

15 Matth. XVI. 21; XXVI. 24, 54, 56; Mark IX. 12; XIV. 49; Luke XVIII. 31—34; XXII. 22, 37; XXIV. 26, 27, 44—46; Acts III. 18, 24; XVII. 3; XXVI. 22, 23; 1 Pet. I. 10—12; comp. Hebr. XI. 36—38; Matth. XXIII. 29—32; John XII. 27; Dan. VII. 13; IX. 26; Isai. LII. 13—LIII. 12; Jer. II. 30; XI. 19; XV. 10—18; XX. 7—18; Neh. IX. 26.

16 Comp. Matth. XXI. 33—39; Luke XX. 9—15; Acts VII. 52.

17 See p. 296.

18 John IV. 24.

19 K. Bähr (Lehre der Kirche vom Tode Jesu, p. 9) admits that "the connection between vicarious satisfaction

## XX. THE SACRIFICES OF THE HEBREWS COMPARED WITH THOSE OF OTHER NATIONS.

Surveying the Levitical system of sacrifices, we are bound to admit that, as a whole, it is judicious and thoughtful, simple yet comprehensive, clearly and plainly symbolical, broad and intelligible in its principles, coherent and consistent, and skilfully adapted both to the requirements of individuals and of a theocratic community. Avoiding fantastic capriciousness of detail, it is untainted by that spirit of pedantry and hairsplitting triviality, often childish and often profane, which characterises its later Talmudical development; and it appears simple and moderate, if contrasted with the complicated rituals of other eastern nations, as the Hindoos and even the Persians. It is so pure in its conceptions of the Deity and of the nature of sin, that the critic is compelled to assign it to a very advanced stage in the history of the Hebrew mind,[1] in which conclusion he is not shaken by that one noteworthy exception, the "offering of jealousy" (מנחת קנאות) which certainly recalls the heathen ordeals, but is not properly a sacrifice, and was, as regards its principal features, retained by the compilers of the Law in the form which it had received in the practice of the people.[2] The Levitical system is indeed framed on the basis of tradition and the general usage of antiquity; but it is modified in accordance with the distinctive religious views of the Pentateuch, deeper, purer, and more spiritual than any anterior ceremonial, simplified in many respects, and enlarged in several significant points. Free from narrow-minded exclusiveness, it permits strangers also to approach the central Sanctuary with sacrifices, certainly holocausts and thank-offerings,[3] and if the spirit of the law be considered, probably sin-offerings also,[4] a law which

---

through Christ and the sanctification of our lives, is rather artificial": but his efforts to prove that the Fathers of the Church in the three first centuries did not connect with the death of Christ the idea of punishment and vicarious suffering, in as much as "they did not say, God has been reconciled to us by the death and blood of Christ, but we to Him", or that God gave up His son from motives of love and not of justice (l. c. pp. 87, 88, 176, 179) — these efforts, even if they be considered as successful, are without importance for our enquiry, since they do not attempt to dispute that Christ's death was a *sacrifice*. The same remark applies to John Taylor (Scripture doctrine of Atonement examined, pp. 77—136), whose views nearly coincide with those of K. Bähr.

[1] See pp. 43 *sqq.* [2] See Sect. XVI.

[3] Lev. XVII. 8; XXII. 18; Num. XV. 14—16, 29.

[4] Philo (De Vict. 3) observes that the public sacrifices were "offered on behalf of the whole nation, and indeed, to say the whole truth, on behalf of all mankind" (εἰ δὲ δεῖ τὸ ἀληθὲς εἰπεῖν, ὑπὲρ ἅπαντος ἀνθρώπων γένους).

seems to have been acted upon at all times,[5] and is reflected in the Messianic hopes of the age when all nations alike will worship and sacrifice in the Temple;[6] though the bigoted intolerance of later centuries laboured to confine the permission of strangers to burnt-offerings of pigeons alone.[7] Nor can it fairly be represented as unduly splendid and expensive; it mainly requires materials which, in an agricultural and cattle-breeding country of singular fertility, were furnished in abundance and formed the property of every citizen; and it prescribes for the whole year not quite 1300 animals as public sacrifices, or in the average 3 or 4 daily.[8]

The chief characteristic of the sacrifices of different nations necessarily coincides with the chief characteristic of their various creeds, since sacrifices formed the centre and kernel of religious worship.

---

[5] Comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 41—43; 2 Macc. II. 35; XIII. 23; *Joseph.* Contr. Ap. II. 5 (*καὶ γὰρ τρίτος Πτολεμαῖος ὁ λεγόμενος Εὐεργέτης... παραγενόμενος εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, πολλὰς ὡς ἡμῖν νόμιμόν ἐστιν ἐπετέλεσε θυσίας τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἀνέθηκεν ἀναθήματα τῆς νίκης ἄξια*).

[6] Isai. LVI. 6, 7; comp., however, Zech. XIV. 21.

[7] Comp. *Maimon.* Maas. Hakkorb. c. 3; *Abarban.* Introd. to Levit. c. III; see p. 234 note 8.

[8] The following are the exact numbers. By far the greater part were holocausts, namely, every day — morning and evening — 2 lambs; in addition to them, on Sabbath 2 lambs; on the day of the new-moon and on every day of Passover, except the second, 2 bullocks, 1 ram, and 7 lambs, that is, with the daily sacrifice, 12 holocausts in all, or if a sabbath, 14; while on the second day of Passover, the firstfruit-sheaf of barley was accompanied by one lamb only (Lev. XXIII. 12); on the Feast of Weeks, besides the 2 daily lambs, 2 bullocks, 1 ram, and 7 lambs, as on Passover, and moreover, as an accompaniment of the new loaves of bread, 1 bullock, 2 rams, and 7 lambs, that is 22 animals, or if on a sabbath, 24 in all; on the Day of Memorial, or the first day of the seventh month, in addition to the new-moon sacrifice of 10 beasts and the daily offering of 2, 1 bullock, 1 ram, and 7 lambs, or 21 holocausts in all, and if on a sabbath, 23; on the Day of Atonement, 1 bullock, 1 ram, and 7 additional lambs; on the first day of Tabernacles, 13 bullocks, 2 rams, and 14 additional lambs, in all 31, or on a sabbath 33 holocausts; on the six following days of the feast, the same number of rams and of lambs, but every succeeding day one bullock less, so that on the seventh day 25 holocausts were offered, or if on a sabbath 27, while on the eighth day or the "Feast of Conclusion", 1 bullock, 1 ram, and 7 additional lambs were burnt. Therefore, all holocausts computed for the term of a solar year of 365 days, amounted to 1094 lambs, 112 bullocks, and 38 rams, in all 1244 pieces of cattle. The public sin-offerings (חטאת), also burnt entire, were a kid of the goats on each day of the new-moon, on every day of Passover, except the second, on the Feast of Weeks, an additional one on the Day of Memorial or the first of the seventh month, and on the Day of Atonement, on all days of the Feast of Tabernacles, and on the Feast of Conclusion; to which may be added the goat sent into the wilderness on the

Now the multiplicity of the heathen gods naturally engendered a multiplicity of sacrifices,[1] whereas the unity of the God of Israel permitted no more than a few broad classes of offering judiciously suited to all occasions and emergencies. Again, the God of the Hebrews is not only the Creator and all-powerful Ruler of the universe, "a personal lord of an impersonal world", totally distinct from it in essence and absolutely swaying it according to His will, but also the merciful Father of mankind. He does not merely govern matter in majestic distance, but He lovingly cares and provides for His creatures; He is an all-pervading Providence; He feels pity for the weakness of man, and therefore tempers His justice with compassion. The gods of other nations are deifications of nature or her powers; they represent production, preservation, or destruction; they mostly bear even sexual distinction; their attributes are identified with those of the world; they represent the influences or forces of the cosmos; for they are themselves emanations of primeval matter: far from governing, they are governed by unalterable laws; they are held in subjection either by inexorable Fate or by superior divinities; they form either a creed of pantheism, as in many eastern religions, or of simple polytheism, as in the theology of the Greeks and Romans; they may exact homage from man, but they cannot raise him above his state of nature.[2] Therefore the sacrifices of the Hebrews have a *moral* or *ethical*, those of other nations a purely *cosmical* or *physical* character; the former tend to work upon mind and soul, the latter upon fears and interests; the one strive to elevate the offerer to the sanctity of God, the other lower the gods to the narrowness and selfishness of man.[3] We are far from denying the numerous

---

Day of Atonement — in all 31 kids of the goats, so that the total amount of animals entirely given up, is raised to 1275.

[1] Comp. *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. III. ii. 2, p. 759.

[2] See Comm. on Gen. pp. 53—63; Comm. on Exod. pp. 185, 186.

[3] This difference has been most admirably stated and unfolded by Bähr (Symb. II. 217—268; comp. pp. 283, 329—337; 435—438), leaning on the excellent labours of Creuzer, Baur, and others; he points to the Aswamedha or horse-sacrifice of the Hindoos; the horse- and bull-sacrifice of the Persians; the great sacrificial festival in honour of Isis among the Egyptians; the incense-offerings, the human sacrifices, and "offerings of chastity" of the Babylonians, Syrians, and Phoenicians; the four chief sacrifices performed in China by the emperor himself at the beginning of spring; the religious usages of the Germanic and northern tribes; and the offerings of the Greeks and Romans presented to their numerous gods who, in their anthropomorphic forms, are clearly embodiments of nature, and who by their distinction as Olympian, terrestrial, and infernal deities (Ὀλύμπιοι, χθόνιοι, and ὑποχθόνιοι) evidently represent the universe consisting of heaven, earth, and the lower world; and Bähr's demonstration does, in this case, not suffer

analogies that exist between the theology of the Hebrews and of other nations, and we readily concede that sporadically most of the conceptions of the former are, in some shape, found among the latter; and that even the Hebrew notion of God or Jehovah has a remarkable parallel in "the Mind" (*Νοῦς*) of Anaxagoras, who defines this Mind as a spirit, infinite, all-knowing, existing before the world and all finite things, ruling the universe, yet distinct from it,[4] as the absolute Master directing all things and pervading all,[5] as simple, undivided, unchangeable, and without community with any thing,[6] as an immaterial being, the governing and discerning principle, of a substance different from that of which all other things are formed,[7] incorporeal,[8] a soul and the principle of life:[9] yet this "Mind" is very different from Jehovah, a personal God who allows no other deity beside Him, who not only preserves the world but judges mankind, who is "merciful and gracious, long-suffering, abundant in goodness, and full of truth";[10] therefore the perfect identity of the Anaxagorean Mind and the Hebrew Jehovah can be asserted and upheld only by strange and insufficient analogies.[11]

---

materially from his peculiar propensity to minute symbolism, nor from his strong dogmatic bias; although the general results at which he arrives are open to grave objections which we have pointed out in their proper places.

4 *Anaxagor.* Fragm. VIII ed. Schaub., Fragm. VI ed. Schorn.: *Νοῦς δέ ἐστιν ἄπειρος καὶ αὐτοκρατὲς καὶ μέμικται οὐδενὶ χρήματι, ἀλλὰ μοῦνος αὐτὸς ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐστιν.*

5 *Plat.* Cratyl. c. 27, p. 413C, *λέγει Ἀναξαγόρας νοῦν εἶναι τοῦτο· αὐτοκράτορα γὰρ αὐτὸν ὄντα καὶ οὐδενὶ μεμιγμένον, πάντα φησὶν αὐτὸν κοσμεῖν τὰ πράγματα διὰ πάντων ἰόντα.*

6 *Arist.* De Anim. I. 2, *μόνον γοῦν φησιν αὐτὸν τῶν ὄντων ἁπλοῦν εἶναι καὶ ἀμιγῆ τε καὶ καθαρόν*; comp. ibid. III. 4 (*ὁ νοῦς ἁπλοῦν ἐστι, καὶ ἀπαθὲς, καὶ μηδενὶ μηδὲν ἔχει κοινόν*); Phys. VIII. 5 (*διὸ καὶ Ἀναξαγόρας ὀρθῶς λέγει, τὸν νοῦν ἀπαθῆ φάσκων καὶ ἀμιγῆ εἶναι*).

7 *Plutarch*, Vita Pericl. 4 (*τοῖς ὅλοις πρῶτος οὐ τύχην οὐδ' ἀνάγκην διακοσμήσεως ἀρχὴν, ἀλλὰ νοῦν ἐπέστησε καθαρὸν καὶ ἄκρατον ἐν μεμιγμένοις πᾶσι τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀποκρίνοντα τὰς ὁμοιομερείας*); *Plotin.* Ennead. V. 1 (ed. Porph.. X. 9 ed. Kirchhoff, *Ἀναξ. νοῦν καθαρὸν καὶ ἀμιγῆ λέγων ἁπλοῦν κτλ.*), 9 (*ἀναγκαῖον καὶ ἐν νῷ τὸ ἀρχέτυπον πᾶν εἶναι καὶ κόσμον νοητὸν τοῦτον τὸν νοῦν εἶναι*); *Cic.* De Nat. Deor. I. 11; *Tertullian*, De Anim. 12; *Lactant.* Instit. I. 5, 18.

8 But this is not quite incontrovertible, as the *νοῦς* is by Anaxagoras called *λεπτότατον πάντων χρημάτων*, which expression, to say the least, leaves open the possibility of a corporeal conception of the *νοῦς*.

9 *Aristot.* De Anim. I. 2; *Anaxag.* Fragm. l. c. *ὅσα γε ψυχὴν ἔχει, καὶ μείζω καὶ ἐλάσσω, πάντων νόος κρατέει.*

10 Plutarch (De Stoicor. Repugnant. c. 38) observes, "not all men conceive the gods as merciful (*χρηστούς*), see for instance how the Jews and Syrians think of the Deity" — with what degree of truth needs not to be pointed out.

11 As has been attempted by Aug. Gladisch in his treatise "Anaxagoras und die Israeliten" (Leipzig 1864) — a work otherwise instructive and useful.

Human sacrifices, sanctioned and regulated in the religious codes of nearly every other people, could not possibly be permitted or legalised among the Hebrews from the moment that the foundations of their theology were established:[1] for among the heathens man was an integral part of material nature, among the Hebrews he was the reflex of God Himself, the Holy One, in whose image he was created; among the former the shedding of human blood, for the purposes of worship, was the highest form of piety, among the latter it was, under all circumstances, an abomination to be punished with death; children especially were, by the one, regarded as due to the deities that personified the productiveness of nature, by the others as a free gift and blessing from Him who bestows or withholds fruitfulness in accordance with His wisdom; sacrifices of children, and more especially of the firstborn, were, therefore, among the pagans a merit and a privilege, among the Hebrews a horror and a crime.

Again, the offerings of maiden virginity largely prevailed in many parts of middle Asia, in Babylon and Cyprus in honour of Bel and Mylitta;[2] in Armenia, in honour of Anaitis, identical with Mylitta;[3] in Syria and Cappadocia, the Pontus and other regions;[4] they were sometimes, as is reported of the Locrians, vowed to Venus in times of distress, to be performed as thank-offerings for deliverance;[5] but they were absolutely impossible among the Hebrews according to the doctrines of the Pentateuch, which did not recognise separate deities of generation, sexually distinct, but was, on the contrary, partially framed to oppose such conceptions, and necessarily recoiled from the idea of appointing the chastity of virgins a "firstfruit-oblation" to the Deity in the very precincts of His Sanctuary.[6] The castration of the priests, extensively connected with the worship of Cybele and Attis, and rooted in the same class of notions, forms an analogous point of contrast.[7] As the Pentateuch avoided everything that could even remotely be

---

1 See Sect. XXIV.

2 Comp. *Herod.* I. 181, 182, 199 (*αἴσχιστος τῶν νόμων*; the man in throwing a piece of silver into the woman's lap, said, *ἐπικαλέω τοι τὴν θεὸν Μύλιττα*); *Strabo* XI. xiv. 16. Creuzer (Symb. II. 351) observes: "Hier sehen wir durch die Macht einer fanatischen Religion die ehernen Schranken durchbrochen, die sonst die Asiatische strenge Sitte um die Frauen zog."

3 Comp. *Herod.* I. 131; *Creuzer*, l. c. I. 232, 233; II. 285, 331.

4 Comp. *Lucian*, Syr. D. 6; *Creuzer*, l. c. II. 350—358, 464—472.

5 *Justin.* XXI. 3, Quum bello Locrenses premerentur, voverant, si victores forent, ut die festo Veneris virgines suas prostituerent; see *Bähr*, Symb. II, 243.

6 Comp. *Herod.* II. 64 (*οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι σχεδὸν πάντες ἄνθρωποι, πλὴν Αἰγυπτίων καὶ Ἑλλήνων, μίσγονται ἐν ἱεροῖσι*).

7 Comp. *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 367—370.

referred to a deification of the powers of nature, it ordained no *vernal sacrifices,* designed to implore fertility, and all but universal among ancient nations, especially the Egyptians, Hindoos, and Romans, and most of the northern tribes,[8] nor sacrifices at other seasons of the year, to pray for productiveness of the soil, as among the Chinese:[9] for the Passover, whatever its first origin, lost in the Law every trace of a cosmical sacrifice, and received, like the offerings of the Feast of Weeks and of Tabernacles, the meaning of a eucharistic gift.[10] Nor does it sanction *nuptial sacrifices*, meant to plead for progeny, as was customary among the Greeks[11] and others who, on the day before the marriage, offered sacrifices to the tutelary gods of matrimony.[12] It appoints no *sacrifices for the dead* performed among the heathens with the most peculiar ceremonies, in accordance with the supposed nature of the lower gods and the infernal abodes;[13] although later, when the belief in resurrection became an article of faith among the Jews, these also offered sacrifices for the departed, which the pious praised as highly meritorious.[14] It evidently shuns all rituals that might be connected with phenomena of nature, or might recall pagan conceptions. It repudiates, in connection with sacrifices, above all *divination,* almost universal in the pagan world,[15] whether the augury be sought in the entrails,[16] the heart or liver, the bile or the lungs, all considered as bound up with the principle of life, in their shape, their appearance, and their movements, or in the fall or the death of the victim,[17] or any other incident.[18]

[8] Comp. *Herod.* II. 40, 42, 47; *Macrob.* Saturn. I. 21; III. 5; *Virg.* Ecl. V. 74, 75; Georg. I. 345; *Ovid,* Fast. IV. 62 *sqq.*; etc.

[9] *Stuhr*, Religionssysteme d. Orients, pp. 19 *sqq.*; *Du Halde*, Beschreib. des Chines. Reiches, III. p. 11.

[10] See Sect. XVII.

[11] *Προτέλεια τῶν γάμων* or *προγάμεια.*

[12] *Θεοὶ γαμήλιοι*; comp. *Plut.* Amator. Narrat. c. 1; *Mone*, Gesch. des nord. Heidenthums, I. 258 *sqq.*

[13] Comp. *Hom.* Od. XI. 25—28; Il. XXIII. 166—182; *Aeschyl.* Pers. 615—624; *Eurip.* Iph. Taur. 632—635; *Virg.* Aen. III. 62—68; VI. 243—254; *Ovid,* Fast. II. 533—542; V. 419—444; *Juven.* II. 156—158; *Plin.* H. N. XXXV. 15; *Cic.* De Legg. II. 24; *Heliod.* VI. 14; *Apoll. Rhod.* Arg. III. 1032—1038, 1207—1211; etc.; *Lucian*, Charic. c. 29; *Athen.* Deipn. IX. 78; *Plut.* Coriol. 25; Num. 14; etc.; *Manu* III. 74, 81, 214 *sqq.*; see also pp. 141 note 17, 186 notes 2 and 3, 231, 232.

[14] 2 Macc. XII. 43—45 (on which passage the practice of *missae pro defunctis* has been based by the Catholic Church); comp. Isai. LXV. 4; see Sect. XXII.

[15] Especially before uncertain or dangerous enterprises, as sea-voyages and battles; comp. *Schömann*, l. c. p. 237. The Hebrews were likewise wont to offer sacrifices before battles (1 Sam. VII. 9; XIII. 9), but simply as acts of public worship, not as means of augury.

[16] Extispicium, *ἱεροσκοπία.*

[17] Comp. Exta fumantia, spirantia, trepidantia, palpitantia, etc.; *Virg.* Georg. II. 194; *Ovid,* Met. XV. 576; *Stat.* Theb. IV. 466; *Plut.* De Defect. Orac. c. 49.

[18] Comp. *Macrob.* III. 5 ("hostiarum genera esse duo, unum in quo volun-

**It contains no analogy to usages like that of the Egyptians who, in some seasons, impressed upon the sacrificial cakes the image of a tied ass,[1] and at other times, the image of a fettered hippopotamus,[2] to intimate that Typhon to whom those unclean creatures were subject, had been conquered and enthralled. Nor does it exhibit an analogy to the far-spread custom observed both by men and women, of depositing their hair, or that followed by young men of devoting their curls carefully cultivated from boyhood and the "firstlings of their beards", in gold or silver boxes, at the temple of some deity as a symbol of self-sacrifice.[3] Its principles both in the selection and qualification of victims and vegetable offerings are of a simplicity and judiciousness the more striking if contrasted with the confusion elsewhere obvious on the same points.[4] It knows no distinctions like those familiar to the Greeks and Romans, who worshipped the "upper" gods on high structures (*βωμοί, altaria*), the "lower" deities on low hearths (*ἐσχάραι*);[5] sacrificed to the one by day, to the others by night;[6] killed the victims of the one from above downwards, of the others from below upwards;[7] sprinkled the blood, in the one case, on the altar, but made it, in the other, to flow into a pit;[8] offered to the former "the things of the first or odd number", and to the latter "the things of an even number."[9] It**

---

tas dei per exta disquiritur", whence they were also called hostiae consultatoriae); *Herod.* VII. 134 (*τοῖσι Σπαρτιήτῃσι καλλιερῆσαι θυομένοισι οὐκ ἐδύνατο*); IX. 38, esp. 61; *Thuc.* V. 54; *Soph.* Ant. 1005—1011; *Aristoph.* Pax 1040—1065; *Pausan.* VII. ii. 2 (*Μαντικὴ δὲ ἡ μὲν ἐρίφων καὶ ἀρνῶν τε καὶ μόσχων ἐκ παλαιοῦ δήλη καθεστῶσά ἐστιν ἀνθρώποις, Κύπριοι δὲ καὶ ὑσὶν ἐπεξευρόντες εἰσὶ μαντεύεσθαι*); *Strabo*, IV. iv. 5, p. 198; *Diod. Sic.* V. 31; *Porph.* Abst. II. 51 (hence in Greek *θύεσθαι* is used in the sense of *μαντεύεσθαι*, see Ammonius s. v.); *Virg.* Aen. IV. 63, 64 (pecudumque reclusis Pectoribus inhians spirantia consulit exta); *Cic.* De Divin. II. 12—14 (Ut ordiar ab haruspicina, quam ego reipublicae causa communisque religionis colendam censeo); *Tacit.* Hist. II. 3, 4, 78; *Sil. Ital.* I. 119—122 (raptimque recludit Spirantes artus poscens responsa sacerdos, Ac fugientem animam properatis consulit extis); *Juven.* Sat. VI. 548—552; so also among the Phoenicians, comp. Tablet of Mars. l. 11 (אם שצף אם חוח, "sei es ein Opfer mit Haruspicium, sei es ein Wahrsageopfer" or "Sicht- und Schauopfer"; comp. *Movers*, l. c. pp. 65, 66, 72, 73). See also Sect. XXII.

1 *Plut.* De Isid. c. 30. 2 Ibid. c. 50.

3 In some towns, neither men nor women were permitted to marry unless they had previously dedicated their hair to Hippolytus. Comp. *Paus.* II. xi. 6; *Juven.* III. 186; *Stat.* Silv. III. 4; *Lucian*, Syr. Dea c. 60 (where the author remarks that he himself had adhered to the same custom, and that his hair with his name may be found in the temple of Hierapolis).

4 See Sectt. VII. VIII.

5 See pp. 16, 175 note 1.

6 See p. 172.

7 See p. 186.

8 See also p. 208 note 8.

9 *Plat.* Legg. IV. 8, p. 717 A., *τὰ περιττὰ* and *ἄρτια καὶ δεύτερα καὶ ἀριστερά*; comp. also Pythagoras in Porphyr. life of Pyth. p. 197 ed. Cant.

could not adopt the rule that the victim should, as much as possible correspond with the peculiar nature of the divinity to whom it was offered.[10] For among the heathens, the animal represented the *deity*,[11] whence for instance *pregnant* cows were offered to Ceres in the spring, but *barren* ones to the spirits of the lower world,[12] whereas in the system of Hebrew sacrifices, the animal represented the *worshipper*. It may be for this reason that the pagans frequently wreathed the sacrificial animals with garlands of flowers, and adorned them with the leaves of the plants sacred to the honoured deity,[13] or that they gilt the horns of victims, especially bulls and cows,[14] and sometimes their hoofs,[15] exactly as they decked the statues of the gods with leaves and festoons.[16] From a similar consideration perhaps, the Greeks laid particular stress upon the tractable bearing of the victim; they avoided dragging it to the altar by force; they desired to see it approach with a willingness that might be construed as an approbation of the deity; they regarded its bellowing at the altar, and still more its attempt at escape, as highly ominous;[17] the priest delayed the act of killing till the animal by a movement of the head seemed to have plainly intimated assent; he frequently procured that movement by pouring water into the victim's

---

*τοῖς μὲν οὐρανίοις θεοῖς περιττὰ θύειν, τοῖς δὲ χθονίοις ἄρτια*; *Plut.* Num. c. 14, *τοῖς μὲν οὐρανίοις περισσὰ θύειν, ἄρτια δὲ τοῖς χθονίοις.*

[10] See pp. 86—88.

[11] "Hier lag der Grund in irgend einer vermeintlichen näheren Beziehung jener Thiere zu der Natur der Götter, denen man sie opferte" observes Schömann (l. c. p. 235) with respect to sacrifices of the Greeks. [12] See pp. 102, 103.

[13] Comp. p. 169 note 11; see also *Bähr*, Symb. I. 361—363.

[14] Though this custom may have had no reference to the sun and moon which were considered to be "horned" (*Bähr*, Symb. II. 252).

[15] This was not only the case among the Greeks and Romans, but the Persians (*Strabo*, XV. iii. 13); *Hom.* Il. X. 294; Od. III. 384, 426, 436, 437; *Plat.* Alcib. II. c. 20, p. 149 C; *Virg.* Aen. IX. 627 (aurata fronte juvencum); *Macrob.* Sat. I. 17 (bos auratus, femina aurata); *Ovid*, Met. XV. 131; *Lucian*, Sacrif. 12; *Stat.* Theb. IV. 449; *Strab.* XV. iii. 13, p. 732; *Athen.* XV. 16, p. 674; *Porphyr.* Abst. II. 15; *Saubert*, De Sacrif. p. 388.

[16] In later times, similar customs seem to have been adopted by the Jews, probably from their contact with the Greeks (comp. *Joseph.* Ant. XIII. viii. 2; *Mishn.* Bikkur. III, 3, והשור הולך לפניהם וקרניו מצופות זהב ועטרה של זית בראשו).

[17] Comp. *Macrob.* Saturn. III. 5 (Observatum est a sacrificantibus, ut, si hostia quae ad aras duceretur, fuisset vehementius reluctata, ostendissetque se invitam altaribus admoveri, amoveretur; quia invito Deo offerri eam putabant: quae autem stetisset oblata, hanc volenti numini dari existimabant); *Virg.* Georg. II. 395 (Et ductus cornu stabit sacer hircus ad aras); *Sil. Ital.* V. 63—65; *Plin.* H. N. VIII. 45 or 70 (nec trahente se ab aris); *Diod Sic.* V. 31; *Lucan*, Phars. I. 611 (Impatiensque diu non grati victima sacri Cornua succincti premerent quum torva ministri, Deposito victum praebebat poplite collum).

ears;[1] and at Delphi he waited till a trembling considered as divine seized the limbs of the animal. Thus certainly the usage of employing the entrails of the victim as a celestial oracle, is more intelligible: if the animal represented the deity, its vital organs could well be considered to possess a mystic significance and to disclose the will of heaven. And similarly the perpetual fire on the altars of the heathens was a symbol of the divinity itself, on that of the Hebrews it was the emblem of divine worship, of the people of God, of the holy nation; and therefore among the former, the fire that consumed the victim was an augury, among the latter simply a means of presenting "the food of the Lord";[2] in short, the offering was among the heathens designed to conciliate the power of the deity,[3] among the Israelites to cleanse and to satisfy the mind of the suppliant; it was among the former, a direct appeal to superior beings, among the latter, virtually a means to a moral end. Therefore the notion of atonement differed widely among the heathens and the Hebrews: the former desired by their offerings, for instance after pestilence, drought, or internecine war, to restore the harmony of nature or the even current of events, which was, or was feared to be disturbed; the latter endeavoured to strengthen or to renew that inward unity with the Deity which, if felt, was considered the highest blessing, if lost, the direst curse of existence. The former knew no expiatory offerings in the deeper meaning, the latter sanctioned none in the worldly or outward sense. Agamemnon was required to sacrifice his daughter in order to appease the wrath of an offended goddess and thus to secure her favour and assistance for a national enterprise;[4] Job offered expiatory holocausts for his children, because he deemed it possible that they had trespassed and slighted God in their hearts. A Hebrew sacrifice analogous to that of Agamemnon was indeed that of David when he "hung up before the Lord" seven descendants of Saul in alleged deference to the Gibeonites,[5] but that act of barbarity and

---

[1] *Plut.* Symp. VIII. viii. 3 (*ἄχρι δὲ νῦν παραφυλάττουσιν ἰσχυρῶς τὸ μὴ σφάττειν πρὶν ἐπινεῦσαι κατασπενδόμενον*); comp. *Serv.* ad Virg. Aen. VI. 244; Schol. Apoll. Rhod. I. 415.

[2] See Comm. on VI. 1—4.

[3] Hence the terms *θεοὺς ἱλάεσθαι* or *ἱλάσκεσθαι*, or deos placare, propitiare, litare, or perlitare; comp. *Hom.* Il. II. 550 (*Ἔνθα δέ μιν ταύροισι καὶ ἀρνειοῖς ἱλάονται*); *Hesiod,* Op. 336; *Plin.* H. N. VIII. 47 or 72 (magna et pecori gratia vel in placamentis deorum etc.); *Hor.* Od. I. xxxvi. 1 *sqq.* (Et thure et fidibus juvat etc.); Sat. II. iii. 206; *Caes.* Bell. Gall. VI. 16; *Cic.* Pro Font. X; *Macrob.* Saturn. III. 5 (who explains litare by sacrificio facto placare numen).

[4] Comp. *Eurip.* Iph. Aul. 1553—1556 (*Τοὐμὸν δὲ σῶμα τῆς ἐμῆς ὑπὲρ πάτρας Καὶ τῆς ἁπάσης Ἑλλάδος γαίας ὕπερ Θῦσαι δίδωμ' ἑκοῦσα πρὸς βωμὸν θεᾶς*); *Virg.* Aen. II. 116, 117. Sanguine placastis ventos et virgine caesa, Quum primum Iliacas Danai venistis ad oras.

[5] 2 Sam. XXI. 1—9.

astuteness has nothing in common with the spirit of the sacrificial system of the Pentateuch.[6] One of the most liberal and enlightened of heathen writers observes, "we honour the gods with sacrifices either to seek deliverance from misfortunes, or to secure benefits, or to prove our gratitude for blessings, or to obtain some advantage";[7] he adds indeed vaguely, that we may also do so "merely from respect for the goodness of their nature",[8] but sacrifices prompted by such motives, though unselfish and pious, do not necessarily bespeak contrition or penitence. Paganism, ultimately identifying creator and creature, and therefore merging the individual in the general life of the universe, seeks the cause of man's estrangement from the deity in the contrast that exists between the finite and the infinite; it knows therefore only sacrifices destined to effect the removal of physical or cosmical evils; but the Hebrew Law, conceiving both man and nature in absolute dependence on the Divine will, attributes that estrangement to human wickedness or sin, because its standard of virtue is the holiness of God, and it ordains therefore sacrifices to ensure the removal of moral evils purely as such. The heathens — and this is another most momentous difference — deemed it possible to propitiate the anger of the gods for whatever offence or crime; so that, for instance, the so called "blood-chapter" in Kalika-Purana specified the length of time during which, according to Hindoo sages, the various sacrifices were efficacious in securing the goodwill of the gods — fishes or a crocodile, whether their flesh or their blood, for one month, a wild ox or guana for one year, an antelope or wild boar for twelve years, the wild sarabhas for five and twenty, the rhinoceros, buffalo, or tiger for a hundred, and a lion, a stag, or a man for a thousand years.[9] The Hebrews, as a rule, admitted expiatory offerings for undesigned sins only, and held intentional transgressions resulting from impious contumacy to lie beyond the sphere of the altar; the majesty of the law inexorably demanded justice, but the holiness of God mercifully received into His community those who had forfeited that holiness unwittingly.

Therefore, among the heathens, the principal act in the sacrificial ritual was the killing of the animal; among the Hebrews, the sprinkling of the blood had peculiar importance; the former approached the deity mainly with a view of deliverance from punishment, which was

---

[6] See Sect. XXIII.

[7] *Porphyr*. De Abst. II. 24, *τιμῶμεν δὲ τοὺς θεοὺς ἢ κακῶν μὲν ἀποτροπὴν, ἀγαθῶν δὲ παρασκευὴν ἡμῖν γενέσθαι ζητοῦντες κτλ.*

[8] *Κατὰ τὴν ψιλὴν τὴν τῆς ἀγαθῆς αὐτῶν ἕξεως ἐκτίμησιν.*

[9] Asiat. Res. V. 371 *sqq*.; comp. *Rhode*, Religiöse Bildung der Hindus, II. 248.

borne by the slaughtered animal; the latter chiefly with the hope of internal purification, which was attained by putting the blood upon the parts of the Sanctuary symbolising Divine presence and mercy. And yet, among heathens, the blood was almost synonymous with sacrifice, because it was the chief part devoted to the gods; among the Hebrews, it was no more than a principal feature; it was indeed of paramount importance in expiatory offerings; but in holocausts it was subordinate to the consumption of the body by the flames, in thank-offerings to the burning of the fat and the fat parts; it had in these two classes of sacrifice force and significance chiefly in as much as they shared the expiatory character, which, however, they did but collaterally and indirectly. The blood was not in itself considered divine, as was necessarily the case among pagan nations which supposed the victim to represent the deity; it was holy in so far only as it pointed to the life (נפש) of the offerer, who sought safety and sanctity by surrendering another life (נפש); it was in every respect a symbol, it had no real power, since man was regarded as a creature essentially different from the victim towards which he occupied no close or cosmical relation, the one being merely a living breath (נפש חיה), the other a reflex of God Himself.[1] The bloody sacrifices were certainly regarded as most valuable, but the bloodless offerings were in every way deemed as acceptable from those who could afford no more; and on many important occasions, both private and public, they were prescribed not as mere substitutes, but as the regular and ordinary oblations. The Hebrew name for offering (קרבן) means simply *gift*, and includes indifferently the bloody and the bloodless kinds.[2]

Again, those two classes of sacrifice which manifest the highest degree of self-abnegation and of humility, the holocausts and the expiatory offerings, were particularly frequent and indeed predominated among the Hebrews, while they occupied a very subordinate place among most other nations, and were all but unknown among many. The latter presented offerings more generally either to conciliate the favour of the deity,[3] or to express gratitude and joy for benefits received; they were

[1] It can, therefore, not be asserted that the Mosaic and the heathen sacrifices perfectly agree in respect to the meaning of the blood (*Bähr*, Symb. II. 263); as if to oppose and to eradicate such opinion, the Pentateuch admitted bloodless oblations even for sin-offerings: the chief distinction between both systems was naturally and most strongly reflected in the meaning of the blood, the principal element of sacrifice.

[2] See Sect. V.

[3] Hence several gods and especially Zeus bore the epithet μειλίχιος (placabilis), *Xen.* Anab. VII. viii. 4; *Pausan.* I. xxxvii. 4; II. ix. 6; II. xx. 1; *Thucyd.* I. 126. Münter (Rel. der Karth. p. 9) identifies improbably μειλίχιος with מלך, and he has been readily followed by other etymologists.

actuated by worldly considerations; they looked to the promotion of their material welfare only; they followed the dictates of necessity and often the impulses of covetousness. The prayers which accompanied the sacrifices of the Hindoos mostly concerned temporal and selfish boons, such as life, posterity, wealth, annihilation of enemies, especially the destruction of the followers of other creeds, or protection against evil spirits.[4] Not unfrequently they attributed to the sacrifices magical powers which compelled the deity, even against its will, to grant the demanded favours.

It is indeed highly probable that burnt-offerings formed a very early, if not the earliest class of sacrifice even among the rudest and most untutored nations; they must almost exclusively have prevailed among those who regarded the sacrifices as presents or as food offered to the gods; and they have thus been characterised by ancient and modern writers.[5] Consequently they are indeed occasionally met with in heathen literature; as among the Boeotians, on the festival of the great Daedala celebrated every sixty years;[6] among the tribes in and near Titane, not far from the Asopus, where the entire animals, whether bulls, lambs, or pigs, were burnt to Aesculapius;[7] or in Patrae at the festival of Artemis Laphria, when animals of every kind, as wild boars, stags, and roes, wolves and bears, were thrown alive into the flames, presenting a horrid spectacle of agony;[8] or in Persia, where the elder Cyrus, on occasions of peculiar splendour, is stated to have offered holocausts of bulls to the highest god and holocausts of horses to the Sun;[9] or among the Carthaginians, in whose name Hamilcar, during a fierce battle with the army of Syracuse, burned on a large pyre the entire bodies of the victims;[10] the Athenian citizens seem indeed to have been in the habit of offering holocausts of hogs, especially to Zeus Meilichios, the Atoner;[11] yet they did so merely for personal advantage and in emergencies of special distress;[12] and in a similar spirit they annu-

---

[4] Comp. *Wilson*, Introd. to Rig-Veda-Sanhita, I. p. xxv; II. p. vi.

[5] Comp. *Porph.* De Abst. II. 44 ("All theologians agree that nothing should be tasted of sacrifices presented for the sake of averting misfortunes": but ibid. V. 4 proves nothing, as is evident from a careful examination of the passage); *Hygin.* Astron. Poet. II. 15 (Antiqui soliti sunt totas hostias in sacrorum consumere flamma); *L. Schmitz* in Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiqq. p. 999.

[6] *Pausan.* IX. iii. 4.

[7] *Paus.* II. xi. 7.

[8] See Paus. VII. xviii. 8; comp. IV. xxxi. 7; *Diod. Sic.* V. 4 (*θύουσιν οἱ μὲν ἰδιῶται τὰ ἐλάττω τῶν ἱερείων, δημοσίᾳ δὲ ταύρους βυθίζουσιν ἐν τῇ λίμνῃ*); see also p. 187 notes 16—19.

[9] *Xenoph.* Cyrop. VIII. iii. 24; comp. ibid. § 34.

[10] *Herod.* VII. 167.

[11] *Xen.* Anab. VII. viii. 4 (*εἰώθειν ὁλοκαυστεῖν*).

[12] Comp. *Xen.* l. c.

ally in the month of November appeased Jupiter Maimaktes as god of Tempests by a ram burnt entire, to avert the evil effects of the storms.[1] But if we except offerings to the dead or to the deities and shades of the nether world,[2] holocausts were only presented in isolated instances; they are not mentioned at all in Homer; in the historical times we find that some inconsiderable parts of the victim were deemed sufficient for the gods, while the chief portions remained for the use of the worshippers to be consumed in convivial repasts.[3] So the Greeks burnt ordinarily, besides the hair that grows between the horns,[4] only the thigh-bones,[5] on which often but little flesh was left,[6] and certain parts of the intestines enveloped in fat and covered with flour,[7] because, as some ancient authorities assert, the thighs conduce to the power of generation, and are therefore justly burnt to the gods who bestow it,[8] though sometimes small portions of all the limbs were added covered with fat,[9] and in later times the liver, the heart, and some parts not suitable for human consumption. The Romans, following nearly the same sacrificial rites and customs as the Greeks,[10] burnt the intestines (exta) if declared favourable by the haruspex, and portions of the limbs spread over with the dough of kneaded spelt-flour[11] or strewed with barley-meal;[12] or they dedicated to the deity the skin of the victim suspending it in the temple

---

1 *Polem.* Fragm. ed. Preller, p. 140; comp. *Strabo*, IV. iv. 5, p. 198 (the Gauls *κατασκευάσαντες κολοσσὸν χόρτου καὶ ξύλων, ἐμβαλόντες εἰς αὐτὸν βοσκήματα καὶ θηρία παντοῖα καὶ ἀνθρώπους ὡλοκαύτουν*); *Plut.* Sympos. VI. viii. 1 (*Σμυρναῖοι τὸ παλαιὸν Αἰολεῖς ὄντες θύουσι Βουβρώστει ταῦρον μέλανα, κατακόψαντες αὐτόδορον* — cum ipsa pelle — *ὁλοκαυτοῦσιν*).

2 "Tamquam omnia vorantibus" (*Outram*, De Sacrif. I. 10, p. 113); comp. *Apoll. Rhod.* Argon. III. 1032 (*ἀδαίετον ὠμοθετῆσαι*); *Virg.* Aen. VI. 253; *Lucian*, De Luct. c. 9; Contempl. c. 22; comp. *Schömann*, l. c. pp. 236, 237.

3 "For the ordinary sacrifices of the temple, the feast was essential", observes Bernays (Theophr. Schrift über Frömmigkeit, p. 112); see Sect. X. 14.

4 As *primitiae*, or as a symbol of consecration of the whole victim (*libamina prima*), whence the act was called *κατάρχεσθαι τοῦ ἱερείου*; comp. *Hom.* Il. III. 273; XIX. 254; Od. XIV. 422; III. 446; *Eurip.* Electr. 811, 812; *Virg.* Aen. VI. 245, 246.

5 *Μηροί, μηρία, μῆρα.*

6 Comp. *Schömann*, Griech. Alterth. II. p. 231.

7 *Hom.* Il. I. 40, 460, 461; II. 423; Od. III. 456—458; *Plat.* Alcib. II. 13; comp. *Hesiod.* Op. 535 (*ἐπὶ δ' ἀγλαὰ μηρία καίειν*); Theog. 535—557, where the custom of the Greeks is traced to a stratagem of Prometheus practiced upon Jupiter (*Ἐκ τοῦ δ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων Καίουσ' ὀστέα λευκὰ θυηέντων ἐπὶ βωμῶν*).

8 *Eustath.* ad *Hom.* Il. I. 461; comp. femur, fetus, femina; *Saubert*, De Sacrif. pp. 438 *sqq.*

9 *Hom.* Od. XIV. 428, 429 (*Πάντων ἀρχόμενος μελέων, ἐς πίονα δημόν*); III. 421—463; Il. I. 461—474; II. 421—427; *Apoll. Rhod.* Arg. I. 425—435; *Lucian*, De Sacrif. 12.

10 *Dion. Hal.* VII. 72.

11 *Dion. Hal.* l. c.

12 *Cato*, R. R. 134; Liv. XXIX. 27

or throwing it over the statue of the god.[13] Concerning the Babylonians the apocryphal epistle of Jeremiah remarks, that their priests sold and employed the sacrifices for their own use, or that their wives "laid up a part of them in salt."[14] The Phoenicians, though reported to have primitively burnt the sacrifice entirely, in later times consumed the larger portions of it themselves.[15] The Scythians devoted to the gods "the first-fruits of the flesh and entrails."[16] Among the Persians, who shunned all burnt-offerings as offences against the sacred element of fire, nothing except a little fat was set apart for the deity that was believed to require only the soul of the animal which dwells in its blood.[17]

The Israelites, on the contrary, presented burnt-offerings so constantly and so numerously that strangers might well consider and represent them as their *only* class of sacrifice,[18] which fact is the more significant as their holocausts obviously partook of the character of sin-offerings.[19] And yet so anxious were the framers of the Levitical code not to imperil the fundamental doctrines of the Law that, whilst the heathens generally presented their firstling-sacrifices, wherever they did so systematically, as holocausts, because they offered them in submissive reverence to the productive powers of nature, the Hebrews, lest they should be misled into pagan notions, were commanded to dedicate them to the Deity as thank-offerings in commemoration of a glorious epoch of national redemption.[20]

Again, some instances of expiatory sacrifices among pagans appear indeed to be recorded. It is true that the Egyptians presented sin-offerings rather than thank-offerings,[21] but they were induced to offer them not from an impulse of penitence or a conviction of unworthiness, but from fear and servile awe, to avert a dreaded punishment or to expiate it. Brahmah's "sacrifice of creation", when calling forth the

---

(cruda exta victimae uti mos est in mare porricit); *Virg.* Aen. V. 775 (extaque salsos Porricit in fluctus); VI. 253, 254; *Ovid*, Fast. IV. 935, 936.

13 Comp. *Saubert*, De Sacrif. c. 20, p. 445. On the custom of the Kalmucks who spread the hides of the sacrificed horses on fitting skeletons, see *Grimm*, Deutsche Mythologie, p. 384.

14 Baruch VI. 28.

15 Comp. *Porphyr.* De Abst. IV. 15; *Movers*, Opferw. d. Karthager, p. 71.

16 *Herod.* IV. 61, ὁ θύσας τῶν κρεῶν καὶ τῶν σπλάγχνων ἀπαρξάμενος.

17 See *Strabo*, XV. iii. 13, p. 732; *Herod.* II. 132; *Catull.* XC. 5. Of the pigs offered to the moon, the Egyptians "put together the tip of the tail, with the spleen and the caul, covered them with the fat found about the belly of the animal, and consumed them with fire" (*Herod.* II. 47).

18 Comp. *Porph.* De Abst. II. 26, Ἰουδαῖοι ... οὐχ ἑστιώμενοι τῶν τυθέντων, ὁλοκαυτοῦντες δὲ ταῦτα ... ἀνήλισκον τὴν θυσίαν θᾶττον κτλ.; see p. 168 note 2.

19 See pp. 236, 237.

20 See Treatise on Priesthood, ch. III.

21 Comp. *Sharpe*, Egypt. Myth. and Egypt. Christian. pp. 52, 59.

universe, is represented as a sin-offering; but the legend on the subject is too singular and fantastic to be of practical influence or moral value; and that sacrifice, like its anti-type, the horse-offering or Aswamedha,[1] embodies a metaphysical speculation in cosmogony rather than an ordinance to regulate a religious life. The sacrifices offered to Kali, the goddess of destruction and punishment, have indeed an expiatory character, but, "as her revenge consists in being all-devouring time, the expiation is not of an ethical but a cosmic nature, aiming at the conciliation of the finite and transitory with the infinite and eternal."[2] The laws of Manu, sanctioning an older arrangement of the sages, direct the propitiation of the gods for involuntary sins possibly committed, by the daily performance of the five great sacraments;[3] but they leave it indistinct how far this ordinance was prompted by fear or how far by a yearning after purity of mind. The great bull-sacrifice offered to Mithras, the mediator between Ormuzd and Ahriman, was certainly an expiatory offering; but it was presented to atone for the original sin of Ahriman, who, by killing the world-creating or primeval bull, called forth the evils of nature.[4] Similar results will be apparent from an analysis of other alleged cases of pagan offerings of atonement. Among the Greeks, they were not even, like the other classes of sacrifice, deemed to form a necessary part of divine worship, nor an essential condition of piety.[5] Severed from the higher aspirations of the soul, they were powerless for elevation and ennoblement which might at least result from holocausts and sin-offerings prompted by a sincere conviction of the heart's sinfulness and an anxious desire of confessing it. The heathens held indeed the notion of the *goodness* of the gods to whom they owed all useful gifts, but they were strangers to the notion of the *holiness* of the Deity, which forms the centre of Hebrew theology; they presented therefore indeed thank-offerings, but could not be familiar with true sin-offerings in which the system of the Hebrews culminated. They looked upon moral evil simply as the result of human weakness; whereas the Hebrews viewed it in humble contrast to Divine perfection. They entertained and uttered principles directly opposed to those which give birth to expiatory sacrifices; they encouraged proud self-consciousness (*μεγαλοψυχία*), and praised it as divine; "as it behoves

---

1 *Manu*, XI. 261; see p. 89.

2 *Bähr*, Symb. II. 223.

3 *Manu*, III. 69; comp. chapt. XI; see, however, *supra* pp. 66—70.

4 *Bähr*, l. c. p. 227.

5 *Ευσέβεια*; see the classification of Porphyry, p. 2 note 2; comp. *Bernays*, l. c. pp. 106, 107 ("die Sühnopfer, wie sie nach Ausweis der griech. Religionsgesch. die jüngsten sind, nahmen weder im Volksbewusstsein noch im öffentlichen Leben eine den ältern Opfern ebenbürtige Stellung ein, und wurden nicht zur Gottesverehrung gerechnet").

Zeus", observes Chrysippus, "to know that he is great in himself and in his life, and to speak highly of his own worth, . . . so it behoves all good men to do the like, convinced that Zeus is not superior to them";[6] and with still higher pride and moral self-sufficiency, Aristotle remarks, "magnanimous (μεγαλόψυχος) is he who estimates his own worth highly; for he who makes too low an estimate of it, is a fool."[7]

Moreover, the sacrifices of the Hebrews were distinguished by greater earnestness and solemnity; the imposition of the hand, the burning of the whole or of a part of the victim on the altar, and above all the sprinkling of the blood so significantly appointed and varied, nay the very meals in the holy place, whether held by the priests "to remove the sin of the people", or by the Israelites with their households and their poorer guests, all these rites, rigidly fixed and enforced, and partly carried out by the suppliant himself, were designed to fill his mind with awe and reverence, and no doubt produced those feelings as perfectly as the gross form of worship by sacrifice in any way permitted. Thus Theophrastus could be misled into the error of asserting that the Jews fasted whenever they sacrificed,[8] and that they used at their oblations much honey, so extensively employed at the heathen offerings for the dead.[9] Sacrifices were deemed so essential among the Hebrews, that scarcely any holy or solemn act, or any important event or occurrence was left without them; for they were meant not only to satisfy the religious wants of individuals, but to foster an active and healthful communion between God and the whole chosen people[10] — between the Ruler who grants boons and pardon and the nation that looks to Him as the source of all power and holiness.

## XXI. ON HUMAN SACRIFICES IN GENERAL.

As sacrifices primitively originated in the desire to conciliate the gods by offerings held dearest and most precious, it cannot be sur-

[6] *Plut.* De Stoic. Repugn. c. 13, *ὥςπερ τῷ Διὶ προςήκει σεμνύνεσθαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ τε καὶ τῷ βίῳ καὶ μεγαφρονεῖν ... οὕτω τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς πᾶσι ταῦτα προςήκει, κατ' οὐθὲν προεχομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Διός.*

[7] *Aristot.* Ethic. Nicom. VII. iii. 3, *μεγαλόψυχος ὁ μεγάλων αὑτὸν ἀξιῶν, ἄξιος ὤν· ὁ γὰρ μὴ κατ' ἀξίαν αὐτὸ ποιῶν, ἠλίθιος*; comp. ibid. § 7, *ὁ δ' ἐλαττόνων ἢ ἄξιος μικρόψυχος*; and § 9, *εἰ δὲ δὴ μεγάλων ἑαυτὸν ἀξιοῖ ἄξιος ὤν, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν μεγίστων, περὶ ἓν μάλιστα ἂν εἴη.*

[8] See p. 168 note 2.

[9] See p. 141. Tholuck (l. c. p. 91) finds the same character of earnestness implied in the circumstance that most of the victims were slaughtered at the "cheerless" or northern side of the altar, which is however improbable (see p. 174; comp. also p. 254).

[10] Hence the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (VII. 12) might well say, "the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also in the Law" (*μετατιθεμένης γὰρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ νόμου μετάθεσις γίνεται*).

prising to find that, for a long time, human sacrifices were nearly co-extensive with sacrifices in general. Not content with presenting their choicest property, whether animate or inanimate, untutored nations slaughtered in honour of their deities human beings prized as the noblest work of creation, and in many respects kindred with the gods themselves. It may be that very rude tribes, steeped in ignorance and barbarism, regarded the immolated men actually as food laid before their divinities, since all oblations were commonly looked upon in the same light: thus Bacchus was believed to delight in the raw flesh of human victims,[1] who in Chios and Tenedos were offered to him cut into pieces.[2] Again, several nations may have sacrificed men because they were themselves in the habit of eating human flesh,[3] and people usually shared with their gods their most delicious food.[4] Nor is it quite impossible that some tribes introduced the custom of human sacrifices at first in times of distressing famine or hopeless siege, when necessity and despair led them to taste the flesh of their dead or killed fellow-men;[5] and that then, having acquired for it an unconquerable appetite, they offered it to their gods as the most exquisite dainty.[6] But all these motives can have operated in exceptional cases only. As a rule, men offered up their fellow-beings, because they regarded them as the "finest of all sacrifices"[7] or "the best of all seeds",[8] as the noblest, most acceptable and most perfect means of divine veneration.[9] For human sacrifices

---

[1] He hence bore the epithets ὠμηστής, ὠμάδιος, ὠμοφάγος or ἀνθρωποῤῥαίστης; comp. also αἰγοφάγος, κριοφάγος (*Plut.* Them. 13; Arist. 9; Anton. 24; *Pausan.* III. xv. 7; *Porphyr.* Abst. II. 55; *Aelian*, Nat. Anim. XII. 34); see p. 6; comp. *Hermann*, Gottesdienstl. Alterth. der Griechen, p. 121; *Creuzer*, Symb. IV. 94, 188; *Hartung*, Religion und Mythologie der Griechen, III. 30; see, however, *Schömann*, Griech. Alterth. II. 213, 240, 241; the metaphorical phrase αἵματος ἆσαι Ἄρηα (*Hom.* Il. V. 289, etc.) does not refer to sacrifices.

[2] *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 55; comp. *Pausan.* X. xiv. 2; *Diod. Sic.* V. 83; *Aelian*, Var. Hist. XIII. 2.

[3] Comp. *Porph.* l. c. II. 8; Pliny observes, the difference is but small between sacrificing human beings and eating them (Hist. Nat. VIII. 2; comp. IV. 26; VI. 20).

[4] Comp. *Wolf*, Vermischte Schriften, p. 270; *Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, p. 104.

[5] Comp. Lev. XXVI. 29; Deut. XXVIII. 53—55, 57; 2 Ki. VI. 25—30; Jer. XIX. 9; Lament. II. 20; *Joseph.* Bell. Jud. V. x. 4; xiii. 7; *Appian*, Iberik. 96; comp. *Cels.* Hierob. II. 30—34; see *infra* Sect. XXV.

[6] Comp. *Juven.* XV. 87, 88, 93—103; *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 56, 57; see also *Valer. Max.* VII. vi. 3.

[7] Τὸ κάλλιστον θυμάτων, *Heliod.* I. 31.

[8] *Varro* ap. Augustin. Civ. Dei VII. 19, Deinde ideo dicit a quibusdam pueros ei solitos immolari, sicut a Poenis, et a quibusdam etiam majores, sicut a Gallis, quia *omnium seminum optimum est genus humanum.*

[9] *Plut.* De Superst. c. 13 (θεοὺς ... νομίζειν χαίροντας ἀνθρώπων σφαττο-

prevailed most among communities that had considerably advanced on the path of civilisation and had commenced to speculate on the subtler problems of religion. They were not merely presented on account of their awful grandeur or their heroic self-denial, but because man was conceived as the most superior part of creation, as an epitome of universal life, which he represents in its highest and richest form, or as a "microcosmos."[10] Thus closely connected with the centre of paganism, and expressing, in an intensified manner, the deepest of the current views on the nature of the gods and on their relation to mankind, they were not at once abolished as refinement advanced; they could in fact vanish only with paganism itself. It is, therefore, a matter of singular interest to survey the extent to which human victims were slain, and to examine the motives which prompted and the emergencies which claimed them: such enquiry, forming an instructive no less than melancholy chapter in the history of human aberrations, strikingly illustrates the fearful enormities to which religious zeal, however earnest and single-minded, is liable, unless guided by enlightened thought. We shall thus have an opportunity not only of completing our sketch on sacrifices, but of examining the question, much debated even in our time, whether and in what degree human sacrifices were practised by the Hebrews.

### 1. The occasions on which they were offered.

The paramount sacredness attached to human sacrifices is manifest from the fact that, though presented for nearly every religious purpose, they were chiefly chosen for expiatory offerings. They formed, therefore, in many lands, an essential part of the public or state worship. Based upon the belief that propitiation of the gods is necessary even if individual offences be not manifest, they were repeated at regular intervals, to expiate the guilt that might rest on the nation, and to mark a new phase in the religious life of the community. They are therefore indeed found to be most prevalent among savage and barbarous tribes: the Thracians and Scythians immolated men chiefly to Diana;[11] the Bassari in Thrace who came into contact with the Taurians and imitated their habits, ate the flesh of the men they sacrificed, and are said to have thereby been maddened to such sanguinary rage that they attacked and devoured each other;[12] among the Zulus in Zululand "human victims are, on certain occasions, either killed or buried alive";[13] and the kings of

*μένων αἵμασι, καὶ τελεωτάτην θυσίαν καὶ ἱερουργίαν ταύτην νομίζοντας*).

[10] Comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. 333.

[11] *Herod.* IV. 62; *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 56; *Lucian*, De Sacrif. 14.

[12] *Porphyr.* l. c. II. 8; comp. *Hartung*, l. c. p. 37.

[13] *Colenso*, Abraham's Sacrifice, a Sermon, p. 2.

Dahomey solemnise their "annual customs", to provide the departed monarchs, who are supposed to be present at the ceremonies, with fresh attendants in the lower world, about 60 or 65 every year, sometimes more sometimes much less; a former sovereign (Gezo) reduced the number to 36, the present king (Gelele) increased it to 39 or 40, to which must, however, be added as many female victims secretly killed by the Amazons in the palace — a practice founded on a purely religious basis, designed as a sincere manifestation of the king's filial piety sanctioned by long usage,[1] upheld by a powerful priesthood, and believed to be closely bound up with the existence of the commonwealth of Dahomey itself.[2] Human offerings were no less frequent among semi-barbarous nations; the Dumatheni in Arabia sacrificed a girl every year and buried her under the altar,[3] and the star-worshippers in the same country adored Mars in a temple of red colour[4] and offered to him, with blood-stained garments, a warrior by throwing him into a pit;[5] the Gauls followed the rite to a very considerable extent, chiefly in honour of Hestus (Mars) and Teutot (Mercury);[6] the old Teutons, generally sparing in offerings, presented, on certain days, human victims to Wodan (Mercury);[7] the Semnones, the most powerful section of the Suevi, and the Frieses slaughtered a man annually at their chief festival;[8] the Redarii, a Slavonic tribe, worshipped their principal deity Radegast not only with bulls and sheep, but with men;[9] the Pomeranians, at their harvest feast, immolated to their god Swantowit a stranger kidnapped for the purpose;[10] the old Swedes, every nine years, on the great national festival celebrated for nine days, offered nine male animals of every chief species, together with one man daily;[11] the Danes, assembling

---

[1] Though the Europaeans heard of it first about the year 1710.

[2] Comp. *Burton*, A mission to Gelele, king of Dahomey, I. 345; II. 26; see the descriptions of Norris, Wallon, Forbes, and Burton, l. c. I. 348 *sqq.*; II. 322 *sqq.* The king of Dahomey himself observed in the course of a long speech, "If I neglected this indispensable duty, would my ancestors suffer me to live? Would they not trouble me day and night, and say that I sent nobody to serve them; that I was only solicitous about my own name, and forgetful of my ancestors?" (l. c. II. 214, comp. p. 176, "his subjects would deem it impious were he to curtail or to omit the performance").

[3] *Porphyr.* Abstin. II. 56.

[4] *Norberg*, Lexid. p. 107.

[5] *Gesenius*, Jesaia, II. 345.

[6] *Caes.* Bell. Gall. VI. 16; *Cic.* Pro Fonteio, X (31); *Lucan*, Phars. I. 144, 145; III. 403—405; *Lactant.* Instit. I. 21; *Tertull.* Apolog. 9.

[7] Comp. *Tacit.* Germ. 9; *Mallet*, North. Antiqq. ch. VI.

[8] *Tacit.* Germ. 39; *Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, pp. 109, 110.

[9] Comp. *K. Schwenk*, Mythologie, VII. 148—156.

[10] *Schwenk*, l. c. pp. 135—141.

[11] *Mone*, Gesch. des nord. Heidenthums, I. 260; *Grimm*, Deutsche Mythologie, p. 32; comp. *supra*, p. 90.

every nine years in their capital Lederun, sacrificed to their gods 99 horses, 99 dogs, 99 cocks, 99 hawks, and 99 men;[12] and the Mexicans, on the festival of the great Tlaloc, drowned a boy and a girl in a lake, while, on other occasions, they shut up three boys in a cavern and left them there to die of starvation.[13] But the hideous custom took also root among nations capable of a higher civilisation: the Egyptians annually during the dog-days burnt alive in the town of Ilythia (i. e. Lucina) red-haired men, called Typhonic, and scattered their ashes in the air;[14] and in Heliopolis they are reported to have for many generations killed daily three men at the altar of Juno;[15] the Hindoos regularly sacrificed some of their fellow-men to Narayana[16] and to Kali, the awful personification of the destructive and avenging power of Shiva,[17] though the laws of Manu never mention human sacrifices;[18] many Asiatic tribes presented them in the service of Mithra, the god of the Sun;[19] the Phoenicians and most of their colonists, especially the Carthaginians, practised the burning of their children to Saturn (Cronos or Moloch) to a frightful extent, besides killing human sacrifices generally;[20] the Syrians in Laodicea offered every year a virgin to Minerva,[21] the people of Falerii in Etruria one to Juno,[22] the Phocaeans a man to Artemis Tauropolos,[23] the Salaminians to Agraulos the daughter of Cecrops, and later to Diomedes,[24] the Cretans and Rhodians to Saturn,[25] the people of Chios and Tenedos to Dionysos Omadios,[26] the Cyprians from the

---

[12] *Mone*, l. c. p. 271; *Grimm*, l. c. p. 29; comp. *supra* p. 89.

[13] *Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, pp. 233, 234. [14] *Plut.* De Iside, c. 73; see *infra*.

[15] *Porph.* Abst. II. 55; see *infra*.

[16] *Colebrooke*, Asiat. Research. VIII. p. 430. [17] Ibid. V. 371 *sqq.*

[18] In Ramayana (I. 48) occurs one instance which is probably mythical. In Hitopadesa (Book III, fab. 8, transl. by Max Müller, pp. 134—138) it is related that the goddess of fortune demanded the son of Viravara, the faithful servant of king Sudraka for an atonement if she was to remain propitious to the monarch; but this narrative bears internal evidence of being a fiction; see *infra* p. 350.

[19] *Socrat.* Hist. Eccl. III. 2; comp. *Creuzer*, Symb. I. 258.

[20] See Sect. XXIII; comp. *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. xvi. 6 (*οὐδ' ἐν Καρχηδόνι τῷ Κρόνῳ κοίνῃ πάντες ἀνθρωποθυτοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ περίοδον τῆς τοῦ νομίμου χάριν μνήμης ἐμφύλιον ἀεὶ αἷμα ῥαίνουσι πρὸς τοὺς βωμούς*); Orat. in laud. Constant. c. 13; *Sil. Ital.* IV. 770 (Urna reducebat miserandos annua casus); *Plin.* H. N. XXXVI. 5 (12, ad quem — Herculem — Poeni omnibus annis humana sacrificaverant victima); see also *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 457, 458; *Tertull.* Apolog. c. 9.

[21] *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 56.

[22] *Plut.* Parall. 35 (*ἐὰν παρθένον τῇ Ἥρᾳ θύωσιν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν κτλ.*).

[23] *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. xvi. 11; *Pythocl.* ap. *Clem. Alex.* Protrept. p. 12.

[24] *Porphyr.* De Abstin. II. 54.

[25] *Porph.* l. c. II. 54—56; comp. *Jul. Firm.* p. 9; *Athanas.* c. Gent. p. 21 C, *Φοίνικες δὲ καὶ Κρῆτες τὸν Κρόνον ἐν τοῖς τεκνοθυσίαις αὐτὸν ἱλάσκοντο.*

[26] See *supra*, p. 324 note 1.

time of Teucer to Jupiter,[1] the inhabitants of the island of Leucas to Apollo,[2] others to Neptune as a propitiatory offering,[3] the Lacedaemonians to Mars,[4] and the Athenians to Zeus, and after the time of Lykaon[5] to Apollo, in whose honour, on the great expiatory solemnities of the Thargelia, or summer festival,[6] whether annually or only in times of misfortune and danger,[7] two persons called *φαρμακοί*, healers or purifiers,[8] and fed for the purpose by the state,[9] one on behalf of the men and the other on behalf of the women, the one with a garland of black, and the other of white figs round the neck, were led out of the town to the sound of flutes and with the recital of penitential hymns, and beaten on the way with rods of fig-wood, and then either hurled down from rocks,[10] or burnt as a lustration-sacrifice, on funeral piles, and their ashes thrown into the sea and scattered to the winds.[11]

But if some great transgression seemed likely to provoke the wrath of the gods, human sacrifices were at any time offered as an extraordinary atonement. They were deemed particularly essential when the offence was public and concerned the whole community. The Athenians, having been afflicted by a plague which they believed to be owing to the pollution contracted in the matter of Cylon, Epimenides purified the town by immolating two young men, Cratinus and Ctesilius, who had offered themselves spontaneously.[12] The Athenians sent every year seven young men and seven virgins to Crete as a tribute, designed to propitiate the gods for the murder of Androgeus the son of Minos.[13]

---

[1] *Lactant.* l. c. I. 21.

[2] *Strabo*, X. ii. 9, p. 452.

[3] Comp. *Suidas* sub *περίψημα — ἀπολύτρωσις οὕτως ἐπέλεγον τῷ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν συνέχοντι τῶν κακῶν· περίψημα ἡμῶν γενοῦ ... καὶ οὕτως ἐνέβαλλον τῇ θαλάσσῃ, ὡσανεὶ τῷ Ποσειδῶνι θυσίαν ἀποτιννύντες*. The mythical narratives quoted by Hartung (Relig. u. Mythol. der Griech. II. 65—67) relate for the most part not to sacrifices in the proper sense.

[4] *Porphyr.* l. c.

[5] *Pausan.* VIII. ii. 6.

[6] *Diog. Laert.* Socrat. II. 23 (44, *ὅτε καθαίρουσι τὴν πόλιν Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν γενέσθαι Δήλιοί φασι*; comp. *Hesiod.* Op. 769; *Plat.* Phaed. p. 58 B; *Suidas* sub *Θαργήλια — ὀνομαζόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ θερεῖν τὴν γῆν, τὸν αὐτὸν ὄντα τῷ ἡλίῳ*).

[7] *Νοσούσης τῆς πόλεως*, *Tzetzes*.

[8] That is, scape-goats.

[9] *Suidas*, l. c. *φαρμακοὺς τοὺς δημοσίᾳ τρεφομένους, οἳ ἐκάθαιρον τὰς πόλεις τῷ ἑαυτῶν φόνῳ*; comp. *Aristoph.* Equit. 1136, *ὥσπερ δημοσίους τρέφεις κτλ.*

[10] *Müller*, Dor. I. 329.

[11] *Tzetzes*, Chiliad. V. 40, 41 (*τέλος πυρὶ κατέκαιον ἐν ξύλοις τοῖς ἀγρίοις Καὶ τὸν σπόδον εἰς θάλασσαν ἔῤῥαινον εἰς ἀνέμους*); *Hellad.* ap. *Phot.* Bibl. c. 279, p. 534; *Hesych.* II. p. 337; comp. *Hermann*, Gottesd. Alterth. § 60; *Schömann*, l. c. pp. 243, 434, 435; *Smith*, Diction. of Gr. and Rom. Antiqq. p. 1120; *Hartung*, l. c. II. 63.

[12] *Diog. Laert.* Epimen. 3; *Athenaeus*, Deipnos. XIII. 78 (where the name of the second victim is Apollodorus).

[13] *Plutarch*, Theseus 15; Quaestiones Graecae 35; compare also *Pausanias*, II. vii. 7.

The inhabitants of Potniae in Boeotia, who in the excitement of drunkenness had slain a priest of Dionysus, and were subsequently visited by a pestilence, sacrificed annually a fine youth by command of the Delphic oracle.[14] When the Carthaginians, at the siege of Agrigentum in Sicily, destroyed many graves that obstructed their military operations, and were about the same time visited by a virulent epidemic, the general Hamilcar (or Imilco) appeased the gods by sacrificing "according to the paternal custom" a boy to Cronos.[15] When, at Rome, two Vestal virgins had been convicted of unchastity (in B. C. 217), the books of fate directed that for atonement a Gallic man and woman and a Greek man and woman, be let down alive in the cattle-market, into a place fenced round with stone and already before used for human sacrifices.[16]

Similar offerings were presented when a glaring crime had been committed, especially against a deity, by a family or an individual, because it was believed to expose the whole community to divine punishment. As Athamas, the son of Aeolus, had planned the death of his son Phrixus, the oracle commanded that the eldest of his race should, as an expiation, be invariably immolated to Zeus[17] if he entered the prytaneum of his town Alos in Achaia.[18] When Athamas himself was to be sacrificed as an atonement for his intended crime, Cytissorus, the son of Phryxus, rescued him, for which reason his descendants became liable to the same penalty.[19] The story of Agamemnon and his daughter Iphigenia at once occurs to every reader. At Patrae in Achaia, Komaetho, a priestess of Artemis, and Melanippus impiously disgraced the temple of the goddess; to appease her wrath when the town was smitten with famine and disease, the two offenders, and then annually the finest virgin and the finest youth, were sacrificed to her honour.[20] At a military sedition, Caesar ordered two of the soldiers to be publicly killed as expiatory offerings by the high-priest and the priest of Mars, and fixed their heads before the Regia Martis.[21]

As calamities were believed to be the consequence of sins committed against the gods, and therefore to require expiation, human sacrifices were offered to ensure the cessation of signal public disasters. They were frequently resorted to in times of war or pestilence. They

---

14 *Pausan.* IX. viii. 2; though, later, Dionysus was content with a goat.

15 *Diod. Sic.* XIII. 86.

16 *Liv.* XXII. 57, where, however, Livy, to mark his disapproval, adds minime Romano sacro, see p. 331 n. 16.

17 *Ζεὺς Λαφύστιος.*

18 *Herod.* VII. 197.

19 *Herod.* l. c.

20 *Pausan.* VII. xix. 2.

21 *Dion Cass.* XLIII. 24, where the historian reprovingly adds, that Caesar was authorised in this deed neither by the behest of the Sibylline books nor by the permission or command of any god.

were, in such emergencies, presented by the Greeks, and also by the old Italic tribes, especially the Sabines, when they celebrated the so-called "holy spring",[1] and all domestic animals[2] and all children that had been born between the beginning of March and the end of April, were devoted to the gods;[3] in Egypt, where persons with red hair, the colour of Typhon, were burnt; among the Phoenicians,[4] the Gauls,[5] and various other nations.[6] So deeply rooted was this custom that even Origen[7] expressed the opinion, that at periods of national misfortune the Deity may be best appeased by the voluntary death of some pious man.

From such conceptions there is but a small step to the belief that *impending* dangers may be *averted* by presenting to the gods the most precious offering which it is in the power of man to bestow. Hence the Greeks, up to the time of the Peloponnesian war, are reported to have sacrificed a man when they marched out upon a military expedition;[8] and though this practice may not have been regularly carried out or universally adopted, an apparently historical account relates that Themistocles was compelled, before the battle of Salamis, both by the advice of the priest and the impetuous demand of the people, to sacrifice three Persians to Dionysos Omadios.[9] Menelaus, when detained in Egypt by adverse winds, is said to have seized two children and to have sacrificed them.[10] Phrixus, the son of Athamas and Nephele, was to be killed on the altar of Jupiter to avert the scourge of a dearth.[11] When Erechtheus, the king of Athens, was at war with the Eleusians aided by Eumolpus, the son of Poseidon, the oracle promised him the victory if he devoted one of his four daughters to Persephone, and when he had slaughtered the youngest of them, the three others killed themselves spontaneously as a sacrifice.[12] Similarly Marius, having been defeated by the Cimbrians, received in a dream the assurance of success if he sacrificed his daughter Calpurnia; he did so, and routed his enemies.[13]

---

[1] Ver sacrum, *ἔτος ἱερόν*.

[2] Swine, sheep, goats, and oxen.

[3] *Dion. Halic.* I. 16; *Liv.* XXII. 10.

[4] *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 16; *Justin.* XVIII. 6 (quum inter caetera mala etiam peste laborarent, etc.); *Oros.* Adv. Pagan. Histor. IV. 6.

[5] *Caes.* Bell. Gall. VI. 16; *Serv.* ad Aen. III. 57.

[6] *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 56; comp. 2 Sam. XXI. 1—9; Num. XV. 4.

[7] Contra Cels. I. p. 349 ed. Paris.

[8] *Porphyr.* De Abstin. II. 56; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 16.

[9] *Plut.* Them. 13; Arist. 9; Pelop. 21.

[10] *Herod.* II. 119 (*λαβὼν γὰρ δύο παιδία ἀνδρῶν ἐπιχωρίων, ἔντομά σφεα ἐποίησε*); comp. *Virg.* Aen. II. 116—119 (Sanguine placastis ventos etc.).

[11] *Apollod.* I. ix. 1; comp. *Pausan.* I. xxiv. 2; *Plato*, Min. 315 C; etc.; although a ram was accepted instead (*Apollod.* l. c.).

[12] *Apollod.* III. xv. 4; comp. *Plut.* Parall. 20; *Stob.* Serm. 157; the story is narrated with slight variations by *Hygin.* Fab. 46; comp. also *Creuzer*, Symb. IV. 341.

[13] *Plut.* l. c.

When Idomeneus, the celebrated Cretan leader before Troy, returned home, and a great storm arose at sea, he vowed to Poseidon to sacrifice to him whatever he should meet first on his landing; he saw his own son first, and he offered him to the god; but the legend — evidently of a later origin[14] — adds that Crete was, in consequence of that sacrifice, visited by a plague, and that the Cretans expelled Idomeneus from the island.[15] When after the conclusion of the first Punic war, the Gauls and other foreign tribes threatened to deluge Italy with their hosts, the Romans, acting upon the directions of the Sibylline books, buried a Greek man and woman and a Gallic man and woman alive in the cattle-market.[16] In fact, it was laid down as a general rule that the civil or military chief of Rome was permitted to dedicate to the gods before a battle any soldier he might select.[17] Decius declared, "It is the privilege of our family to serve as expiatory offerings for averting public dangers."[18] Nero, to escape the calamities supposed to be foreshadowed by the portentous appearance of a comet, killed as an expiation the most illustrious men of Rome.[19] Whenever the Gauls were troubled by imminent dangers or harassed by anxieties, they sacrificed or vowed to the gods human victims, believing "that the deity would not be satisfied for the life of one man without the death of another;" on such occasions some of their tribes constructed gigantic figures of osiers, and filled them with men, and then set them on fire.[20] When, at the approach of Antigonus, the auguries taken from the entrails of the sacrificial animals, were alarmingly unfavourable, the Gauls, to propitiate the gods, killed their wives and children.[21] The old Saxons, before entering upon an expedition vowed every tenth captive as a sacrifice, and redeemed their

---

14 Comp. *Hom.* Od. III. 191, 192; *Diod. Sic.* V. 79, *Ἰδομενέα καὶ Μηριόνην ... διασωθέντας εἰς τὴν πατρίδα τελευτῆσαι καὶ ταφῆς ἐπιφανοῦς ἀξιωθῆναι καὶ τιμῶν ἀθανάτων.*

15 *Serv.* ad Aen. II. 116; III. 121, 401, 531; X. 264; Schol. ad Od. XIII. 259; comp. also the parallel of Jephthah and his daughter, see Sect. XXIII.

16 *Plut.* Marcell. 3; yet Plutarch denounces the act as barbarous, inhuman and not Roman (*βαρβαρικόν ... ἔκφυλον κτλ.*); see p. 329 note 16.

17 *Liv.* VIII. 10, licere consuli dictatorique et praetori, quum legiones hostium devoveat, non utique se, sed quem velit ex legione Romana scripta civem devovere.

18 Datum hoc nostro generi est, ut luendis periculis publicis piacula simus (Liv. X. 28; comp. VIII. 10, Decius omnes minas periculaque ab Diis superis inferisque in se unum vertit); comp. *Plin.* H. N. XXVIII. 2 (3).

19 *Sueton.* Nero 36.

20 *Caes.* Bell. Gall. VI. 16 (qui sunt adfecti gravioribus morbis quique in proeliis periculisque versantur, aut pro victimis homines immolant, aut se immolaturos vovent ... publiceque ejusdem generis habent instituta sacrificia); *Diod. Sic.* V. 31 (*ὅταν περὶ τινῶν μεγάλων ἐπισκέπτωνται*, adding *παράδοξον καὶ ἄπιστον ἔχουσι νόμιμον*).

21 *Justin.* XXVI. 2 (auspicia belli a parricidio incipientes).

promise with great pomp. The Goths thought victory in battle impossible, unless they had before offered a human sacrifice. The Prussians, previous to commencing an engagement, offered through their high-priest (Criwe) an enemy to their gods Pikollos and Potrimpos. And the inhabitants of the Tonga islands immolate a child when there is dangerous illness in the family, while in less serious cases the members of the house cut off a part of their little finger as an atonement to the gods.[1] But the most remarkable instance is that related in the second Book of Kings.[2] When Mesha, king of Moab, was severely pressed and besieged in Kir-Haraseth by the Israelites and their allies, he sacrificed publicly on the walls of the town his firstborn-son and heir; and when the Hebrews witnessed this act, they withdrew from the city in dismay; which narrative unmistakably proves the notion of the supreme efficacy of human sacrifices in counteracting dangers to have not only been entertained by the Moabites, but shared by the Hebrews in the ninth century.[3]

If victims generally were considered instrumental in ascertaining the issue of uncertain events,[4] *human* victims were deemed especially fitted to disclose the hidden future. They were, therefore, in extraordinary cases employed for divination. The Gauls took their auguries for many ages[5] from the fall of a slaughtered man, from the convulsions of his limbs and the flow of his blood,[6] and a similar practice is stated to have been resorted to by many ancient nations.[7]

The same means of worship by which disasters were supposed to have been obviated, were naturally employed for evincing gratitude when deliverance had been effected. Human victims formed, therefore, not

[1] *Wuttke*, Geschichte des Heidenthums, I. p. 141. [2] III. 26, 27.

[3] See *infra* Sect. XXIII.

[4] See p. 313 notes 15—18.

[5] *Diod. Sic.* V. 31, *παλαιᾷ τινι καὶ πολυχρονίῳ παρατηρήσει περὶ τούτων πεπιστευκότες.*

[6] *Diod. Sic.* l. c. (*καὶ πεσόντος τοῦ πληγέντος ἐκ τῆς πτώσεως καὶ τοῦ σπαραγμοῦ τῶν μελῶν ἔτι δὲ τῆς τοῦ αἵματος ῥύσεως τὸ μέλλον νοοῦσι*); *Strab.* IV. iv. 5, p. 198 (*ἄνθρωπον κατασπεισμένον παίσαντες εἰς νῶτον μαχαίρᾳ ἐμαντεύοντο ἐκ τοῦ σφαδασμοῦ*); *Tacit.* Ann. XIV. 30 (nam cruore captivo adolere aras et hominum fibris consulere deos fas habebant).

[7] Comp. *Porph.* Abst. II. 51 (*ἐπιφαίνεται γὰρ μᾶλλον, ὥς φασι, τοῖς τούτων* — sc. men — *σπλάγχνοις τὰ μέλλοντα, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων δι᾽ ἀνθρώπων σπλαγχνεύονται*); *Juven.* VI. 556, 557 (Pectora pullorum rimatur et exta catelli, *Interdum et pueri*); *Dion Cass.* LXXIII. 16 (*ἔκτεινε*—Didius Julianus—*δὲ καὶ παῖδας συχνοὺς ἐπὶ μαγγανεύμασιν, ὡς καὶ ἀποστρέψαι τι τῶν μελλόντων, εἰ προμάθοι αὐτά, δυνησόμενος*); LXXIX. 11 (*παῖδας σφαγιαζόμενος καὶ μαγγανεύμασιν χρώμενος*); *Lamprid.* Heliogabal. c. 8 (cecidit et humanas victimas lectis ad hoc pueris nobilibus ... cum inspiceret exta puerilia etc.); *Socrat.* Hist. Eccl. III. 2; comp. *Hor.* Epod. V. 83 *sqq.*; *F. Lindenbrog* ad Amm. Marc. XXIX. 9.

unfrequently the thank-offering after happy events and successful wars.[8] Sextus Pompejus, having landed in safety after a violent storm at sea, ordered men to be thrown alive into the waves, together with their horses, as an oblation to Neptune.[9] The people of Argos, after having taken Mycenae, dedicated every tenth inhabitant to the gods.[10] After the victory over L. Antonius and the capture of Perusia, Augustus is related to have sacrificed 300 senators and knights on the altar of Caesar as an offering of atonement.[11] The Carthaginians, having defeated Agathocles, burnt by night the finest prisoners as a eucharistic offering to the gods.[12] At the conclusion of campaigns, the Assyrians offered captive soldiers to their god of war Nergal.[13] After the battle of the Teutoburg forest, the Cherusci sacrificed a large number of prisoners, and suspended their bodies on trees. The Saxons, after their war with Charlemagne, killed on the holy Harz-mountain all the Frankish prisoners in honour of their god Wodan.

Next to expiation and thanks-giving, human sacrifices were most frequently offered in commemoration of the dead; and they are so met with in the most different countries and ages. It may be doubtful, whether the Egyptian kings in early times sacrificed foreigners at the grave of Osiris,[14] since Herodotus[15] distinctly denies it.[16] Nor is it quite certain whether the custom of consigning to the grave of departed persons their best and most attached friends can in all cases be looked upon in the light of a sacrifice, since it seems frequently to have possessed a different meaning. In Dahomey, in former times, the moment the death of the king was reported in the palace, the women began to

[8] Aristomenes of Messene is by Eusebius (Praep. Ev. IV. xvi. 9) related to have sacrificed 300 men to Jupiter, but seems in reality to have three times offered the sacrifice hecatomphonia (ἑκατομφόνια) customary among the Messenians from early times, whenever any one among them had killed 100 enemies (see *Pausan.* IV. xix. 3).

[9] *Dion Cass.* XLVIII. 48.

[10] *Diod. Sic.* XI. 65.

[11] *Dion Cass.* XLVIII. 14; *Suetonius*, August. c. 15 (scribunt quidam, trecentos ex dedititiis electos utriusque ordinis ad aram Divo Julio extructam Idibus Màrtiis hostiarum more mactatos); comp. *Propert.* El. I. xxii. 2, 3 (Si Perusina tibi patriae sunt nota sepulcra Italiae duris funera temporibus).

[12] *Diod. Sic.* XX. 65.

[13] Comp. 2 Ki. XVII. 30; *Gesen.* Com. über den Jesaia II. 345; see Sect. XXII.

[14] *Diod. Sic.* I. 88. For red-haired men, such as the rite required, were but rarely found among the natives of Egypt; hence the fable of the murder of strangers by Busiris, that is the grave of Osiris, probably originated; *Diod. Sic.* l. c.; comp. also *Plut.* De Isid. c. 73.

[15] II. 45.

[16] Sir G. Wilkinson, in his notes on the passage, in Rawlinson's edition, shares the opinion of Herodotus; though even he is obliged to admit the possibility "that in their earliest days, the Egyptians may have had human sacrifices like the Greeks and others"; comp. *Costaz*, Descr. de l'Eg. Ant. mem. I. 75.

kill themselves and one another, because the sovereign must enter Dead-land with royal state, accompanied by some of his wives and eunuchs, singers and bards, drummers and soldiers; the greatest number was 500 persons; and this custom prevailed through the African continent to the south-eastern country of the Cazembe, and in many parts, where a much larger number of human victims was demanded;[1] at present, the Dahomans celebrate after the death of the king "the grand customs", distinguished by greater splendour and bloodshed than the "annual customs";[2] those held in 1791 lasted for three months, from January to March, when no less than 500 men, women and children fell victims to the detestable superstition.[3] Of many analogous instances we shall only adduce a few more. In Maabar, a province of India, it was usual upon the death of a king and when his body was burnt, for all his devoted servants to throw themselves into the same fire, "intending by this act to bear him company in another life."[4] Similarly the Scythians, at the funeral obsequies of their monarch, buried together with him in one grave his favourite wives after they had been strangled, his cup-bearer, a cook, a groom, a page, a messenger, and horses, besides many valuable objects; and after the lapse of a year, they sacrificed to him, under peculiar ceremonies, 50 of his best servants and 50 of his finest horses.[5] A similar motive must perhaps be attributed to the fearful usage of burning the wives in the funeral pile of their husbands, a usage which obtained among the Wends,[6] the Heruli,[7] among most of the Thracian tribes, where the wife supposed to have been most beloved by her husband, was slain on his tomb by her own nearest relation, having been glorified both by men and women for a distinction eagerly desired by all wives,[8] and especially among the Hindoos.[9] That practice is hardly, as has

---

[1] See *Burton*, Mission to Gelele, II. 20, 23, 24; compare the "Oyo customs" performed at Koma, *Burton*, l. c. I. 197—199.

[2] See *supra* p. 325.

[3] Yet the accounts "of 2000 killed in one day, the canoe paddled in a pool of gore" and other tales are gross exaggerations disseminated from hatred or interest (comp. *Burton*, l. c. II. 19—22, 335). "You have seen", said the king of Dahomey to Commodore Wilmot, "that only a few are sacrificed, and not the thousands that wicked men have told the world of" (l. c. p. 359); compare *Snelgrave*, Voyage to Guinea, pp. 32—34, where it is related that the King, on a military expedition, sacrificed 4000 men in one province alone.

[4] *Marco Polo*, Travels, III. xx. 2.

[5] *Herod.* IV. 71, 72.

[6] *Bonifac.* Ep. ad Ethelbald.

[7] *Procop.* B. Goth. II. 14; *Grimm*, Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer, p. 451.

[8] *Herod.* V. 5; *Cic.* Tusc. V. 27; *Val. Max.* II. vi. 14; *Mela*, II. 2.

[9] By the well-known *suttee* (properly meaning a pure and virtuous woman, then the rite, which however was originally called *saha-gamana*); in some cases, burying alive was substituted for burning (*Ward*, View of

been maintained,[10] of purely social origin, to prevent the wives from poisoning their husbands, for in some instances the sisters of the husband devoted themselves to the flames; much less was it prompted by the avariciousness of the priests coveting the jewels with which the widow was decked, for she burnt herself with all her ornaments.[11] However, the custom, which is not of very early date among the Hindoos, as it is neither mentioned in the Vedas nor in the code of Manu, was not by far so universal as has frequently been asserted. It was limited by numerous conditions. First the act was to be completely and absolutely spontaneous, not urged even by persuasion either on the part of the relatives or priests. If the widow refused, she was by no means regarded to have disgraced herself, but continued to enjoy general respect provided she carried out certain ascetic exercises, was zealous in piety, charity, and prayer, and remained single and strictly chaste;[12] though, of course, the wife who followed her husband in death, was extolled by fervent praises, and cheered by promises of eternal felicity, for she was believed to purify not only her consort, had he even been guilty of the blackest crimes, but also his and her own paternal and maternal ancestors.[13] Again, the rite was interdicted by most sects, if the widow, at the death of her husband, happened to be in another town, since both were to be burnt on the same pile; or if she was at the time unclean or pregnant, or believed to be so, or had little children who required her care. If all these circumstances be considered, it will be admitted that the usage was not so awful in reality as it is in principle; that, in fact, the "martyrs of that superstition have never been numerous", as Colebrooke observes, who, writing in 1795, adds, "it is certain that the instances of the widows' sacrifices are now rare; on this it is only necessary to appeal to the recollection of every person residing in India, how few instances have actually occurred within his knowledge."[14] But the idea of an offering of expiation performed for departed relatives or friends, appears distinctly among the Greeks and Romans. Achilles

---

the History of the Hindoos, vol. I. p. LXXI; vol. II. p. 110; *Rhode*, Religiöse Bildung der Hindus, II. 474, 475).

[10] *Diod. Sic.* XVII. 91; XIX. 33, 34.

[11] Comp. in general, *Mela*, II. 2; *Cic.* Tusc. V. 27; *Diod. Sic.* ll. cc.; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. VI. 10.

[12] *Manu*, V. 160—166; comp., however, Strabo XV. i. 62, p. 714, who states, on the authority of Aristobulus, that "the women who refused to submit to this custom were disgraced" (*τὰς δὲ μὴ ὑπομενούσας ἀδοξεῖν*); or according to Diodorus Siculus (XIX. 33), they were compelled to remain widows, and were, as despisers of the gods (*ὡς ἀσεβοῦσαι*), for ever excluded from sacrifices and other holy rites.

[13] *Bohlen*, Alt. Ind. I. 293—302; *Rhode*, l. c. II. 469—475.

[14] Essays, p. 75, edit. 1858; comp. *Strabo*, l. c. (*παρά τισι δ' ἀκούειν φησὶ καὶ συγκατακαιομένας τὰς γυναῖκας τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἀσμένας*).

threw into the funeral pile of Patroclus, not only numerous cattle and horses and two dogs, nor only jars with honey and oil, but also twelve Torjans.[1] Polyxena was sacrificed to the manes of Achilles. Alexander the Great killed on his father's tomb the accomplices in his murder, in order to propitiate his shades. And Amestris, the wife of Xerxes, ordered twelve men to be buried during her life-time to render the Hades propitious to herself.[2] At Rome the bowels of slaughtered boys seem occasionally to have been offered to the gods of the lower world.[3] But more frequent, as sacrifices for the dead, were gladiatorial combats, in which, if none of the fighters died on the spot, at least blood was required to flow. So the three sons of Aemilius Lepidus (in B. C. 217) caused 22 pairs of gladiators to fight for three days at the funeral games of their father;[4] and somewhat later Titus Flaminius evinced his filial affection by instituting for three days a combat of 74 men.[5]

But human sacrifices were, besides, offered on any extraordinary occasion to which a paramount importance was attached. The Getae in Thraçe were in the habit of despatching every fifth year one of their number as a messenger to Zalmoxis, their teacher and law-giver, with orders to let him know their wants and wishes: the man appointed by lot was thrown into the air and made to fall upon the points of three javelins; if he was transfixed and died, the deity was supposed to be propitious, if not he was accused of wickedness and considered to have been rejected by the god.[6] Similarly in Dahomey, whenever the monarch deems it desirable to convey to his forefathers an account of his actions or of the events of the day, however trivial and frivolous, he sends a messenger to them by chopping off his head, in which manner at least a thousand victims fall annually;[7] and at times, he sends, as an ocean sacrifice, from Agbome a man carried in a hammock with the dress, the stool, and the umbrella of a caboceer; a canoe takes him out to sea, where he is thrown to the sharks.[8]

We believe therefore there is no need of additional proofs to show that human sacrifices were among ancient nations very generally deemed the most precious and the most acceptable oblations that could be presented to the deity.

---

[1] *Hom.* Il. XXIII. 166—182; comp. *Virg.* Aen. X. 517—520.

[2] *Plut.* De Superst. 13; comp. the expiatory offering of Octavian after the capture of Perusia, *supra* p. 333 n. 11.

[3] *Cic.* In *Vatin.* c. 6 (quum inferiorum animas elicere, quum puerorum extis deos manes mactare soleas).

[4] *Liv.* XXIII. 30.

[5] Liv. XLI. 33; comp. *Serv.* Aen. III. 67.

[6] *Herod.* IV. 94.

[7] See *Burton*, Mission to Gelele, II. 24, 25; comp. p. 331.

[8] L. c. II. 141.

### 2. The persons selected.

As human sacrifices, like all other offerings, were prized in proportion to the self-denial which they involved, *self-immolation* was regarded as the highest and most glorious offering, since man cannot manifest his earnestness and religious devotion more strikingly than by delivering up his own life to move the will of the gods.[9] In the war of the seven Argives against Thebes under the leadership of Polyneices, Teiresias or the Delphic oracle prophesied the victory to the Thebans if Menoeceus, the chaste son of Creon, would sacrifice himself for the welfare of the country to Mars incensed on account of the slaughter of the sacred dragon by Cadmus; and Menoeceus accordingly killed himself outside the gates of the town.[10] When the Athenians under king Theseus waged war against the Peloponnesians under Eurystheus because they refused to deliver up the children of Hercules, they received from the oracle the assurance of conquest if one of the hero's offspring devoted himself to Demeter; upon which Macaria the daughter of Hercules and Deianira offered herself spontaneously.[11] The two Greeks, who at the purification of Athens by Epimenides gave themselves up as expiatory offerings, were revered as the rescuers of the city.[12] Even the death of Leonidas at Thermopylae was later conceived as a spontaneous sacrifice for the safety of Greece in consequence of a divine oracle.[13] The Decii[14] and M. Curtius[15] were for their pious heroism glorified as the saviours of their country. When in a battle of the Carthaginians against the Syracusans, the victory seemed to incline to the enemy, Hamilcar threw himself into the flames to propitiate the gods.[16] Antinous, the page of the emperor Hadrian, has made his memory famous by precipitating himself into the Nile, because he believed that his death would secure the success of his master's schemes.[17] In all parts of India, at the processions of the image of Juggernauth, enthusiasts threw themselves under the colossal chariot which carried the god, to be crushed by the ponderous wheels, either in fulfilment of a vow, or to appease the deity; and though this practice may not be of very early origin, since it is neither mentioned by ancient writers nor later travellers,[18] it obtains to this day, at Orissa, Serampore, and

[9] Comp. *Philo*, De Vict. 13, *κτημάτων γὰρ τὸ μέγιστον αὐτός τίς ἐστιν αὐτῷ οὗ παραχωρεῖ καὶ ἐξίσταται.*

[10] *Eurip.* Phoen. 898—952; *Apollod.* III. vi. 7; *Pausan.* IX. xxv. 1; comp. IX. xvii. 1; *Stat.* Theb. X. 756 *sqq.*

[11] *Eurip.* Heraclid. 408—607, esp. 531 (*ἑκοῦσα κοὐκ ἀκοῦσα*), 547—551; *Paus.* I. xxxii. 6; *Plut.* Pelop. 21.

[12] See *supra* p. 328.

[13] *Plut.* Pelop. 21; comp. *Herod.* VII. 223, 224.

[14] See *supra* p. 331.

[15] *Liv.* VII. 6 (manum nunc in coelum, nunc in patentes terrae hiatus ad deos manes porrigentem se devovisse).

[16] *Herod.* VII. 167.

[17] *Dion Cass.* LXIX. 11; *Spartian.* Hadrian. c. 14.

[18] Comp. *Bohlen*, Alt. Ind. I. 275.

elsewhere, under the very eyes of the British authorities, and it is so difficult to eradicate chiefly on account of the prevailing conviction that the victim, had he even committed the foulest crime, becomes spotless, yea is changed into the god Shiva himself, and through many ages enjoys divine bliss and honour.[1] An eye-witness, giving an account[2] of the festival which took place at Serampore on the 6th of July 1864, describes the chariot as a vast house of wood seventy feet high and twenty square, rising tier above tier to the idol's throne, and loaded at every stage with Brahmins and gigantic figures. The chariot "crushed out a life with every revolution of its hideous wheels, covered as they were with human flesh and gore...The Brahmins looked down from the car upon the poor wretches with perfect unconcern, and were even signalling the crowd to pull again."[3] The voluntary death of the Hindoo wives on the demise of their husbands, has above been commented upon. Among the old Prussians, the custom prevailed that the high-priest, having attained a certain age, burnt himself for the weal of the people.[4] A different character must be ascribed to the instances of self-destruction sanctioned by the tenets of the stoics, when life seemed to be a burden or a disgrace, or by the doctrines of the Hindoo sages, who, although denouncing suicide as a rule, deem it a most meritorious act to end an ignoble life of disease or decrepitude by the sacred and purifying flames or waves which secure to the sufferer immediate admission into heaven:[5] it suffices to allude to the story of Cabanus (originally Sphinas, the happy), the Indian friend of Alexander the Great,[6] and to that of Zarmanochegas (that is, the holy) of Barygaza, who lived at Athens in the time of Augustus;[7] and, in the year 166 of the present era, the convert Peregrinus followed their example.[8] In fact, pious Christians believed martyrdom to be the noblest form of sacrifice. This was the opinion of Origen;[9] its harmony with the

[1] Comp. Asiat. Res. V. 374, 380; *M. N. Schmidth*, De Sacrificiis religionis Indo-Brahmanicae, pp. 19, 20.

[2] In the *Times*.

[3] See also the fine description of Southey, in Curse of Kehama, "A thousand pilgrims strain" etc.

[4] *Mone*, Geschichte des nord. Heidenth., I. 82, 92.

[5] *Lucian*, De Morte Peregrini, c. 25; *Lucan*, Phars. III. 240—243 (pro! quanta est gloria genti Injecisse manum fatis etc.); *Joseph*. Bell. Jud. VII. viii. 7 (*Ἀρ᾽ οὖν οὐκ αἰδούμεθα χεῖρον Ἰνδῶν φρονοῦντες, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἀτολμίας κτλ.*); *Strabo*, XV. i. 73 p. 720; comp. *Bohlen*, Alt. Ind. I. 287—290.

[6] *Arrian*, VII. 3; *Strabo*, XV. i. 4, 64—68; *Diod. Sic*. XVII. 107; *Plut*. Alex. 65; *Aelian*. Var. Hist. V. 6 (*ὅτε ἐβουλήθη ἀπολῦσαι αὑτὸν ἐκ τῶν τοῦ σώματος δεσμῶν*).

[7] *Strabo*, XV. i. 73, p. 720, where the epitaph on his grave is thus stated, *Ζαρμανοχηγὰς Ἰνδὸς ἀπὸ Βαργόσης κατὰ τὰ πάτρια Ἰνδῶν ἔθη ἑαυτὸν ἀπαθανατίσας κεῖται.*

[8] See *Lucian*, l. c. 21—36.

[9] Comp. p. 330; *K. Bähr*, Lehre der Kirche vom Tode Jesu, pp. 113 *sqq*.

spirit of Christianity is proved by the example of Jesus himself;[10] and a modern theologian writes, "He who, under circumstances, cannot become a martyr, thereby shows that his whole worship has been hollow and empty, and that he was never in earnest with regard to the holocaust so strongly demanded by the Law of God. Whoever has been in earnest, sees in martyrdom nothing but the manifestation of a principle which had ever lived within him."[11]

Next to self-immolation the most valued sacrifice was that of the *dearest relation*.[12] Therefore, the Phoenicians and all those who adopted their religious doctrines and rites, burnt their *children* to Moloch, a custom which prevailed to an almost incredible extent, and which took deep root among the Hebrews also.[13] All children so sacrificed were naturally required to be healthy and well-formed;[14] but the offering was regarded particularly praiseworthy if the child was the *firstborn* or the *only* son of his parents.[15]

*Priests* and *pious people* were next regarded as highly acceptable victims. "Chariclea", says Heliodorus, "was from the beginning reserved to the gods on account of her unsurpassed excellence."[16] Those who had devoted themselves to certain deities, could at any time be killed in honour of them, because by death their souls were supposed to be raised at once to the gods, and to be lifted into heaven, their true abodes.[17] In the service of Ashtarte, the immolation of priests was preserved up to the time of the Christian era; and even in the age of Strabo, an attendant of the temple near Iberia, in the Scythian country of Albania, was annually seized by a priest, bound with sacred fetters, and maintained sumptuously, to be sacrificed in honour of the goddess at the expiration of the year.[18] The chief priest of Diana Taurica or Ari-

---

10 See Sect. XIX; comp. esp. Philipp. II. 17; 2 Tim. IV. 6; Ephes. V. 2.

11 *Hengstenberg*, Opfer, pp. 34, 35.

12 *Ἔθυον τῶν φιλτάτων τινά*, *Porph.* Abst. II. 56; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 16 (*ὡς καὶ τοῖς τῶν φιλτάτων αἵμασι . . . ἱλεοῦσθαι νομίζειν τὰς μιαιφόνους δυνάμεις κτλ.*). 13 See Sectt. XXII. XXIII.

14 *Oros.* Adv. Pagan. Hist. IV. 6, puras animo et incorruptas offerri hostias mos est; comp. *Curt.* IV. 3 (15, ingenuus puer).

15 Comp. *ἀπαρχαὶ ἀνθρώπων*, the *firstlings of men*, presented by the Eretrians and Magnetians to Apollo whom they revered as the bestower of all fruits, as the paternal, beneficent god, and the patron of births (*Plut.* Pyth. orac. 16; comp. *Eurip.* Phoen. 203, *ἀκροθίνια Λοξίᾳ*; Iph. Taur. 459); *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 46; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. I. x. 36 (*υἱὸν μονογενῆ . . . ὃν διὰ τοῦτο Ἰεοὺδ* — i. e. יחיד — *ἐκάλουν*; comp. Gen. XXII. 2, קח־נא את־בנך את־יחידך); In laud. Constant. c. 13 (*Κρόνῳ γὰρ Φοίνικες καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ἔθυον τὰ ἀγαπητὰ καὶ μονογενῆ τῶν τέκνων*); *Diod. Sic.* XX. 14 (*τῶν υἱῶν τοὺς κρατίστους*); see also 2 Ki. III. 26, 27 (*supra* p. 332).

16 *Heliod.* X. 9 (*θεοῖς ... διὰ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς φύσεως ἀρχῆθεν φυλαττομένην*). 17 *Macrob.* Saturn. III. 7.

18 *Strab.* XI. iv. 7, p. 503.

cina in Latium was commonly slain by his successor's own hands.[1] On important occasions, the Franks cast lots among themselves to decide who was to die as a sacrifice, and the person so marked out was regarded as the special favourite of the gods.[2] — In Meroe it was customary for the *king* to be killed as a sacrifice when the priests deemed it expedient or pretended to have been directed by an oracle; which usage was maintained up to the third century before Christ, when the Ethiopian king Ergamenes, having been summoned for a similar sacrifice, killed the priests and abolished the custom.[3] As chastity was regarded a chief condition of holiness, *virgins* and *unstained youths* were, in many instances, esteemed as victims, especially in honour of maiden goddesses, as Minerva and Diana; the former deity received annually a virgin on her altar at Laodicea.[4] Pelopidas was commanded, by a vision in a dream, to offer a fair virgin;[5] the Ethiopians sacrificed to Helios and Selene none but chaste persons, whose innocence was tested by their being placed on a sacred grate (*ἐσχάρα*) which, if they were not spotless, was supposed to burn off their feet.[6]

Anxious to show that success in great or dangerous enterprises was attributed to the favour of the gods, most nations, both at the commencement of a military expedition and after its happy conclusion, sacrificed *captives of war*, in the one case for supplication, in the other for grateful acknowledgment,[7] which custom was continued up to a very late period.[8] For this purpose the first prisoners captured[9] were deemed most desirable, as among the Ethiopians, whenever they triumphed over foreign enemies,[10] among the Thulitae or Scandinavians,[11] and occasionally among the Persians.[12] Particularly grateful also were captives of *high rank*, such as *chiefs* and *generals*, who, among the old Prussians and others, were burnt on a funeral pile together with their arms and horses. In other cases, supplication or gratitude was manifested by the *multitude* of victims. The Scythians sacrificed one of every hundred prisoners;[13] the Argivi, after the conquest of Mycenae, devoted every tenth inhabitant to the gods;[14] the Tarquinians (in B. C. 355) slaughtered 307 captive Romans,[15] and the Mexicans as many of the Spanish in-

---

1 *Strab.* V. iii. 12, p. 239; comp. *Pausan.* II. xxvii. 4; *Hygin.* Fab. 261; *Sueton.* Calig. 35; *Ovid*, Fast. III. 260.

2 *Mone*, l. c. p. 136.

3 *Diod. Sic.* III. 6.

4 See *supra* p. 327.

5 See, however, *infra*.

6 Heliod. X. 7.

7 Comp. *Ovid*, Fast. I. 336 (Hostibus a domitis hostia nomen habet); see *supra* pp. 330—332.

8 Comp. *Tertull.* Adv. Gnost. 7; *Just. Mart.* Apoll. II. 12; *Tatian.* c. 46.

9 Called ἀπαρχαὶ τοῦ πολέμου, *Heliod.* X. 7.

10 *Heliod.* X. 7, 20.

11 *Procop.* Bell. Goth. II. 15.

12 Comp. *Herod.* VII. 180.

13 *Herod.* IV. 62.

14 *Diod. Sic.* XI. 65.

15 Liv. VII. 15.

vaders as they were able to seize. It is noteworthy that, in most cases, sacrifices of captives were employed as a means of divination and of ascertaining the issue of the war, as is related of the Lusitanians, the Britons, and the inhabitants of Mona (or Anglesey), the Cimbri, the Prussians, and others.[16]

The custom of sacrificing prisoners of war probably gave rise, among many tribes, to the idea of killing in honour of the gods *strangers* rather than natives; for foreigners and enemies were extensively held to be equivalent terms.[17] The sacrifice of shipwrecked strangers by the Scythians in Tauris at the shrine of Diana, has become celebrated by the descriptions of historians and poets.[18] Foreigners were offered by the Hindoos,[19] by the Egyptians in honour of Typhon,[20] by the Ethiopians, who are said to have periodically seized two strangers to slaughter them for the welfare of the community,[21] and frequently by the old Germans.[22] From this point it is not difficult to trace

### 3. The gradual abolition of human sacrifices.

For when men accustomed themselves to consider strangers as oblations pleasing to the gods, they imperceptibly strove to substitute them for their own countrymen and relatives. They thus satisfied their deepest feelings of religion by presenting a human sacrifice, and yet avoided the tormenting conflict into which such sacrifice might bring them with their natural sympathies. But even this first step was not achieved without a severe struggle. It was by men of a fanatic or enthusiastic creed regarded as a cowardly evasion of the most sacred of religious duties. As the Phoenicians and those who adopted their faith believed their eldest sons rightfully to belong to Moloch, the childless among them, to evince their holy zeal, were from early times wont to *buy* the sons of poor persons and to present them to the god; the mother was required to be present at the sacrifice; but if she shed a tear or uttered a sigh, she lost the purchase money, without saving her offspring.[23] Such precedents induced rich parents secretly to purchase boys and to sacrifice them as their own.[24] The detestable practice seems, in later times, to have obtained to a considerable extent. Therefore, when the Carthaginians were defeated by Agathocles, they supposed that the disaster

16 See *supra*, pp. 332, 333; comp. *Strabo*, III. iii. 7, p. 154.

17 Comp. *Plut.* Marc. 3.

18 Comp. *Eurip.* Iph. Taur. 28, 29; *Ovid*, Trist. IV. iv. 63, 64; Pont. III. ii. 65 *sqq.*; *Juven.* XV. 116 *sqq.*; *Plin.* H. N. VII. 2; *Lucian*, De Sacrif. 13; etc.

19 Asiat. Research. V. p. 386.

20 See *supra* p. 327.

21 *Diod. Sic.* II. 55; see, however, *infra* p, 344.

22 *Grimm*, Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer, p. 344.

23 *Plut.* De Superst. 13.

24 Comp. *Plut.* l. c. 20.

had been sent by Saturn wroth at being deprived of his due honours; they appeased him by a speedy offering of 200 boys of the best families; and 300 adult persons joined in the sacrifice spontaneously.[1]

The next advance towards mitigating the terrors of human sacrifices was to slaughter men who by the laws of the land had forfeited their lives, especially *condemned criminals*. In Maabar, in India, the culprit sentenced to die usually sacrificed himself in honour of some particular idol, and the readiness evinced in the act was by the people regarded as eminent piety.[2] At Athens, malefactors were kept and fed at the public expense, sometimes for many years, to be offered as expiatory sacrifices at the festival of the Thargelia, at impending or actual public misfortunes, such as pestilence, war, or famine.[3] The same usage prevailed in Rhodus, where primitively a pious man, and afterwards a criminal, was sacrificed at the festival of Saturn;[4] it obtained on the island of Leucas,[5] and in Rome where it was acted upon in the worship of Jupiter Latialis considerably later than the commencement of the Christian era;[6] among the Cimbri, the Frieses, and the Gauls, who went so far as to look upon the sacrifice of delinquents, especially thieves and robbers, as peculiarly agreeable to the gods, and offered innocent men only when convicts were not at hand.[7] In Dahomey, the victims are either foreigners, especially captives of war, or if natives criminals and dressed as such.[8] In fact, a modern traveller received the assurance from king Gelele himself, that "many victims would be released, and that those executed would be only the worst of criminals and malignant war-captives."[9]

Blood, the symbol of life, being generally regarded as the chief and most important element in sacrifices,[10] thoughtful men, urged moreover by considerations of humanity, held it to be unnecessary to kill the human victim, and declared that the gods are effectually propitiated

---

1 *Diod. Sic.* XX. 14; *Lactant.* Instit. I. 21, 33.

2 *Marco Polo*, III. 20.

3 *Tzetzes*, Chil. V. 25; Schol. Aristoph. Equit. 36, 1144; Ran. 730—733, *ἔτρεφον γάρ τινας Ἀθηναῖοι λίαν ἀγενεῖς καὶ ἀχρήστους . . . ἔθυον τούτους ἕνεκα καθαρθῆναι τοῦ μιάσματος, οὓς καὶ ἐπωνόμαζον καθάρματα* (comp. 1 Cor. IV. 13).

4 *Porph.* De Abst. II. 54.

5 *Strab.* X. ii. 9, p. 452; see *infra*.

6 As is confirmed by Minucius Felix, Lactantius, and Tertullian (Apol. c. 9, Jupiter quidam quem ludis suis humano proluunt sanguine); see *Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, p. 543; comp. *Sueton*. Calig. 27.

7 *Caes.* Bell. Gall. VI. 16, supplicia eorum qui in furto aut in latrocinio aut aliqua noxia sint comprehensi, gratiora dis immortalibus esse arbitrantur; sed cum ejus generis copia defecit etiam ad innocentium supplicium descendunt.

8 Comp. *Burton*, l. c. I. 345—350; II. 20, 28, 352.

9 L. c. I. 372.

10 See Sect. IX. 7.

provided some of the man's blood flowed in their honour. Thus another and a very decided step towards a less revolting form of human sacrifices was made. In Sparta, the image of Artemis Orthia, supposed to have been that once taken away by Orestes and Iphigenia from Tauris, was for a long time worshipped by human victims, but this sacrifice was later, it is asserted by Lycurgus, changed into the flagellation of boys (*διαμαστίγωσις*), so that the image was sprinkled with their blood;[11] and at Alea in Arcadia, Dionysos was honoured at an annual festival (*σκιέρεια*) by the scourging of women.[12] In Elis, a libation of blood was offered at the grave of the dead as an expiation.[13] The priests of Phoenicia and Syria, especially of Baal, those of Hierapolis, of the Greeks in later periods, and chiefly those of Bramah and Buddha, were in the habit, on certain festivals or serious occasions, of cutting themselves with knives and lancets "till the blood gushed out upon them";[14] the same practice sprang up in Rome where it was observed by the priests and priestesses of Bellona;[15] and it prevails still among the Dervishes of Turkey and Persia.[16] The Carian settlers in Egypt, when on the great festival of Isis at Busiris the sacrifice had been performed in honour of Osiris, "cut their faces with their knives."[17] In Rome, the image of Jupiter Latiaris was every year sprinkled with the blood of a gladiator who had been wounded in the public games, and this custom was maintained up to the second and third century after Christ.[18] When the Romans rigorously interdicted human

11 *Pausan.* III. xvi. 6 (*οὕτω τῷ ἀγάλματι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ταυρικῇ θυσιῶν ἐμμεμένηκεν ἀνθρώπων αἵματι ἥδεσθαι*); comp. *Cic.* Tusc. II. 14 (34); *Lucian*, Anachars. c. 38; Schol. Stat. Theb. IV. 227.

12 *Porph.* Abst. II. 27; *Pausan.* VIII. xxiii. 1 (*καὶ ἐν Διονύσου τῇ ἑορτῇ κατὰ μάντευμα ἐκ Δελφῶν μαστιγοῦνται γυναῖκες, καθὸ καὶ οἱ Σπαρτιατῶν ἔφηβοι παρὰ τῇ Ὀρθίᾳ*); comp. *Porphyr.* Abst. II. 27 (*ἐμφύλιον ἀεὶ αἷμα ῥαίνουσι πρὸς τοὺς βωμούς*); comp. *Eurip.* Iph. Taur. 1458—1461.

13 *Pind.* Olymp. I. 90, 91 (146, 147, *νῦν δὲ αἱμακουρίαις ἀγλααῖσι μέμικται*).

14 1 Ki. XVIII. 28; *Lucian*, Syr. Dea, c. 50 (*τάμνονταί τε τοὺς πήχεας*); comp. cc. 51, 59.

15 *Tibull.* El. I. 47—49 (Ipsa bipenne suos caedit violenta lacertos, Sanguine et effuso spargit inulta deam, Statque latus praefixa veru, stat saucia pectus); *Propert.* El. III. xv. 15 (Cur aliquis sacris laniat sua brachia cultris?); *Stat.* Theb. X. 170—175; *Lucan.* Phars. I. 565 (quos sectis Bellona lacertis Saeva movet cecinere deos, crinemque rotantes Sanguineum populis ulularunt tristia Galli); the "Bellonarii" performed the rite annually, though perhaps only in a symbolical manner, on the 24th of March, hence called "dies sanguinis"; whereas Commodus "from love of cruelty forced them really to cut open their arms" (*Lamprid.* Commod. 9).

16 Comp. *Rauwolf*, Reise I. p. 149; *Olearius*, Persian. Reisebeschreib. IV. p. 243; see *Rosenmüller*, Morgenl. III. 189—191.

17 *Herod.* II. 61; comp. notes on Lev. XIX. 28.

18 *Tertullian*, Adv. Gnost. 7; *Just. Mart.* Apol. II. 12.

sacrifices among the Gauls, the latter, as a substitute for their ancient rites, scratched the skin of the devoted person, and offered to the deity the blood so obtained.[1] And the Incas in Peru presented cakes sprinkled over with human blood.[2]

A further progress was manifest in the growing belief that the *intention* of offering a human being is as pleasing to the gods as the actual oblation. Not sufficiently enlightened to perceive the abomination of human sacrifices, and yet too merciful to slaughter their fellow-creatures if it could possibly be avoided, some tribes resorted to the most curious devices to overcome the harassing dilemma. They not only connived at but facilitated the escape of the intended victim. In Orchomenos, the maiden appointed to be sacrificed to Dionysos was allowed to save herself by flight from the very altar.[3] The eldest member of the family of Athamas, doomed to die if he entered the Prytaneum of his native town, was permitted to seek refuge in another country.[4] On the island of Leucas, a man was annually, at the festival of Apollo, precipitated into the sea as an expiation for the people; but various kinds of wings were attached to his body, and even birds suspended at his person to lighten by their fluttering the fall or the leap; below, many persons were stationed around in small fishing boats to receive him, to preserve his life if possible, and to carry him beyond the boundary of the country.[5] The Ethiopians placed the two foreigners whom they seized from time to time as a national atonement,[6] in a strong vessel, furnished them with provisions for six months, and ordered them to sail on in a southward direction till they came to a blooming island, where a hospitable reception awaited them: the safe arrival of the men on the island was by the Ethiopians considered as a pledge that the country would, during the period of 600 years, enjoy peace and prosperity. So ancient a work as the Vedas commanded, as a symbolical rite, to tie to posts the persons devoted to death in honour of the goddess Kali, then, after the recital of the hymn on the allegorical immolation of Narayana, to release them unhurt, and finally to make oblations of butter on the sacrificial fire.[7] Later, the multiplied conditions, under which human sacrifices were permitted in India, rendered their frequent occurrence impossible.[8] Gradually, by the softening

[1] *Mela*, III. 2 (manent vestigia feritatis jam abolitae, atque ut ab ultimis caedibus temperant, ita nihilominus ubi devotos altaribus admovere delibant). [2] *Robertson*, America, II. 559.

[3] *Plut.* Quaest. Graec. 38; *Herod.* VII. 197. [4] See *supra* p. 329.

[5] Strab. X. ii. 9, p. 452.

[6] See *supra* p. 341.

[7] *Colebrooke*, Asiat. Research. VIII. p. 437; comp. Essays, pp. 35, 36 (edit. 1858); *Moor*, Hindupanth. p. 366.

[8] Comp. Asiat. Research. V. 369 *sqq.*; *Rhode*, Hindus, II. 249—251: the

influence of the Brahmans and the wisdom of Gautama, they ceased entirely, and were in later writings forbidden by the threat of eternal punishment in hell.[9] In a similar manner, they were rejected and denounced in other countries, as better notions regarding the nature of the deity and of atonement prevailed.[10] From early times, there was, in spite of the cosmic character of paganism,[11] among more civilized tribes a tendency towards that end. Not unfrequently *animals*, considered as legitimate and acceptable representatives, were sacrificed instead of devoted men.[12] It was incompatible with the national character of the Greeks to suffer long the atrocity of human sacrifices which was utterly abhorrent to the nature of Hellenism.[13] Homer mentions indeed the immolation of men in honour of Patroclus, but not the tradition of Iphigenia's sacrifice. The horrid custom seems to have been brought into Greece by foreign contact and as a foreign element.[14] Though it is true, as we have abundantly shown, that "we find traces of it throughout almost the whole Hellenic world, in the *cultus* of almost every god, and in all periods of their independent history",[15] it is certain that it was from the fifth century openly denounced as an unholy and godless practice repugnant to the spirit of the national laws.[16] The substitution of animals for men is related in legends reaching back even into pre-historic times;

---

king must give his consent; the victim must neither be a Brahman, nor a Kshatrya, nor a descendant of either; he must not before have been devoted to a god or a Brahman; he must be childless, absolutely perfect in form and health, and not under twelve years of age; the sacrifice cannot be performed by a Brahman; etc.

[9] *Jones*, Works, IV. p. 130; Asiat. Res. III. 388; sacrifices of children are without example in India, except that in some cases daughters were killed if it was to be feared that poverty would preclude them from marrying; see *Bohlen*, Alt. Ind. I. 302—304.

[10] Comp. *Cic.* Pro Font. X. 31 (humanis hostiis deorum aras funestant; religionem scelere violant, etc.); De offic. III. 23 (tetrum facinus); *Diod. Sic.* V. 31 (παράδοξον καὶ ἄπιστον ἔχουσι νόμιμον); *Plut.* Pelop. 21; *Clemes* in Euseb. Pr. Ev. IV. xvi. 12 (φόνος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀνδροκτασία ἡ τοιαύτη θυσία); *Plut.* Superst. c. 13; *Lucian* passim; *Heliod.* X. 9; *Plin.* Hist. Nat. III. 264 (monstra in quibus hominem occidere religiosissimum erat, mandi vero etiam saluberrimum); *Sil. Ital.* IV. 768 (infandum dictu); *Curtius*, IV. 3 (15, sacrilegium verius quam sacrum; dira superstitio); *Justin.* XVIII. 6 (scelere pro remedio usi sunt); etc.

[11] See p. 310.

[12] Comp. *Porph.* De Abst. II. 55, where men and animals are termed ἰσάξιον; and, on the other hand, in Hierapolis children were sometimes sacrificed instead of calves (*Lucian*, Syr. Dea 58).

[13] Comp. *Böttiger*, Kunstmythologie, II. 10; see also *Schömann*, l. c. pp. 240—246 (whose remarks are, however, too partial and apologetic).

[14] Comp. *Gladstone*, Address on the Place of ancient Greece in the providential Order of the World, pp. 35, 36.

[15] Sir John Acton, quoted by Gladstone l. c. p. 34.

[16] Comp. *Eurip.* Iph. Taur. 463—466, ὦ πότνι', εἴ σοι τάδ' ἀρεσκόντως πόλις ἥδε τελεῖ, δέξαι θυσίας, ἃς ὁ παρ' ἡμῖν

though not alluded to in the Homeric poems, it was primitively sanctioned in several religious systems;[1] it is implied in the story of Iphigenia intended for a sacrifice to Diana but replaced by a stag,[2] and in the narrative of Abraham offering a ram instead of his son Isaac. Phryxus, devoted by the oracle to die in honour of Zeus Laphystios,[3] received from his mother Nephele a ram with a golden fleece, on which he was carried to Colchis, and which he there offered instead of himself.[4] A youth was, at Potniae in Boeotia, to be sacrificed every year to Dionysus, because the inhabitants had slain one of the priests of the god; but "a few years later",[5] the youth was replaced by a kid of the goats.[6] The people of Tenedos, in later times, offered to the same deity, instead of a child, a new-born calf to which they attempted to give a human appearance by providing its feet with cothurni, while they nursed the cow that had thrown the calf like a woman after childbirth, and obliged the man who had sacrificed the calf to flee, probably because in former periods the person who had sacrificed the child was equally persecuted.[7] The human victim periodically offered at Salamis to Minerva and Diomedes, was by Diphilus, king of Cyprus, replaced by a slaughtered ox.[8] Pelopidas, invited in a dream, the night before the battle of Leuctra, by the shades of the "virgins of Leuctra" and their father, to expiate their murder by the sacrifice of a fair-haired virgin, believed he satisfied the request of the vision by slaughtering a light-coloured colt which had strayed from the herd and ran through the camp;[9] and in a similar manner Agesilaus, when staying over night in Aulis and admonished by a dream to sacrifice a man in commemoration of Agamemnon and Iphigenia, offered a stag.[10] And at Laodicea, in Syria, a virgin was, for some time, offered every year, but later a stag.[11]

---

*νόμος οὐχ ὁσίας Ἕλλησι διδους ἀναφαίνει*; *Plato*, Min. 5, p. 315 C, *ἡμῖν μὲν οὐ νόμος ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπους θύειν ἀλλ' ἀνόσιον*; *Plut.* Pelop. 21, *ὡς οὐδενὶ τῶν κρειττόνων καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς ἀρεστὴν οὖσαν οὕτω βάρβαρον καὶ παράνομον θυσίαν, οὐ γὰρ τοὺς Τυφῶνας ἐκείνους οὐδὲ τοὺς Γίγαντας ἄρχειν, ἀλλὰ τὸν πάντων πατέρα θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων*; *Euripid.* Heraclid. 411—414.

[1] Comp. *Nägelsbach*, Homer. Theologie, p. 303; *Müller*, Eum. pp. 144 *sqq.*

[2] Comp. *Eurip.* Iph. Aul. 1592—1595, *ταύτην* — viz. the stag — *μάλιστα τῆς κόρης ἀσπάζεται, ὡς μὴ μιάνῃ βωμὸν εὐγενεῖ φόνῳ*; *Hygin.* Fab. 98.

[3] That is, the Devourer (from *λαφύσσειν* to engulf, *Hom.* Il. XI. 176), who accepted men as victims.

[4] *Apollod.* I. ix. 1; *Paus.* I. xxiv. 2; comp. *Hartung*, Relig. and Mythol. der Griechen, III. p. 29.

[5] *Ἔτεσι δὲ οὐ πολλοῖς ὕστερον.*

[6] *Pausan.* IX. viii. 1.

[7] *Aelian*, Hist. Nat. XII. 34; comp. p. 12; see also *Schömann* l. c. pp. 242, 243.

[8] *Porph.* De Abst. II. 55.

[9] Comp. *Plut.* Pelop. 20—22.

[10] *Plut.* Ages. 6; Pelop. 21; comp. *Xen.* Hell. III. iv. 3; VII. i. 34.

[11] *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 16; *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 56.

However, sometimes not animals but symbolical figures were substituted instead of men, and this must be regarded as another advancement in religious notions. The Egyptian king Amasis offered at Heliopolis wax-images instead of the human beings formerly sacrificed.[12] The Hindoos shaped the form of a man in butter or dough, and burnt it to the destructive goddess Kali.[13] An ancient oracle ordered the old Italic tribes, "Offer heads to Hades, and to his father (Saturn) a man",[14] and this command was for some time acted upon: but when Hercules passed through Italy with the herd of Geryon, he is said to have persuaded the people to offer images of human heads instead of real ones,[15] and torches instead of men.[16] Again, it was customary on the festival of the Compitalia celebrated on the cross-ways, to offer sacrifices in honour of the Lares and their mother the goddess Mania; but Junius Brutus induced the people to present garlic and poppy-heads instead of human heads.[17] Every year, on the ides of May, during the festival of the Lemuralia celebrated for the souls of the departed, 24 or 30 figures[18] of men made of bulrushes[19] were, for the propitiation of Saturn, by the chief priests and the Vestal virgins thrown from the Sublician bridge into the Tiber, as substitutes for the human victims which had once been killed on the same day;[20] and this usage, the origin of which is likewise attributed to Hercules, was maintained at least to the time of Augustus.[21] The vows of the "sacred spring" which the Romans had adopted from the old Italic tribes,[22] were later confined to the cattle alone,[23] or if the children were also included, they were not killed, but in the spring of their twentieth or twenty-first year, they were led out

---

[12] *Porph.* Abst. II. 55. Whiston (in his Translation of Josephus, p. 678) attributes this change to the example of Abraham and the frustrated sacrifice of Isaac!

[13] Asiat. Res. V. 376.

[14] *Καὶ κεφαλὰς Ἅιδῃ καὶ τῷ πατρὶ πέμπετε φῶτα*, *Macrob.* Sat. I. 7; comp. *Dion. Halic.* I. 19, *Καὶ κεφαλὰς Κρονίδῃ κτλ.*

[15] Oscilla ad humanam effigiem arte simulata.

[16] Because the word *φῶτα* admits of this interpretation also; comp. *Macrob.* Sat. I. 7.

[17] See *Macrob.* l. c.

[18] According to Varro 24, according to Dion. Halic. 30; see note 20.

[19] Called Argei (*Ἀργεῖοι*), *εἴδωλα ἀνδρείκελα*, priscorum simulacra virorum, or straminei Quirites (Ovid).

[20] Comp. *Ovid*, Fast. V. 621—660; *Plut.* Quaest. Rom. 32; *Varro*, L. L. VII. 44 (Argei ab Argis; Argei fiunt e scirpeis, simulacra hominum XXIV; ea quotannis de ponte sublicio a sacerdotibus publice deici solent in Tiberim); *Dion. Hal.* I. 38 (*εἴδωλα μορφαῖς ἀνθρώπων εἰκασμένα, τριάκοντα τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἱερᾶς γεφύρας βάλλουσιν εἰς τὸ ῥεῦμα τοῦ Τιβέριος, Ἀργείους αὐτὰ καλοῦντες*); *Festus* s. v. Depontani; *Lactant.* Instit. I. 21.

[21] *Dionys. Halic.* I. 38 (*τοῦτο δὲ καὶ μέχρις ἐμοῦ ἐπετέλουν Ῥωμαῖοι ὅσέτη κτλ.*); comp. also *Grimm*, Deutsche Mythol. p. 690.

[22] See *supra* p. 330; comp. *Strabo*, V. iv. 12.

[23] Liv. XXII. 9, 10; XXXIV. 44 (ver sacrum videri pecus).

of the boundaries of the land, provided with arms, and directed to establish colonies wherever they might chance to find a resting place; and indeed many settlements, and among them those of the Picentines and Mamertini in Sicily, owe their origin to the emigration of devoted persons.[1]

But human sacrifices were too deeply rooted in the life of the ancient world to be easily eradicated; they lingered for long periods, even after more rational views had been diffused and adopted; and their suppression required the continuous and zealous efforts of public teachers and reformers. They were kept up in the Roman empire with incredible tenacity. Darius Hystaspis, king of Persia, is said to have forbidden the Carthaginians "to offer human sacrifices and to eat dog-flesh;"[2] Gelon, the king of Sicily, after his victory over the Carthaginians at Himera (B. C. 480), made the abolition of child-sacrifices in honour of Moloch a condition of peace;[3] a certain Iphicrates devised another attempt at their extinction;[4] but they survived the destruction of Carthage itself;[5] till at last, in the second century after Christ, the proconsul Tiberius, to put an end to the abomination, ordered the priests who performed the rite to be crucified on the trees of their temples.[6] When, in B. C. 116, two Gauls had been sacrificed in one of the streets of Rome, the practice was forbidden, "except when human offerings were ordered by the Sibylline books." The first interdiction for Italy was proclaimed by the senate in B. C. 96, especially in connection with the art of magic.[7] But that law was by no means decisive or effectual. Men were sacrificed by the most prominent, and often the most educated individuals, as by Caesar, at a sedition of his soldiers,[8] by Augustus after the victory over Mark Antony and at the surrender of Perusia,[9] by Vatinius whom Cicero accused of offering the entrails of boys to the gods of the lower world,[10] by Nero at the appea-

---

[1] See *Plin.* H. N. III. 13 (18, orti sunt — Picentes — a Sabinis voto vere sacro); comp. *Dion. Hal.* I. 16; *Justin.* XXIV. 4; *Serv.* ad Aen. VII. 796.

[2] *Justin.* XIX. 1, Legati a Dario . . . Carthaginem venerunt, afferentes edictum, quo Poeni humanas hostias immolare, et canina vesci prohibebantur.

[3] *Plut.* De Sera Num. Vind. c. 6, *ὅτι παύσονται τὰ τέκνα τῷ Κρόνῳ καταθύοντες.*

[4] *Porphyr.* II. 56; comp. *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. xvi. 5.

[5] *Curt.* IV. 3 (15), quod sacrilegium ... Carthaginienses, a conditoribus traditum usque ad excidium urbis suae fecisse dicuntur; *Dion. Halic.* I. 38, *ὥσπερ ἐν Καρχηδόνι τέως ἡ πόλις διέμεινε.*

[6] *Tertull.* Apolog. c. 9.

[7] *Plin.* H. N. XXX. 2 (3).

[8] See *supra*, p. 329; *Dion Cass.* XLIII. 24 (*ἐν τρόπῳ τινὶ ἱερουργίας ἐσφάγησαν*, and *πρός τε τῶν ποντιφίκων καὶ πρὸς τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ Ἄρεως ἐτύθησαν*).

[9] See *supra* p. 333 note 11.

[10] *Cic.* In Vatin. c. 6; comp. *Tacit.* Ann. II. 69, where it is related that attempts were made to avert the death of Germanicus by enchantments supported by "carcases half burnt, besmeared with gore."

rance of a comet,[11] and frequently at his magical incantations,[12] by Commodus (A. C. 180) who at the mysteries of Mithra offered human victims,[13] by Didius Julianus (A. C. 192) and Heliogabalus (A. C. 217) who found satisfaction in sacrificing children to the Sun in connection with magic artifices,[14] by the emperor Valerian (A.C. 253) who on the advice of an Egyptian magician sacrificed boys and disemboweled new-born babes, and by Maxentius (A. C. 306), who cut open pregnant females and examined the bowels of children to invoke the daemons or to avert impending war:[15] abominations indulged in at the same period by others also.[16] Indeed, the Fathers of the Church are almost unanimous in testifying to the existence of the horrid practice in their own time.[17] Therefore, the prohibition had to be repeated again and again; it was rigorously enjoined by the emperor Claudius,[18] and renewed by Hadrian for the whole extent of the empire.[19] Still the effect of these edicts was long imperfect and fluctuating. The Gauls sacrificed men publicly at every important crisis in the time of Caesar and Cicero.[20] Some transalpine tribes killed human victims at least up to the time of the elder Pliny.[21] On an elevation in Arcadia, Zeus Lycaeus continued to be honoured with sacrifices of boys in the time of Pausanias, in the

---

11 *Sueton.* Nero 36.

12 *Plin.* H. N. XXX. 5, 6.

13 *Lamprid.* Commod. 9.

14 Comp. *Münter*, Rel. der Karthag. p. 24.

15 *Euseb.* H. E. VIII. 14.

16 As the tribune Pollentianus; see *Amm. Marcell.* XXIX. ii. 17 (Pollentianum . . . iisdem diebus — i. e. A. C. 371 — convictum confessumque, quod exsecto vivae mulieris ventre, atque intempestivo partu extracto, infernis manibus excitis de permutatione imperii consulere ausus est); comp. *supra* p. 332; *Lucan.* Phars. VI. 554—561 (Vulnere si ventris, non qua natura vocabat, Extrahitur partus, calidis ponendus in aris).

17 Comp. *Tertull.* Apol. c. 9 (sed et nunc in occulto perseveratur hoc sacrum facinus); Adv. Gnost. c. 7; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 16; and Lactantius (who died in A. C. 325) says explicitly (Instit. I. 21 ("Ne Latini quidem hujus immanitatis expertes fuerunt, si quidem Latialis Jupiter *etiam nunc* sanguine colitur humano"); and so Porphyry (De Abst. II. 56, *Ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν τίς ἀγνοεῖ κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην πόλιν τῇ τοῦ Λατιαρίου Διὸς ἑορτῇ σφαζόμενον ἄνθρωπον*). Hence Sir John Acton (l. c. p. 35) is correct in his conclusion that "in every generation of the four centuries, from the fall of the Republic to the establishment of Christianity, human victims were sacrificed by the emperors."

18 *Sueton.* Claud. 25.

19 *Porph.* De Abst. II. 56; *Lactant.* Instit. I. 21.

20 *Caes.* Bell. Gall. VI. 16, see *supra*; *Cic.* Pro Fonteio X. 31 (si quando aliquo metu adducti deos placandos esse arbitrantur . . . quis ignorat, eos usque ad hunc diem retinere illam immanem ac barbaram consuetudinem hominum immolandorum?).

21 Hist. Nat. VII. 2, *nuperrime* trans Alpes hominem immolare gentium earum more solitum; comp. *Dion. Hal.* I. 38, *ὥσπερ . . . παρὰ Κελτοῖς εἰς τόδε χρόνου γίνεται καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις τισὶ τῶν ἑσπερίων ἐθνῶν ἀνδροφόνοις*: see also *Plat.* Legg. VI. 22, p. 782 C.

second century of the present era.[1] The old Prussians and Goths adhered to the custom for centuries after their open adoption of Christianity.[2] And in India, the burning of the widows was continued up to the establishment of the British rule. In 1829, Lord William Bentinck abolished it as far as his authority extended, that is among the 37 millions British subjects out of 77 millions souls forming the population.[3] Instances, however, are recorded at Oodypore so late as August 30, 1838, and at Kolah in October 29, 1840.[4] But in 1844, a religious change was wrought. It began in the stronghold of the rite, among the Rajpoots in Rajpootana living in the north-western frontier, a brave race of warriors and hunters, and almost revered by the other tribes. Lieutenant Colonel Ludlow, then the English representative at Jypore, happily availed himself of the movement to carry out his long cherished and philanthropic designs. He forcibly pointed out what indeed had long been known, that the rite of *suttee* was not only unsanctioned but inferentially forbidden by the earliest and most authoritative Hindoo scriptures; that the laws of Manu clearly involve its non-existence; that an obscure passage in Rig-Veda, long the only support of its advocates, has been clearly proved to have no reference to it whatever;[5] and that, in fact, it was an unauthorised innovation and heresy of no earlier date than B. C. 300.[6] Ludlow succeeded first in Jypore (Aug. 1846), next among most of the remaining Rajpoot states, and then in some other free principalities of India occupying about two thirds of the whole territory.[7]

Among the Dahomans also the rite is beginning to lose ground; it is by the chiefs upheld from motives of expediency rather than of religion; king Gelele released, at Captain Burton's intercession, nearly half of the intended victims;[8] this prince, having to perform "a disagreable duty" over his ancestral graves, takes care that the executions are performed without cruelty;[9] in 1863 and 1864, he allowed no victim to be put to death publicly during day-time;[10] and sometimes he exposes the men without slaying them.[11] "If I were to give up this custom at once", said he, "my head would be taken off to-morrow; by and by, little by little, much may be done."[12]

---

1 *Paus.* VIII. xxxviii. 5 (*ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ βωμοῦ τῷ Λυκαίῳ Διῒ θύουσι ἐν ἀποῤῥήτῳ*); comp. *Augustin*, De Civit. Dei XVIII. 17 (sacrificio, quod Arcades immolato puero deo suo Lycaeo facere solerent).

2 *Procop.* II. c. 25.

3 Comp. *Wilson*, Hist. of Brit. India. III. 265 *sqq.*

4 Comp. *H. J. Bushby*, Widow-burning, a narrative, 1855, pp. 8 *sqq.*

5 Comp. *supra* p. 327 note 18.

6 See Prof. Wilson's Paper on the subject read before the Royal Society, on Febr. 4, 1854.

7 Comp. *Bushby*, l. c. pp. 37—39.

8 *Burton*, l. c. p. 7.

9 L. c. II. 21.

10 L. c. II. 27.

11 L. c. I. 350.

12 L. c. p. 359.

Thus, then, the slaughter of men to secure the favour of the gods originated indeed in a religious sentiment common to all nations and apparently inherent in the human mind; it was resorted to on occasions of exceptional solemnity when the sacrifice of animals seemed inadequate to express the full depth of religious emotion;[13] it was long regarded as a form of divine worship so praiseworthy and exalted that its neglect was deplored as a symptom of degeneracy and of declining earnestness;[14] it proved compatible with a very considerable degree of civilisation and mental culture; and as it accustomed men to feel supreme satisfaction in seeing their fellow-beings nay their own children massacred, pierced by the sword, burnt to death, hurled from rocks or lofty terraces, drowned in rivers, seas or cess-pools, exposed to starvation or otherwise cruelly exterminated,[15] it is one of the awful warnings held out by history to prove how narrow-minded enthusiasm, even if exercised for spiritual ends, may lead to the most revolting and most degrading enormities — a warning equalled if not surpassed, in the Christian times, by the burning of witches and the horrors of the inquisition.

We might now enter upon the question how far human sacrifices were practised among the Hebrews; but in order to prepare the way still more completely for the unbiassed treatment of that enquiry, we deem it expedient to premise a sketch of

## XXII. THE VARIOUS FORMS OF IDOLATRY ADOPTED BY THE HEBREWS.

A COMPREHENSIVE summary of the variety and extent of heathen worship among the Israelites, as mirrored forth in the works of their historians and prophets, suggests the most momentous and most significant conclusions with regard to the religious development of the chosen nation.

Can a stronger proof of the confusion which long prevailed in the

---

[13] Comp. *Müller*, Dor. I. p. 329.

[14] Comp. *Plut.* De Sacrif. c. 13 (*ὁ μέν γε Σκύθης πάσας τὰς θυσίας ἀφεὶς καὶ ἡγησάμενος ταπεινὰς αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι παρίστησι καὶ οὕτως ποιῶν ἀρέσκει τὴν θεόν*). *Ewald* (Alterth. pp. 26, 27) observes justly, "Nach der Folgerichtig*keit* solcher Gefühle musste endlich eben das Menschenleben als das unvergleichlich höchste und wunderbarste Opfer gelten . . . So lag dies Menschenopfer eigentlich überall als die Spitze und Vollendung aller dieser Aeusserungen der Gottesfurcht vor." Against all history is Hengstenberg's view (Auth. II. 144).

[15] Comp. *Strabo*, IV. iv. 5, p. 198, *ἄνθρωπον γὰρ κατασπεισμένον παίσαντες εἰς νῶτον μαχαίρᾳ . . . καὶ κατετόξευόν τινας καὶ ἀνεσταύρουν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς . . . καὶ ὡλοκαύτουν*; *Diod. Sic.* V. 31, *ἄνθρωπον κατασπείσαντες τύπτουσι μαχαίρᾳ κατὰ τὸν ὑπὲρ τὸ διάφραγμα τόπον καὶ πεσόντος τοῦ πληγέντος ἐκ τῆς πτώσεως κτλ.*; etc.

notions of the Deity be conceived than the fact that men who meant to serve Jehovah in earnestness and piety, represented and worshipped Him by images? Even the history of Jeroboam is instructive in this respect. This king, anxious to prevent his newly-acquired subjects from visiting the capital of the sister kingdom, not from worshipping its God, placed two golden calves, the familiar symbols of the Egyptian Apis and Mnevis, in Bethel and Dan, towns probably consecrated by national sanctuaries from remote times,[1] and proclaimed to the people, "Behold these are thy gods, o Israel, that brought thee out of the land of Egypt."[2] It is not surprising to find that the author of the Books of Kings, living at a time when the worship of Jehovah began to take root in consequence of the promulgation and diffusion of the Pentateuch, severely reprimanded this act of Jeroboam, and described it as the cause and origin of grievous sin,[3] which was unavoidably followed by fearful visitations,[4] and which in his zeal he goes so far as unjustly to characterise as rejection of Jehovah and adoption of strange gods.[5] It is even less surprising to notice that the compiler of the Books of Chronicles, writing at a still later period and with a strongly marked Levitical bias,[6] did not scruple to call those images "no-gods" (לא־אלהים), and to denounce them as foul paganism.[7] But an impartial examination of the facts warrants no such conclusion. The arrangement of Jeroboam had a political rather than a religious object; it was not designed to weaken the people's attachment to the common God of the Hebrews, but to strengthen their fidelity to the new dynasty. The phrase so frequently repeated by the later historian, "the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who caused Israel to sin",[8] does not refer to the worship of heathen gods, but merely to the consecration of the two golden statues. This may not only be reasonably inferred from several passages,[9] but is distinctly stated in that narrative which, after declaring that Jehu killed the worshippers of Baal, burnt his images, and destroyed his temple, continues, "However, as regards the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who caused Israel to sin, Jehu did not depart from them, namely, the golden calves that were in Bethel and in Dan."[10] Jeroboam transgressed therefore not the first but the second commandment; he did not repudiate Jehovah, but fashioned Him in golden images.[11] However,

---

1 See Comm. on Genes. p. 335.

2 1 Ki. XII. 28; comp. 2 Ki. XVII. 16.

3 1 Ki. XII. 30.

4 XIII. 1—10.

5 אלהים אחרים, XIV. 9; comp. Jer. XLVIII. 13.

6 See pp. 31—33.

7 2 Chr. XIII. 8—10.

8 חטאות ירבעם בן־נבט אשר החטיא את ישראל, 2 Ki. III. 3; XIII. 2; XV. 9, 18, 24, 28; etc.

9 1 Ki. XVI. 31—33; 2 Ki. III. 1—3; XIII. 6.

10 2 Ki. X. 29; comp. vers. 26—28.

11 Comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 346.

the people, uneducated and eagerly bent upon foreign superstitions, could not fail ere long to regard these statues not as impersonations of Jehovah, but actually as the Egyptian Apis or Mnevis, and to worship them as such. Hence the prophets stigmatized them not unfairly as pernicious snares; they called *Beth-el* (בֵּית־אֵל) tauntingly *Beth-aven* (בֵּית־אָוֶן), *the town of iniquity*;[12] they castigated the practice among the worst forms of idolatry certain to provoke the wrath of God.[13] Indeed the worship of the golden calves inevitably caused many deplorable aberrations; and in this sense Hebrew moralists were justified in inveighing against *"all the sins of Jeroboam."*[14]

But we are able to adduce even more striking instances and proofs of the proposition above set forth. The pious priest Ahimelech who, at Nob, conducted a complete and lawful service,[15] had in his possession a gold-plated image or ephod (אֵפוֹד) which evidently represented Jehovah.[16]

David appropriated to himself this ephod;[17] and he solemnly consulted it, whenever in critical emergencies he wished to explore the will of God. Having retired to Keilah and being actively pursued by Saul, "he said to Abiathar the priest, Bring hither the ephod; then said David, O Lord God of Israel (יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל), Thy servant has heard for certain that Saul seeks to come to Keilah to destroy the city for

---

[12] Hos. IV. 15; X. 5; Am. V. 5.

[13] Hos. VIII. 5, 6; X. 5; XIII. 2; Am. III. 14; IV. 4; V. 6; VII. 9, 13; VIII. 13, 14: in which passages the allusions, though partly veiled, are yet unmistakable.

[14] כָּל־חַטֹּאות וכ׳, 2 Ki. XIII. 11; XIV. 24; etc. — It would, therefore, be hazardous to contend that the usages of idolatry were more predominant in the empire of Judah than of Ephraim (*Gramberg*, Rel. Ideen, I. 509, 510); a view which can only be upheld by the most artificial interpretations of the plainest texts (comp. l. c. pp. 516 init., 517 med., etc.); the testimony of writers living very near the times which they describe, is too weighty to be disregarded (comp. 2 Ki. XVII. 16—23); and there was scarcely any form of pagan worship not indulged in by the people of Ephraim (1 Ki. XIX. 18; comp. XVIII. 19; see 1 Ki. XX. 23, 28; comp. also 2 Ki. I. 1—16; XVII. 9—11, 16, 17, 30, 31; XVIII. 19; Am. II. 4—12; etc.; see *infra*). Ezekiel declares indeed (XXIII. 11 *sqq.*) that Judah surpassed her faithless sister Israel in revolt from Jehovah; but this rhetorical phrase of impassioned remonstrance can hardly be taken as a historical witness. Comp. also *Boch.* Hieroz. I. ii. 34.

[15] 1 Sam. XXI. 2—10.

[16] The word אפוד is, in this passage, neither the garment of the High-priest (Exod. XXVIII. 6—13; comp. 1 Sam. II. 28; XIV. 3; XXII. 9; XXX. 7), nor that (אפוד בד) of the common priests (1 Sam. II. 18; XXII. 18; 2 Sam. VI. 14; comp. Treatise on Priesthood ch. IV), but, as in several other passages (Judg. VIII. 27; 1 Sam. XXIII. 6; XXX. 7; Hosea III. 4; see *infra*), like אֲפֻדָּה (Isai. XXX. 22), the golden plating of an image made of wood or clay, and hence the image itself (comp. *Vatke*, l. c. pp. 267, 269).

[17] 1 Sam. XXIII. 6.

my sake... Will Saul come down as Thy servant has heard? O Lord God of Israel, I beseech Thee, tell Thy servant. And the Lord (יְהוָֹה) said, He will come down."[1] When after the pillage and destruction of the town of Ziklag by the Amalekites, despair overpowered the people, David — so relates the historian — "strengthened himself by the Lord his God";[2] he ordered Abiathar to bring the ephod; and "he enquired of the Lord,[3] saying, Shall I pursue after this troop? shall I overtake them? And He answered him, Pursue; for thou shalt surely overtake them, and certainly recover all."[4] The author of the Books of Samuel utters no word of reproof against David's use of the ephod; but the Chronist, faithful to his desire of clearing his favourites from all deeds deemed reproachful at *his* time, makes no mention whatever of that figure in the narrative of the events in question.[5] David had, besides, in his house an image of the Teraphim, obviously for his legitimate domestic worship;[6] and the prophet Hosea enumerates the Teraphim, like "statue (מַצֵּבָה) and ephod", and like "kings, chiefs and sacrifices", as an element of national happiness and prosperity, "when the children of Israel again seek the Lord their God and David their king, and when they fear the Lord and His goodness in later days."[7]

Micah, living in mount Ephraim, had abstracted from his mother and then restored to her a sum of money; when she received it, she declared, "I had wholly dedicated the silver to the Lord[8] from my hand for my son, to make a graven image and a molten image" (פֶּסֶל וּמַסֵּכָה); and when these figures had been made[9] and placed in the house, together with an ephod and Teraphim, and when the services of an itinerant Levite had been secured, Micah was certain to have ob-

[1] 1 Sam. XXIII. 9—11.

[2] ויתחזק דוד ביהוה אלהיו.

[3] וישאל ביהוה.

[4] 1 Sam. XXX. 6—8; comp. 2 Sam. II. 1; V. 19, 23, 24 (XXI. 1), which passages merely state that "David enquired of the Lord", without mentioning the ephod. The explanation of all these texts (recently repeated by *Klaiber*, Das priesterliche Orakel der Israeliten, im Programm des Gymnasiums in Stuttgart 1864—65, pp. 12, 13), by the supposition that the oracle was given by lots in the presence of the ephod, starts from the questionable or rather erroneous view that the ephod was the pontifical garment. David seems to have ceased to resort to this mode of consulting God after the transportation of the Ark to Jerusalem (2 Sam. VI. 12 *sqq.*), when he most likely sought oracles through prophets (comp. 1 Ki. XXII. 5, 6; 2 Ki. VIII. 8; XXII. 13, 14), as he may have done before he came into the possession of the ephod (comp. 1 Sam. XXIII. 1, 4; comp. XIV. 36, 37).

[5] Comp. 1 Chr. XIV. 10.

[6] 1 Sam. XIX. 11—17.

[7] Hos. III. 4, 5; comp. Comm. on Gen. p. 553; see *infra*.

[8] הַקְדֵּשׁ הִקְדַּשְׁתִּי אֶת־הַכֶּסֶף לַיהוָֹה.

[9] It is immaterial for our purpose to enquire in what forms they were prepared, whether the מסכה represented a bull or not, etc.; comp. *Bertheau* in loc.

tained the favour of God, and exclaimed with joyful confidence, "Now I know that the Lord (יהוה) will do me good, since I have a Levite to be my priest."[10] These facts lead to the most remarkable conclusion that even several and different images, worshipped simultaneously, were by well-disposed people viewed as lawful embodiments of Jehovah; hence a number of Danites who, in search of settled abodes, passed through mount Ephraim, were most eager to secure both those images and the Levite, and when they had accomplished their design by cunning and violence, Micah was overwhelmed by grief and consternation.[11] The author of the Book of Judges conveyed indeed an implied disapproval of Micah's images, "In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes";[12] but he regarded the matter from his own point of view and by the light of later convictions.[13]

Gideon who had firmly declared, that "the Lord (יהוה) shall rule over the Hebrews",[14] yet placed in Ophrah, his native town, a golden *figure* (אֵפוד), and revered it in common with the whole nation.[15] The historian's censure, "and this thing became a snare to Gideon and to

[10] Judg. XVII. 3—5, 12, 13. The text evidently distinguishes four different images: the mother of Micah devotes 200 shekels to a פסל and a מסכה (ver. 4), to which Micah himself adds an אפוד and תרפים (ver. 5); the same four figures are named in XVIII. 14, 17; in XVIII. 18, 20 three only are mentioned because completeness in the enumeration was no more deemed necessary; and verses 30 and 31 speaking merely of a פסל מיכה, are a supplement of the narrator who lived many generations after the recorded event (comp. עד יום גלות הארץ, ver. 30). The four terms are, therefore, by no means to be taken as synonyms; nor do they describe four parts of one and the same object — pedestal (מסכה), image (פסל), the robing of the latter (אפוד) "with a bag on the breast for the lots employed at divinations", and the Teraphim within the garment for oracular purposes (*Hengstenberg*, Auth. des Pent. II. 95; *Ewald*, Alterth. pp. 231, 232; comp. also *Klaiber*, l. c. p. 15 note 35); and the separation of the section into two different stories (*Vatke*, l. c. p. 268) seems needless. The observations of Paulus Cassel on the narrative (Theolog. homiletisch. Bibelwerk, herausgegeben von J. P. Lange, V. 156—160) are in his usual biassed and uncritical manner, partly exegetical and partly homiletic, and obviously misinterpreting the Hebrew records by strong dogmatic preconceptions.

[11] Judg. XVIII. 14—26.

[12] L. c. XVII. 6.

[13] Comp. *Jeh. Halevi*, Cusari IV. 14, "Micah was like a man who commits the incestuous act of marrying his sister, but is scrupulous in observing all the legal matrimonial rites."

[14] Which terms express even the true theocratic principle, though they are probably attributable to the author of the Book of Judges rather than to Gideon, since in the time of the latter that principle was scarcely yet established or clearly understood (comp. *Vatke*, l. c. pp. 263, 264).

[15] Judg. VIII. 23, 27. Hengstenberg's remarks (Auth. des Pent. II. 97), intended to prove that the ephod of Gideon was an imitation of that of the High-priest, are not convincing.

his house",[1] must be estimated in the same manner as his disparaging comment on Micah's images.

Aaron himself, according to a narrative embodied in the Book of Exodus, made during the absence of Moses a molten calf (עֵגֶל מַסֵּכָה) of gold, and declared, exactly like king Jeroboam, "Behold, these are thy gods, o Israel, that brought thee out (העלוך) of the land of Egypt"; he is then reported to have built an altar before the image and to have proclaimed for the following day "a festival to the Lord" (חַג לַיהוָה).[2] It is a matter of course that the compilers of the second and fifth Books of the Pentateuch, writing at a very advanced period, taxed in terms of indignant rebuke the iniquity which, in their opinion, merited and almost caused the complete extirpation of the people, and the expiation of which required the destruction of 30,000 persons;[3] and authors of subsequent ages, imbued with the true spirit of theocracy, depicted Aaron's conduct as a forgetful abandonment of God, and a disgraceful exchange of His glory for the "similitude of an ox that eats grass."[4] But the historical fact remains undisputed that even men of good intentions, such as David and Aaron, were unaware of a wickedness when they represented Jehovah in a human form or by the figure of a beast. To this may be added the fact, proved and dwelt upon elsewhere, that the "heights" (במות) were deemed unobjectionable even by some pious and theocratic kings, and therefore left untouched by them as places of private and public worship;[5] from which it appears that the Temple of Jerusalem was originally not designed by David and Solomon to form an exclusive but only a central or national sanctuary;[6] till gradually other places of worship became to be considered as unlawful because dangerous to the purity and unity of faith.[7]

There was, however, in the eastern world scarcely a divinity adored or a religious rite performed which the Hebrews did not adopt, and retain with their own peculiar tenacity. They are, in several passages, summarily stated to have worshipped the gods of Egypt — not only at their early sojourn in that country[8] and in the time of their national existence in Canaan,[9] but even during their later stay in

[1] L. c. ver. 27.

[2] Exod. XXXII. 1—6; comp. Neh. IX. 18, where the singular העלך is employed instead of the plural used in Exodus; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 574, 575; *Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. 442—444, 447—450, 455—458, 505—510.

[3] Comp. Exod. XXXII. 7—10, 20—28; Deut. IX. 12—16.

[4] Ps. CVI. 19, 20; Neh. IX. 18, נֶאָצוֹת גְּדֹלוֹת; compare *Milton*, Parad. Lost, I. 482—487.

[5] See p. 35.

[6] Comp. *Ewald*, Geschichte, III. 110 ("daneben blieben andere Heiligthümer durch's ganze Land zerstreut in voller Freiheit bestehen").

[7] See p. 23.

[8] Josh. XXIV. 14; Ezek. XX. 7, 8; XXIII. 3, 8; see p. 24 note 6.

[9] Ezek. XVI. 26.

Egypt as exiles, in the seventh and sixth centuries[10] — and the gods of the Phoenicians, of the Aramaeans, the Amorites, and Philistines,[11] the abominations of Moab, Ammon and Edom,[12] of Assyria and Chaldea.[13] The permanent establishment of a great portion of these idolatries is distinctly attributed to Solomon acting in deference to the propensities of his foreign wives.[14] For the tendency of the Hebrews towards heathen worship was strengthened by the matrimonial alliances perpetually contracted with neighbouring tribes[15] to such an extent that they could hardly be considered as an unmixed race[16] and the pure descendants of the patriarchs.[17] We are enabled to form an estimate of the astounding multiplicity of their pagan usages by the statements of their prophets and historians, of which we shall attempt to give a brief review. — Above all prevailed the adoration of the heavenly bodies.

The worship of BAAL (בַּעַל) was not only most extensively cultivated, to the utter neglect of Jehovah, from early times up to so late an age as that of Jeremiah,[18] but was frequently attended with the utmost pomp and splendour;[19] the god was honoured with statues[20] and temples,[21] altars,[22] fumigations,[23] and sacrifices, sometimes even of men;[24] he was adored with genuflexions and kisses,[25] even in the very Temple at Jerusalem,[26] and so universal was the idolatry that at the time of Jehu and Elisha not more than 7,000 Israelites were found

---

10 Jer. XLIV. 8; comp. ver. 1; Ezra IX. 1.

11 Judg. VI. 10; X. 6; 2 Chr. XXVIII. 23; Ezra IX. 1. 12 1 Ki. XI. 1, 7, 8.

13 Ezek. XVI. 28, 29.

14 See 1 Ki. l. c.; though the Chronist suppresses this fact; comp. 2 Chr. IX; see *infra*.

15 Comp. Jud. III. 5, 6 ("and the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, Hittites, and Amorites, and Perizzites, and Hivites, and Jebusites; and they took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons, and served their gods"); XIV. 1, 2; Ruth I. 4; 1 Ki. XI. 1—3; Ezra X. 2 *sqq*, 10 *sqq*; Mal. II. 11; Neh. XIII. 23—27.

16 Ezra IX. 1, 2 ("they have taken of their daughters for themselves and for their sons; so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of foreign lands; yea, the hand of the princes and rulers has been chief in this trespass"), 14; Neh. l. c.

17 Comp. *Vatke*, l. c. p. 257.

18 Judg. II. 11, 13; III. 7; VI. 25—32; VIII. 33; X. 6, 10; 1 Sam. VII. 4; XII. 10; 1 Ki. XVI. 31, 32; XVIII. 19; 2 Ki. III. 2; X. 18—28; XI. 18; XVII. 16; 2 Chr. XXIV. 7; XXVIII. 2; Hos. II. 15, 19; Jer. VII. 9; IX. 13; XI. 13, 17; XXIII. 27; etc.

19 Hos. II. 10, 15.

20 מַצֵּבוֹת, 2 Ki. III. 2; X. 26, 27; XI. 18; XVIII. 4; XXIII. 14; 2 Chr. XIV. 2; etc. 21 1 Ki. XVI. 32; 2 Ki. X. 21.

22 Judg. VI. 25; 2 Chr. XXXIV. 4; etc.

23 Hos. II. 15; Jer. VII. 9; XI. 13; XXXII. 29.

24 Jer. XIX. 5; comp. 1 Ki. XVIII. 28 (on Jer. XXXII. 35 see Sect. XXIII. *init.*); comp. *Plin.* Hist. Nat. XXXVI. 5 (*supra* p. 327 note 20); *Creuzer*, Symb. I. 39; II. 457. 25 1 Ki. XIX. 18; see *infra*. 26 2 Ki. XXIII. 4.

**to be free from it.[1] Unless otherwise qualified, the Baal of the Old Testament is mostly the Tyrian Baal, or Melkarth, the tutelary deity of the town,[2] and the common link of the Phoenician cities and colonies, originally coinciding with the Babylonian *Bel*,[3] and usually identified by the Greeks and Romans with Hercules,[4] though occasionally designated by them Zeus, Saturn, or Mars.[5] He was the god of the heavenly fire or of the sun,[6] or the element of light, and Jupiter as planet, the principle of procreation or the male power in nature, sometimes represented with rays encircling his head,[7] and sometimes with grapes and pome-granates in his hands, as symbols of generation,[8] and not unfrequently drawn by bulls[9] — a being utterly incompatible with the existence of Jehovah, the Author and Lord of the Universe.[10]**

**Asherah or Ashtaroth, the Phoenician goddess Ashtarte,[11] was, in almost every respect, the counterpart of Baal, with whom she was generally worshipped in conjunction,[12] and hence bore also the appel-**

---

1 1 Ki. XIX. 18; comp. XVIII. 19; 2 Ki. X. 18—28.

2 מלך קרתא king of the town, ὁ πολιοῦχος θεός; (comp. *Aeschyl.* Sept. 271; Suppl. 1020; see also *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 451).

3 בַּעַל, בֵּל, Isai. XLVI. 1; Jer. L. 2; LI. 44; Bel and the Dragon; comp. *Herod.* I. 181—183; *Strabo* XVI. i. 5, 18; also *Plaut.* Poenul. V. ii. 67 (bel, see *infra*). On the connection between Belus and Merodach, see *Sir Henry Rawlinson,* On the Religion of the Babylonians and Assyrians, in Rawlinson's Herodotus, I. 629. 4 Comp. *Diod. Sic.* XX. 14; *Cic.* N. D. III. xvi. 42; frequently perhaps because Baal was, like Hercules, represented with a lion's skin and a club; hardly because he was the god of commerce, that is הָרֹכֵל (1 Ki. X. 15; Ezek. XVII. 4; XXVII. 3, 13, etc.) or *Hercules*; comp. *Bochart*, Phaleg, p. 610; *Münter*, Religion der Karthager, pp. 42—54; *Julius Braun*, Die Naturgeschichte der Sage, I. 307—321.

5 *Diod. Sic.* II. 8—10 (Διὸς ὃν καλοῦσιν οἱ Βαβυλώνιοι Βῆλον); *Plin.* H. N. VI. 26 or 30; XXXVII. 10 or 58 (Jupiter Belus); *Lucian*, Syr. D. c. 31; *Cic.* Nat. Deor. III. 16; comp. *Gesenius*, Comment. über den Jesaia, II. 335; *De Wette*, Archäol. § 232*a* note *e*.

6 Hence he is in Phoenician inscriptions represented as בעל חמן (*Gesen.* Monum. phoenic. p. 170; Vorrede zum Hebr. Handwörterbuch p. XXIII.); and was also termed "king" or "lord of heaven", *Belsamem* (בעל־שמים) in *Plaut.* Poenul. l. c.; comp. *Movers*, Die punischen Texte im Poenulus des Plautus, pp. 129, 130. On Melkarth as the Sun see *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. III. 11.

7 Comp. *Movers*, Phoen. I. 189; *Müller*, Archäologie der Kunst, p. 297.

8 Comp. *Gesen.* Monum. Phoen. Tab. 23. 9 *Lucian*, Syr. Dea c. 31.

10 Comp. *Selden*, De Diis Syris, Synt. II. c. 1, pp. 193—230; *Vatke*, Rel. des A. T. I. pp. 365—371; *Creuzer*, Symbol. II. 443—452; *Braun*, l. c. I. 356—359.

11 עַשְׁתֹּרֶת, עַשְׁתָּרוֹת, אֲשֵׁרָה, Judg. III. 27; 1 Ki. XI. 5 (אלהי צידונים), 33; XVIII. 19; 2 Ki. XXIII. 13 (שקוץ צידונים); comp. *Lucian*, Syr. Dea c. 4; *Joseph.* Antiqq. VIII. v. 3; C. Ap. I. 18.

12 Comp. Judg. II. 13; III. 7; VI. 25 ("throw down the altar of Baal, and cut down the Ashtarte upon it"); X. 6; 1 Sam. VII. 4; XII. 10; 1 Ki. XVIII. 19; etc.; see also *Gesen.* Monum. Phoen. p. 115.

lation *Beeltis,* the supreme female divinity in the Assyrian Pantheon, "the mother of the gods" or "the great goddess", or "queen of the lands", sometimes called the wife of Asshur, but more safely to be taken as the wife of Bel-Nimrud, the second member of the governing triad of Assyrian gods;[13] for she was the goddess of the moon,[14] and appears in inscriptions under the name *Tanais* (תנת) or the Persian Artemis, and as the goddess of war and the chace.[15] She was therefore called "the queen of heaven"[16] or Urania,[17] and represented either with a woman's head, or the head of a bull, the emblem of royalty,[18] and with horns,[19] generally three, in the form of the crescent,[20] and later a star between them; for she was Venus as planet,[21] or in the Babylonian mythology *Ishtar,* "queen of the land", the "queen of all the gods", "the beginning or mistress of heaven and earth", and especially "goddess of war, battle, and of the chace", the "queen of victory", the "fortunate or happy";[22] she was the passive or female principle of conception and birth,

---

13 She bears the name *Mulita* (*Μύλιττα*, מלדתא) or *Enuta* in Babylonian, and *Billa* (*Βῆλτις, Βήλθης*) or *Bilta Nipruta* in Assyrian, that is *lady* or *queen*. Comp. *Rawlinson*, l. c. pp. 589, 603—605, 625, 626.

14 *Lucian*, Syr. Dea, c. 4 (*Ἀστάρτην δ'ἐγὼ δοκέω Σεληναίην ἔμμεναι*).

15 Comp. *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 356; *Braun*, l. c. II. 192—195.

16 מְלֶכֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם; so also by Jeremiah (VII. 18; XLIV. 17—19).

17 Comp. *Herodian*, V. vi. 4, *Λίβυες μὲν οὖν αὐτὴν Οὐρανίαν καλοῦσι, Φοίνικες δὲ Ἀστροάρχην* — i. e. מלכת השמים, or Ashtarte — *σελήνην εἶναι θέλοντες*; *Dion Cass.* LXXIX. 12, *Οὐρανίαν τὴν τῶν Καρχηδονίων*; *Horat.* Carm. Saec. 35, 36, Siderum regina bicornis . . . Luna.

18 *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. I. x. 21 (*ἡ δὲ Ἀστάρτη ἐπέθηκε τῇ ἰδίᾳ κεφαλῇ βασιλείας παράσημον κεφαλὴν ταύρου*); comp. *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 393.

19 Comp. the town עשתרת קרנים (Gen. XIV. 5).

20 Comp. *Milton*, Paradise Lost, I. 439, 442, Ashtarte, Queen of Heaven, with crescent horns . . . In Sion also not unsung.

21 Comp. *ἀστήρ*, אֶסְתֵּר; Pers. ستارة; Assyr. *Ishtar*; *Suidas* sub *Ἀστάρτη· ἡ παρ' Ἕλλησιν Ἀφροδίτη λεγομένη, ἐκ τοῦ ἄστρου τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν πεποιηκόσιν, αὐτῆς γὰρ εἶναι τὸν ἑωςφόρον μυθολογοῦσιν*; *Cic.* Nat. Deor. III. 23, Quarta — Venus — Syria Cyproque concepta, quae Astarte vocatur, quam Adonidi nupsisse proditum est; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. I. 10; *Augustin.* Civ. D. II. 3 (Berecynthia mater omnium); *Hammer*, Fundgruben des Orients, III. 275; *Gesenius*, Thesaur. II. 1082, 1083; see, however, *Münter*, Rel. der Babylonier, pp. 215 *sqq.* Yet by the Romans she was not only identified with Juno (*Augustin.* Quaest. XVI. in Judic., Juno sine dubitatione a Poenis Astarte vocatur), but understood as a chaste virgin, and called Coelestis virgo (*Augustin.* Civ. D. II. 4; comp. *Tertull.* Apologet. c. 23), Virginale Numen (*August.* l. c. II. 26), Coelestis (*August.* Enarrat. in Ps. LXII), or Vesta (*August.* Civit. Dei IV. 10; comp. *Münter*, Rel. der Karth. 30, 31); while again she was often represented as an hermaphrodite and sometimes bearded (*Selden*, l. c. pp. 239, 240, *Münter*, l. c. pp. 35, 36; *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 334, 335).

22 *Asurah*, like אֲשֵׁרָה, see *infra*. Comp. *Rawlins.* l. c. pp. 604, 634—637;

or the element of water, and therefore the goddess of fruitfulness termed *Mylitta,*[1] and worshipped, especially by women,[2] with cakes, libations, and incense. So universal was her service, that her name was employed to express foreign deities in general;[3] it flourished in Judah especially under Manasseh and in Israel under Ahab;[4] and it was coupled with rites involving the grossest and most sensual forms of natural religion, and probably representing the remains of even ruder notions and more revolting practices.[5] Hence in the Assyrian period, the Hebrews adopted easily the trans-euphratic service of the "Tents of the maidens",[6] kindred

although admitting that Ishtar is in some localities not clearly distinguished from Beltis, he supposes the former to correspond to Venus, the latter to Rhea or Cybele of the Greeks. The Babylonian Ishtar seems to answer to the Assyrian Nana.

1 מלדתא, she who causes to bring forth children (Rawlinson, l. c. p. 605, considers *Μύλιττα* to be the Assyrian Mul, equivalent to Bel, and interprets it therefore *lady*, like Bilta); in the great inscription of Nebuchadnezzar and elsewhere she is termed "queen of fecundity" (*Rawlinson*, l. c. pp. 603, 604). אֲשֵׁרָה also, from אשר to be happy or prosperous, especially with regard to offspring, has probably a similar meaning; comp. עשתרות Deut. XXVIII. 4.

2 Jer. XLIV. 15.

3 Comp. Exod. XXXIV. 13; 2 Ki. XVII. 10; Mic. V. 13; see also Judg. II. 13; VI. 25; X. 6; 1 Sam. VII. 3, 4; XII. 10; XVI. 33; XVIII. 19; 1 Ki. XV. 13 (where the Vulg. renders אשרה by Priapus, ne esset princeps in sacris Priapi et in luco ejus, as in 2 Chr. XV. 16); XVIII. 19; 2 Ki. XIII. 6; XVII. 16; XVIII. 4; XXI. 3; XXIII. 4, 13, 14; Isai. XVII. 8; XXVII. 9; Jer. XVII. 2; comp. also 1 Sam. XXXI. 10 (among the Philistines).

4 See p. 312 notes 2—5; comp. 2 Ki. XXI. 7; XXIII. 6.

5 Comp. Lev. XIX. 29; 2 Ki. XXIII. 7; *Val. Max.* II. vi. 15; *Augustin*, Civ. D. IV. 10 (Cui—Veneri—etiam Phoenices donum dabant de prostitutione filiarum, antequam jungerent eas viris); comp. *Heyne*, De Babyloniorum religioso instituto, ut mulieres ad Veneris templum prostarent, and De Sacerdotio Comanensi (in vol. XVI. of the Göttinger Commentationes); *Hirt*, Die Hierodulen, pp. 17—29. Some antiquarians, as Movers, Gramberg, Hüllmann (Staatsverf. der Israel. pp. 133, 134), Saalschütz (Mos. R. I. 300; Arch. II. 384, 385), and others, have distinguished אֲשֵׁרָה and עַשְׁתֹּרֶת as two separate deities, and described the latter as the *Virgo Coelestis* with a pure and chaste service; but in the Old Testament both are undoubtedly identical; for בַּעַל is placed in juxtaposition indifferently with אֲשֵׁרָה (Judg. III. 7; VI. 25; 1 Ki. XVI. 32, 33; 2 Ki. XVII. 16; XXI. 3; XXIII. 4), and with עַשְׁתָּרוֹת (Judg. II. 13; 1 Sam. VII. 4; XII. 10); while אֲשֵׁרָה and עַשְׁתָּרוֹת are never mentioned together in any one of the very frequent enumerations of heathen gods (comp. אֲשֵׁרִים and חַמָּנִים, Isai. XVII. 8; XXVII. 9; 2 Chr. XXXIV. 4, 7; though אֲשֵׁרָה is also the statue of idols, Deut. VII. 5; XII. 3; Exod. XXXIV. 13; comp. Judg. X. 6; 1 Sam. VII. 4; XII. 10 הבעלים והעשתרות, analogous to Ἐρμαῖ); see also *Selden*, l. c. Synt. II. c. 2, pp. 231—261; *Münter*, Rel. der Karth. pp. 27—42; *Gesen.* Jesai. II. 337—342; *De Wette*, Archäol. § 233 *b*; *Vatke*, l. c. pp. 372—389; and on חמנים, *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. l. II. c. 25.

6 סֻכּוֹת בְּנוֹת, 2 Ki. XVII. 30; comp. XXIII. 7.

to that of Ashtarte, because also requiring the chastity of virgins as an offering to the deity.[7]

Together with Baal and Ashtarte, the Hebrews are, in the later times of the monarchy, usually stated to have adored ALL THE HOST OF HEAVEN,[8] that is, all the sidereal bodies, comprising Sabaeism in its widest extent, whence Jehovah was also called "the God of hosts";[9] and that service was often performed on the flat roofs of houses arranged for the purpose and provided with altars.[10] The Sun (שֶׁמֶשׁ) particularly, called in Assyria "the regent of the heavens and earth", "the great mover", or "destroyer of the enemies",[11] received divine honours.[12] Though sometimes invoked without images,[13] he was revered chiefly by statues or pillars (חַמָּנִים), probably of the form of the cone or of the obelisk, the common symbol of the rising flame,[14] and frequently placed on the altars of Baal,[15] or by carriages and horses, which were kept in the sanctuaries and found access even to the Temple at Jerusalem;[16] and in imitation of the Mithras worship of the Persians, the Israelites prostrated themselves before the rising orb, turning their backs to the Temple and their faces to the east;[17] they adopted during these acts even the curious

[7] It has been plausibly supposed that the name *Venus* is traceable to *Benoth* (בנות), whose worship was, at an early time, disseminated from Carthage and other parts of Africa to the shores of Italy; see *Des Brosses*, Hist. de la Républ. Rom. I. 113; II. 21; *Hirt*, l. c. pp. 25, 26. Rawlinson (l. c. p. 630) identifies *Succoth Benoth* with *Zirbanit*, the wife of Bel-Merodach, and therefore styled the queen of Babylon; but he seems himself to be aware of the precarious nature of that conjecture.

[8] כָּל־צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם, 2 Ki. XVII. 16; XXI. 3, 5; XXIII. 4, 5, 11; Zeph. I. 5; Jer. VIII. 2; XIX. 13.

[9] יהוה צבאות (1 Sam. I. 3, 11; IV. 4; XV. 2; etc. etc.) or אלהי צבאות (2 Sam. V. 10; Ps. LXXXIX. 9; comp. LXXX. 5, 8, 15, 20); comp. *Vatke*, l. c. p. 386.

[10] 2 Ki. XXIII. 12; comp. Zeph. I. 5; Isai. LXV. 3; Jer. XIX. 13; XXXII. 29; see also *Strabo*, XVI. iv. 26.

[11] Comp. *Rawlinson*, l. c. pp. 609, 610.

[12] 2 Ki. XXIII. 5; Jer. VIII. 2; where sun and moon (יָרֵחַ) are joined; comp. also Job XXXI. 26, 27; Deut. IV. 19.

[13] *Lucian*, Syr. D. c. 34; see *supra* pp. 17, 18.

[14] Comp. *Tacit.* Hist. II. 3 (alluding to the Ashtarte at Paphos), simulacrum deae, non effigie humana, continuus orbis latiore initio tenuem in ambitum metae modo exsurgens; *Herodian.* V. 3; *Plin.* H. N. XXXVI. 8 or 14 (trabes ex eo fecere Reges... obeliscos vocantes, Solis numini sacratos). It must be left undecided whether בַּעַל־חָמָן is "the god of Chemnis" in Upper Egypt or Khem, as Braun (l. c. I. 356) contends, in conformity with his scheme of reducing all mythology to an Egyptian source or primitive myth.

[15] Isai. XVII. 8; XXVII. 9; Jer. XLIII. 13; Ezek. VI. 4, 6; 2 Chr. XIV. 4; XXXIV. 4, 7; comp. Lev. XXVI. 30.

[16] 2 Ki. XXIII. 11; comp. p. 89 note 12; *Selden*, l. c. p. 325; *Münter*, Rel. d. Karth. pp. 13, 14. The horses served probably, as was the case in Persia, for a kind of royal oracle. It has hence been conjectured that the great mass of the people considered the Temple to have been dedicated specially to the worship of the Sun.

[17] Ezek. VIII. 16.

custom of putting "the branch to their nose";[1] for the Persians held in their hands, during incantations, "bundles of thin sprays of tamarisk",[2] or date-twigs, known as the holy *Barsom*,[3] which has a remarkable analogy in the *lulav* (לוּלָב) used by the Jews on the Feast of Tabernacles and consisting of a date-branch coupled with twigs of the myrtle and the willow of the brook.[4]

At the same period, the Hebrews began also to deem sacred the twelve SIGNS OF THE ZODIAC (מַזָּלוֹת), in which the sun was believed to rest or lodge during the twelve months of the year,[5] and to which Ezekiel alludes in that remarkable passage, "I went (into the Temple) and saw, and behold, every form of creeping things and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, pourtrayed upon the wall round about"[6] — that is — the Scorpion, Cancer, Bull, and other animals, analogous to the representations of the zodiac at Tentyra.[7]

To this cycle of idolatrous worship belongs the adoration of TAMMUZ (תַּמּוּז), the Syrian name of ADONIS (אָדוֹן), the beloved of Ashtarte or Venus, and the god of fruitfulness. When in the autumn the river Adonis[8] assumes a red colour in consequence of the red dust blown into it by the equinoxial gales from the Lebanon, where is its source, the people of Byblus, among whom Adonis was said to be born and buried, supposed that colour to be owing to the blood of this hero shed by a wild boar on the chace, and flowing into the river. Then they mourned his death with weeping and beating of their breasts and every mark of vehement grief, and offered to him funeral sacrifices; but the following day, they believed he had risen from the dead and had ascended into heaven, and then their grief was changed into festive joy and jubilant exultation.[9] This legend is reflected in the cosmic myth, that Tammuz and Ashtarte rule together from the vernal to the autumnal equinox, causing all vegetation to bloom and thrive; while in the winter, when nature stands bare and lifeless, Adonis dies; and then in Jerusalem

---

1 שֹׁלְחִים הַזְּמוֹרָה אֶל־אַפָּם, ver. 17.

2 *Ῥάβδων μυρικίνων λεπτῶν δέσμην κατέχοντες*, *Strabo*, XV. iii. 14, p. 733.

3 Comp. *Zend-Avesta*, II. p. 204 (*Kleuker*, "those who, with the barsom in their hands, sing praises in the purity of their hearts"); *Rosenmüller*, Schol. on Ezek. VIII. 17 (pp. 247—249); Morgenland, IV. p. 322.

4 Comp. Lev. XXIII. 40; see Comm. on Exod. p. 457.

5 2 Ki. XXIII. 5.

6 Ezek. VIII. 10.

7 Comp. *Vatke*, l. c. p. 387.

8 At present Nahr-Ibrahim; comp. *Strabo*, XVI. ii. 19, p. 755.

9 See *Lucian*, Syr. Dea, cc. 6—8; *Ovid*, Ars Amat. I. 75 (nec te praetereat Veneri ploratus Adonis); Metam. X. 519—556, 708—739; *Theocr*. Idyl. XV. 100—144 (*Ἕρπεις ὦ φίλ' Ἄδωνι καὶ ἔνθαδε κἠς Ἀχέροντα Ἡμιθέων, ὡς φαντι, μονώτατος*, vers. 136, 137); *Plat*. Phaedr. 61, p. 276; *Macrob*. Saturn. I. 21; *Apollod*. III. xiv. 4.

also, at the northern gate of the Temple, "the women were sitting and weeping for Tammuz";[10] while, in the spring, joyful festivals were celebrated, especially by women offering their chastity. This myth recurs, with slight modifications, in many heathen religions; Osiris was mourned in Egypt,[11] Adonis in Phoenicia, Tammuz in Babylon, Attes in Asia Minor, Dionysos and Linos in Greece, and Balder in the countries of the north;[12] and though the rejoicing followed immediately upon the lament, the cosmic meaning of the worship cannot be mistaken.[13]

Baal was, however, worshipped under various special forms and attributes; he was revered as Baal-Berith, Baal-Peor, and Baal-Zebub, and he returns in the shape of the Phoenician Moloch and of other kindred idols.

Baal-Berith (בַּעַל בְּרִית) was "the lord or protector of covenants",[14] probably the patron of the confederacy of the Phoenician towns; his service was in Palestine apparently well established and widely spread;[15] his temples were so richly endowed, that, on particular emergencies, they furnished sums of money to be employed for public purposes;[16] they

---

10 הנשים ישבות מבכות את־התמוז, Ezek. VIII. 14; comp. Epistle of Jeremy (Baruch VI), verss. 31, 32; see also *Milton*, Parad. Lost, I. 446—457, where the poet distinguishes between Tammuz and Adonis. The Jewish opinions on the origin of the custom and of the name Tammuz see *D. Kimchi* Rad. Lib. s. v. אומרים כי היו עושים צלם וממלאים עיניו עפר והיו עושים אש מתחתיו והעופרת נמס ודומה שהוא בוכה וכו'.

11 *Herod.* II. 40, 61; comp. *Lucian*, Syr. D. c. 7; see *Creuzer*, Symbol. II. 394, 450; *Bähr*, Symb. II. 230.

12 See esp. *Macrob.* Saturn. I. 21; comp. *Chwolson*, Ssab. II. 27, 206; *Braun*, l. c. I. 59, 60; II. 103—115.

13 This has sometimes been denied, as by Braun (l. c. II. 104), Lobeck (Aglaophamus, p. 691), Keightley (Mythol. of Anc. Greece and Italy, p. 109); comp., however, *Macrob.* Sat. I. 21, Adonin quoque solem esse non dubitabitur, inspecta religione Assyriorum... lugens inducitur Dea (Venus), quod Sol annuo gressu per duodecim signorum ordines pergens partem quoque hemisphaerii inferioris ingreditur... et cum est in inferioribus signis... lugere creditur Dea tamquam Sole . . . a Proserpina retento etc.; *Apollod.* III. xiv. 4; *Plut.* Is. 69; see *Selden*, De Diis Syris, Syntagm. II. c. 11, pp. 330—340; *Deyl.* Obs. S. III. 506—542; especially *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 417—436, 473—483. The Jews still keep the fifteenth day of the month of Shevat, which is the fifth month in the civil year, as a holiday (about the middle of February) and call it "the New-year of the trees" (ראש השנה לאילן), because they believe that then the fresh sap enters the stem, and the regeneration of nature begins (*Mishn.* Rosh Hashan. I. 1).

14 Analogous to *Ζεὺς ὅρκιος* or Deus fidius (*Ζεὺς Πίστιος*); it is scarcely *allied Baal*, i. e. Baal with whom a covenant has been made (Movers and others), nor the "Baal of Berytus, the Phoenician town"; comp. *Bochart*, Phal. p. 775; *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 413.

15 Comp. Judg. VIII. 33.

16 Judg. IX. 4; comp. ver. 27.

**were — for instance that in Shechem — surrounded with a stronghold (צְרִיחַ) provided with a chief tower (מִגְדָּל), probably intended both for defence in sieges and for astronomical observations.[1]**

**BAAL-PEOR (בַּעַל פְּעוֹר), properly a deity of the Moabites, but worshipped by the Midianites also, deriving his name from mount Peor within the territory[2] of the former, was probably the principle of generation *par excellence*,[3] and at his festivals, virgins were accustomed to yield themselves in his honour.[4] To this disgraceful idolatry the Hebrews were addicted from very early times; they are related to have in the desert already been smitten on account of it by a fearful plague which destroyed 24,000 worshippers,[5] and they seem to have clung to its shameful practices in later periods.[6]**

**BAAL-ZEBUB (בַּעַל זְבוּב), "the god of the flies", the destroyer of obnoxious insects, and therefore protector against pestilence, kindred to Zeus Apomyios worshipped in Elis[7] or to the Heros Myiagros invoked by the Arcadians,[8] was honoured by the Philistines, and had a chief temple in Ekron, to which Ahaziah, the king of Israel, sent for an oracle**

---

[1] Judg. IX. 46—49.

[2] Num. XXIII. 28; Deut. XXXIV. 6; like Jupiter Olympius a. o.; comp. *Theodoret.* in Ps. CV. 28; *Suidas* sub *Βεελφεγώρ* (*Βέελ ὁ Κρόνος, Φεγὼρ ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἐτιμᾶτο*); *G. J. Vossius*, De Orig. et Prog. Idol. II. 7.

[3] And therefore often compared to the Greek Priapus (*Hieron.* ad Hos. IX 10; contra Jovin. I. 12; etc.). It is unsafe to conclude from Ps. CVI. 28 (ויאכלו זבחי מתים) that his sacrifices were offerings to the dead.

[4] Num. XXV. 6. Hence some explain the name בעל פער "the god of opening", qui aperit vulvam; but Rashi (on Num. XXV. 3) ludicrously על שם שפוערין לפניו פי הטבעת ומוציאין רעי (quod distendebant coram illo foramen podicis et stercus offerebant); see also *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 45 ("le culte de *Pe'ôr*, qu'on célébrait en se découvrant les parties honteuses"; *Munk's* Transl.); Origenes (Homil. XX in Num.) indistinctly, Beelphegor est species turpitudinis; Philo (De Mutat. Nomin. 18) *ἑρμηνεύεται Βεελφεγὼρ ἀνωτέρω στόμα δέρματος*, evidently reading בעל פי עור; and similarly Jerome (l. c.), Beelphegor idolum tentiginis habens in ore, id est, in summitate pellem, ut turpitudinem membri virilis ostenderet (comp. *Selden*, De Diis Syris, Syntagm. I. c. 5, pp. 157—164); while others explain "the Baal of uncovering the nakedness" (see *Talm.* Sanhedr. 60 *b*, 106 *a*, a. o.).

[5] Num XXV. 3—6, 9; Deut. IV. 3; comp. Num. XXXI. 16; Josh. XXII. 17.

[6] Comp. Hos. IX. 10; Ps. CVI. 28—31; see *infra*; *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 411.

[7] *Ζεὺς Ἀπόμυιος* (*Pausan.* V. xiv. 2) or *Myiagros deus* (*Plin.* H. N. VIII. 28 or 40, Elei — invocant — Myiagron deum muscarum multitudine pestilentiam adferente).

[8] *Pausan.* VIII. xxvi. 4 (where he adds in his usual simplicity of faith, *καὶ σφισι ταῦτα δράσασιν οὐδὲν ἔτι ἀκαρόν εἰσιν αἱ μυῖαι*); comp. also *Ἡρακλῆς Κορνοπίων* and *Ἰποκτόνος* (*Strab.* XIII. i. 64, p. 613), *Ἀπόλλων Πορνοπίων* (ibid.), and *Παρνόπιος* (*Paus.* I. xxiv. 8), etc.

in a serious illness;[9] though in later times he was understood as the satan or "the chief of the devils."[10]

Molech (מֹלֶךְ), the detestable Phoenician deity and "the abomination" (שִׁקּוּץ) of the Ammonites,[11] to whom children were constantly burnt,[12] was the destructive planet Saturn,[13] whose dreaded power benighted generations sought to appease by surrendering those they loved most fondly;[14] though later speculations conceived him as the impersonation of Time or the revolving Year which produces and destroys all things in a perpetual cycle, and therefore as the Sun himself, and like the Shiva of the Hindoos at once as the bestower and destroyer of life, and hence coinciding with Baal;[15] he was by the Ammonites called Milcom (מִלְכֹּם)[16] or Malcom (מַלְכָּם),[17] and it was to this Ammonite form of the idol that Solomon dedicated a special place of worship[18] on the southern side of mount Olivet;[19] whereas the service of Molech

---

[9] 2 Ki. I. 1—6, 16; for Baal-Zebub was analogous to Ἡρακλῆς σωτήρ or ἀλεξίκακος; comp. Ἀπόλλων Ἐπικούριος (*Paus.* VIII. xli. 5), Παίων (I. xxxiv. 2), Ἀκήσιος (VI. xxiv. 5), Οὔλιος (*Strab.* XIV. i. 6, p. 635), Ἰατρόμαντις (*Aesch.* Eum. 62); see also *Selden*, l. c. Synt. II. c. 6, pp. 300—306; *Münter*, Rel. der Karth. p. 57.

[10] Matth. XII. 24; Luke XI. 15, 18.

[11] 1 Ki. XI. 7; 2 Ki. XXIII. 10.

[12] Comp. Wisd. XII. 4—6 (πράσσειν... τελετὰς ἀνοσίους, τέκνων τε φονέας ἀνελεήμονας κτλ.); XIV. 23 (ἢ γὰρ τεκνοφόνους τελετάς κτλ.); *Philo*, Abrah. c. 33 (II. 27, βαρβαρικὰ δὲ ἔθνη μέχρι πολλοῦ παιδοκτονίαν ὡς ὅσιον ἔργον καὶ θεοφιλὲς προσέοθαι); *Plat.* Min. 5, p. 315 C; the verse of Ennius—Poeni sunt solitei sos sacrificare puellos (or another reading, Ille suos Divois mos sacrificare puellos; see Fragm. Ennii in Annal. Libr. 1, ed. Hesselii, p. 28); *Sil. Ital.* IV. 767—789; *Curt.* IV. iii. 23; *Plut.* De sera Numin. Vindict. c. 6; *Augustin*, De Civ. Dei VII. 19; comp. *Plin.* H. N. XXXVI. 5.

[13] Probably כִּיּוּן, in Am. V. 26 (comp. Acts VII. 43), Syr. כאון, Arab. كيوان, called "the great misfortune", stella nocens (*Lucan*, Phars. I. 652), grave sidus (*Propert.* V. i. 84), sidus triste (*Juven.* VI. 569; comp. *Tacit.* Hist. V. 4, praecipua potentia stella Saturni), and worshipped in a black temple by priests in black robes; comp. *Vitringa*, Obs. Sacr. I. II. c. 1, pp. 239—267; *Pfeiffer*, Dub. Vexat. Cent. IV. 80, pp. 928—930; *Gesen.* Comm. üb. d. Jesaia, II. 343, 344; *Winer*, Real-Wört. II. 386—388; *Rawlins.* l. c. p. 620. That Molech is Mercury (מלאך = מלך, the messenger; so *Goodwin*, Mos. et Aar. p. 633), is an etymological play; equally unfounded are the identifications of Moloch with Mars and Venus (*Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. II. xiii. 1).

[14] Comp. *Macrob.* Sat. I. 7; *Deyling* Obs. sacr. II. 36, pp. 444—456; etc.

[15] Jer. XIX. 5, see *supra* p. 358; comp. *Macrob.* Sat. I. 8; *Münter*, Rel. d. Karth. pp. 14, 15; *Movers*, Phoen. I. pp. 322 *sqq*; *Hartung*, Relig. und Mythol. der Griech. III. 21—31.

[16] 1 Ki. XI. 5 (שקוץ עמנים), 33; 2 Ki. XXIII. 13, generally mentioned together with Chemosh of the Moabites (1 Ki. XI. 7, 33; 2 Ki. XXIII. 13), to whom he is probably akin in attributes.

[17] Jer. XLIX. 1, 3.

[18] 1 Ki. XI. 5.

[19] 2 Ki. XXIII. 13.

was performed, at least in later times, in the valley of Hinnom at a spot called Topheth (תֹּפֶת).[1] The hideous idol was represented by a huge bull-headed but hollow statue of metal; when a fire had been kindled in the cavity, the child was laid into the outstretched and lowered hands of the figure, and was then by some mechanical contrivance made to roll into the blazing flames.[2] Caresses, kisses and promises were lavished upon the wretched child, to prevent its crying if this were possible, "lest a tearful victim be immolated";[3] and in order to drown every sound of agony, the act was accompanied by the din of flutes and drums.[4] Jewish writers[5] maintain that the hollow image of Moloch had seven distinct compartments or divisions, employed respectively for burning an offering of pigeons or turtle-doves, of a sheep

---

[1] 2 Ki. XXIII. 10; Jer. VII. 31; XIX. 6, 14. It has been supposed that the Topheth was only built by king Manasseh (*Ewald*, Geschichte, III. 367). It appears that Milcom and Molech are the same deity, though with national distinctions (comp. 2 Ki. XXIII. 10 and 13); and both were honoured with human sacrifices, though the Bible does not expressly mention this with respect to Milcom (comp. *Winer*, Real-Wört. II. 95, 96; Ewald, l. c. p. 100, proposes, without authority, to read also in ver. 7 of 1 Ki. XI, מלכם instead of מלך). But מֹלֶךְ is nowhere employed for מֶלֶךְ: in Isai. LVII. 9 (ותשורי למלך בשמן), a human king can be understood (*and thou camest to the king with ointment*, that is, for a present, to conciliate his favour); the suffixes in בְּמַלְכּוֹ (Isai. VIII. 21), מַלְכְּכֶם (Am. V. 26; comp. Acts VII. 43), and בְּמַלְכָּם (Zeph. I. 5), prove that the word is no proper noun, no *name* of a god, though it means deity, by way of appellative description; whence the Chaldean translator renders in most of these passages פתכר *idol*.

[2] *Diod. Sic.* XX. 14; the fire was kindled *in* the cavity (*ὥστε τὸν ἐπιτεθέντα τῶν παίδων . . . πίπτειν εἴς τι χάσμα πλῆρες πυρός*), not *beneath* it (so among others Rashi on Jer. VII. 31, ומסיקין אותו מתחתיו); comp. also *Eurip.* Iphigen. Taur. 625, 626 — when Orestes asked what death awaited him, Iphigenia replied, *πῦρ ἱερὸν ἔνδον χάσμα τ' εὐρωπὸν πέτρας*.

[3] Ne flebilis hostia immoletur (Minucius Felix); comp. *Tertull.* Apol. c. 9 (et infantibus blandiebantur ne lacrymantes immolarentur).

[4] *Plut.* De Superst. c. 13. Hence some have curiously derived תֹּפֶת from תֹּף *cymbal*; comp. *Pfeiffer*, Dub. Vexat. Centur. IV. 20, pp. 803—805. Even the king of Dahomey does everything to keep the intended victims "in the best of humours", and therefore probably regales them with liquors (*Burton*, Mission to Gelele, I. 350; II. 32). "These men will allow themselves to be led to the slaughter like lambs" (L. c. I. p. 350).

[5] See Yalkut Shimeoni on Jer. VII. 31 (vol. II. p. 61*e*, ed. Frankf. 5469); the passage which is interesting may here be partially inserted, המולך היה צלם והיה לו שבע קנקלון או חדרים והוא לפנים מהם והיה פניו של עגל וידיו פשוטות · · · והיו מסיקין אותו מכפנים שהיה חלול וכל אדם ואדם לפי קרבנו נכנס כיצד כל מי שהיה לו עוף היה נכנס לקנקל ראשון מקריב צאן לשני שה לשלישי עגל לרביעי פר לחמישי שור לששי ומי שהיה מקריב בנו היו מכניסין אותו לשביעי והוא נושקו · · · והיו מביאים תופים ומקישים בהם בקול גבה כדי שלא יהא קולו של נער יוצא ואביו שומע ומיעיו הומים עליו.

or a goat (צאן), a lamb (שׂה), a calf, a ram, a bull, and a child; but this description, the authenticity of which is not confirmed by any ancient testimony, was probably borrowed from the construction of the temple of Mithras and its seven gates corresponding to the seven planets, or is perhaps based on the circumstance that seven old temples stood originally in the valley of Hinnom.[6] The extent to which the rites of Moloch obtained among the Hebrews will be pointed out in the next section. It is probable that the Moabites and Amorites worshipped a deity akin to the nature of Moloch under the name of CHEMOSH (כְּמוֹשׁ),[7] who, on coins of Areopolis or Ar-Moab, is represented standing on a column of fire, with burning torches at his side.[8] Solomon built a sanctuary for him "on the mountain to the east of Jerusalem", that is, on mount Olivet.[9] And the idols ADRAMMELECH (אַדְרַמֶּלֶךְ) and ANAMMELECH (אֲנַמֶּלֶךְ), embodying the male and female power of the sun, were introduced into Canaan, in Shalmanassar's time, by the colonists from the Babylonian town Sepharvaim, that is, Sippara or Sepphoris,[10] sacred to the sun, hence also called Heliopolis, and famous throughout the East; and those gods were honoured by the Hebrews likewise, who appeased them by the sacrifice of burnt children;[11] and they were therefore essentially equal to Moloch.[12]

In addition to these deities connected with Sabaean idolatry, the Bible specially mentions a variety of other heathen gods worshipped by the Hebrews. From Egypt they adopted, besides the *cultus* of APIS

---

6 Comp. *Selden*, De Diis Syris, Synt. I. c. 6, p. 170; and in general pp. 167—192; *Goodwin*, Mos. et Aar. pp. 663 *sqq.*; *Carpzov*, Appar. Crit. pp. 86—92, and in general pp. 84—100; *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. II. xiii. 1; *Grotius* on Deut. XVIII. 10; *Pfeiffer*, Dub. Vexat. Cent. IV. 80, pp. 930—933; *Münter*, Relig. der Karth. pp. 11, 12; *Braun*, l. c. I. pp. 350—352. Benjamin of Tudela's description of the image of the children of Ammon (שקוץ בני עמון), at Djebail (גיבל), one day's journey from Tripoli (see p. 25 of the Hebrew text, p. 60 of the translation in Asher's edit.), does not refer to a statue of Moloch, but more probably to one of Baal.

7 1 Ki. XI. 7, 33; 2 Ki. XXIII. 13; Jer. XLVIII. 7, 13; Judg. XI. 24: the Moabites are hence called "the people of Chemosh" (עם כמוש), Num. XXI. 29; Jer. XXVIII. 46; comp. *Philo*, Alleg. III. 82 (I. p. 133), *Χαμὼς ἑρμηνεύεται ὡς ψηλάφημα.*

8 Comp. *Eckhel*, Doctrin. Num. I. iii. 504; *Vatke*, l. c. p. 362.

9 1 Ki. XI. 7; comp. 2 Ki. XXIII. 13.

10 Gradually corrupted to Sivra and Sura, modern Mosăib.

11 2 Ki. XVII. 31.

12 Adrammelech seems to signify *king of fire* (ادر Pers.); Rawlinson however proposes "the royal arranger" (*ediru* and *gâmilu*); while he connects Anammelech with *Anunit*, the name for the female power of the sun (like *gula*); comp. *Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, p. 130; *Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. 516; *Gesen.* Jesai. II. 347, 348; *Rawlinson*, l. c. p. 611. The Talmud (Sanhedr. 63*b*) explains the idols by הפרד והסוס, without foundation.

noticed above (p. 352), the adoration of the He-goats (שְׂעִירִים)[1] held sacred in the Mendesian district,[2] and of the Serpent (נָחָשׁ) regarded by the Egyptians as a symbol of the good demon Kneph, of Isis, and of the power of healing,[3] and revered by the Hebrews in the image of a brazen serpent (נְחֻשְׁתָּן), which was supposed to have been set up by Moses himself, and which was continually honoured by fumigations up to the time of Hezekiah,[4] evidently without calling forth disapprobation or reproof, since the historical Books mention it for the first time in the record of Hezekiah's reign.[5] In imitation of their Philistine neighbours, the Israelites bowed to Dagon (דָּגוֹן), an idol with a human head and human hands, but a fish-stump — "sea-monster, upward man, and downward fish"[6] — worshipped by the Israelites through many centuries;[7] and so faithfully did they copy their heathen models that they adhered even to the singular rite of "leaping over the threshold"[8] of Dagon's temple, without treading upon it, a custom traced by the Hebrew historian to an alleged discomfiture of the idol at Ashdod owing to the presence of the Ark of the Covenant.[9]

---

[1] Lev. XVII. 7; 2 Chron. XI. 15 (where the שְׂעִירִים are coupled with the עֲגָלִים, the figures of Apis).

[2] *Herod.* II. 42; *Strabo*, XVII. i. 19, 40, pp. 802, 812 (*Μένδης, ὅπου τὸν Πᾶνα τιμῶσι, καὶ τῶν ζῴων τράγον*); *Diod. Sic.* I. 88 (*τὸν δε τράγον ἀπεθέωσαν, καθάπερ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι τετιμῆσθαι λέγουσι τὸν Πρίαπον, διὰ τὸ γεννητικὸν μόριον*); *Jablonski*, Panth. Aegypt. II. 7 (vol. I. pp. 281, 282); *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. I. II. c. 12; comp. *supra* p. 87. In some passages (as Isai. XIII. 21; XXXIV. 14) שעירים are *satyrs* or *demons* inhabiting deserts and forests, "gespenstische, neckische Wüstengeister" (*Ewald*, Alterth. 230), believed to have the form of goats; comp. *Bochart*, Hieroz. II. 643; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verfass. I. 294.

[3] See Comm. on Genes. pp. 117, 118.

[4] 2 Ki. XVIII. 4, "he broke in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel burnt incense to it, and he called it Nechushtan"; comp. Num. XXI. 8—9.

[5] The Chronist does not allude to it at all (comp. 2 Chr. XXIX. 3 *sqq.*). The author of the notice in the Book of Numbers obviously looked upon the brazen serpent merely as a symbol (comp. Exod. XVII. 11, 12), and supposed that that image, originally intended by Moses as an emblem of Divine assistance during a fearful plague of serpents, was later perverted into an idol (comp. *De Wette*, Beiträge, II. p. 361; *Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. pp. 482, 518; *Vatke*, l. c. p. 799).

[6] 1 Sam. V. 4; perhaps corresponding with the Greek *Δερκετώ* or *Αταργάτις* (*Strabo*, XVI. i. 27; iv. 27, *Ἀταργάτιν δὲ τὴν Ἀθάραν ἐκάλεσαν, Δερκετὼ δὲ αὐτὴν Κτησίας καλεῖ*; *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 391—410, esp. p. 403).

[7] Comp. Judg. XVI. 23; 1 Sam. V. 1—4; 1 Macc. X. 83, 84; comp. *Selden*, l. c. II. c. 3, pp. 261—278.

[8] דולג על־המפתן, Zeph. I. 9; comp. *Rosenmüller*, Schol. in loc.

[9] 1 Sam. V. 1—4. On the Assyrian Dagon frequently employed in the title of Sardanapalus ("he who honours *Anu* and *Dagon*"), see *Rawlins.* l. c. p. 593.

The Teraphim (תְּרָפִים),[10] idols of human form,[11] though perhaps of smaller size,[12] were probably introduced from the countries of the Euphrates and Tigris;[13] the Hebrews, regarding them as tutelary deities, deemed them long as thoroughly compatible with the true worship of Jehovah, and therefore consulted them as a Divine oracle, like the Ark of the Covenant,[14] the Urim and Tummim, and the prophets.[15] But later, when purer religious notions prevailed, the Teraphim were naturally included in the general interdiction of idolatry; they were even denounced as abominations,[16] perhaps just because they were almost viewed by the people as a legitimate means of religious devotion, and had in the lapse of centuries taken such a powerful hold upon the national mind, that they remained in favour at so late a period as that of the prophet Zechariah.[17]

In the times of the declining monarchy, the Israelites were still more infected with the superstitions of the Assyrians and Babylonians, with whom they were brought into contact not only in the regions of the Euphrates but also in Palestine itself through the Assyrian settlers thither transplanted by Shalmanassar.[18] Besides the service of the "Tents of the maidens" and of Adrammelech and Anammelech (see *supra*), they did homage to Nergal (נֵרְגַל)[19] of the Cuthites, in inscriptions also constantly called the god of Cutha[20] and Tiggaba,[21] the Ba-

---

[10] Whether allied to the Seraphim (שׂרפים), or meaning images generally connected with צרף to *melt* or *purge by fire*; Sept. *εἴδωλα* (though in 1 Sam. XIX. 13, 16 peculiarly *κενοτάφια*, and in Hos. III. 4, *δῆλοι* i. e. אורים); Ewald (Alterth. p. 232) conjecturally *face* or *mask* (اشرف) with which he supposes the images to have been provided; see Comm. on Gen. pp. 554, 555.

[11] 1 Sam. XIX. 13.

[12] Gen. XXXI. 34.

[13] Gen. XXXI. 19, 30; Ezek. XXI. 26.

[14] See p. 30 note 1.

[15] Comp. Judg. XVII. XVIII; Hos. III. 4; Zech. X. 2; comp. Ezek. XXI. 26.

[16] 2 Ki. XXIII. 24; 1 Sam. XV. 23.

[17] X. 2; see also 2 Ki. XXIII. 24; comp. *supra* p. 355; comp. *Selden*, De Diis Syris, Synt. I. c. 2, pp. 96—123; *Ewald*, Alterth. pp. 231, 232.

[18] 2 Ki. XVII. 30—41; esp. ver. 40.

[19] 2 Ki. XVII. 30, perhaps signifying "the great hero", and occurring in the proper noun Nergal-shaluzur (i. e. Nergal protects the king) or *Νεργελήσαρος*. His earliest title was *Va-gur* or *Va-hur*, of uncertain meaning; he is also designated *si-du* (ancestor), "the brother", and "the great brother".

[20] The ruins of Cutha, about 12 miles from Babylon, were in 1846 discovered by Sir H. Rawlinson; Cutha is in Arabic writings very commonly represented as the town of Nimrod; there, it was supposed, Abraham was thrown by the king into the fire, and an old and highly revered shrine marks still the spot where the event is alleged to have taken place; comp. *Rawlins.* l. c. p. 632.

[21] Ptolemy calls it *Διδιγούα* (V. xx. 4), Pliny Digba (VI. 26 or 31); the god of Tiggaba, or Nergal, is on inscriptions also called *Aria*, that is, lion (ארי), *Ares* (Mars).

bylonian divinity presiding over war and the chace, bearing the epithets of powerful ruler, king of battle, champion of the gods, strong parent, tutelar god of Babylonia, ancestral god of the Assyrian kings, and patron of huntsmen; he corresponded on the whole to Mars [1] and was held ominous as a planet; he was represented as a warrior in blood-coloured garments, or on Assyrian sculptures by the Man-lion, as Asshur or Nin, to whom he is kindred in attributes, was figured by the Man-bull; [2] and the Arabians honoured him by sacrifices of captive soldiers. [3] The Hebrews, moreover, humbled themselves before Ashima (אֲשִׁימָא), the god of the people of Hamath or Epiphania, [4] of whose nature and attributes we possess no reliable information; [5] to Nibhaz (נִבְחַז) of the Avites, [6] who was probably the god of darkness or the evil demon, his feet resting in the lowest depths of the infernal abyss, while his throne reaches to the surface of the upper world; [7] to Tartak (תַּרְתָּק), also revered by the Avites, [8] probably not differing much from Nibhaz, since he is likewise supposed to be the lord of darkness, and, whether representing Saturn or Mars, to be fatal as a planet; [9] to the god of Fortune Gad (גָּד), equivalent to Baal or Bel, the planet Jupiter, the bestower of all blessings, [10] and the goddess Meni (מְנִי), corresponding to Venus, next to the preceding deity regarded as the source of every boon and happiness, [11] and like him honoured with lectisternia by the Jews who "prepared a table to Gad and filled the goblet for Meni." [12]

Now all these idols, whether expressly mentioned or implied by allusions, were worshipped, under the guidance of a numerous priest-

---

1 The Mendaean name for the planet Mars is still *Nerig*.

2 The Talmudical interpretation of Nergal by cock (תרנגול, *Talm.* Sanhedr. l. c.) is untenable, although Babylonian relics represent priests in the attitude of prayer or sacrifice before a cock on an altar (comp. *Layard*, Niniv. and Babyl. pp. 538, 539); but it is a fanciful combination to identify Nergal with "Typhon Ares" or "Ares Ahriman" or "the Satan himself" (*Braun*, l. c. II. 19), a conjecture contradicted by the nature of the worship accorded to Nergal by the Babylonians.

3 See *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 415, 416; *Selden*, l. c. Synt. II. c. 8, pp. 317—327; *Braun*, l. c. II. 19, 325; esp. *Rawlinson*, l. c. pp. 598, 631—634.

4 2 Ki. l. c.

5 The Talmud (l. c.) explains ברחא קרחא hircus calvus; comp. also *Selden*, l. c. II. 9, pp. 327—329.

6 2 Ki. l. c. ver. 31.

7 The Talmud (l.c.), obviously tracing the word to the root נבח *to bark*, supposes Nibhaz to be a deity in the form of a dog, which animal represented indeed some Syrian divinity.

8 2 Ki. l. c.

9 The Talmud (l. c.) explains ass; comp. *Gesen*. Jesai. II. 346—349.

10 السعد الاكبر, *the greater good fortune*; comp. *Selden*, De Diis Syris, Synt. I. 1, pp. 76—95.

11 السعد الاصغر, *the lesser good fortune*.

12 Isai. LXV. 11, see p. 8 note 3; comp. *Gesen*. Jesai. II. 283—288, 337.

hood[13] specially appointed,[14] by images of wood and stone,[15] and later[16] of gold and silver,[17] or by statues (מַצֵּבוֹת)[18] or pillars with an emblem of some deity,[19] by sacred stones or *Baetylia* (*Βαιτύλια*) placed on the road and public thoroughfares and poured over with libations of wine and oil,[20] and by Memorial-stones[21] most likely provided with superstitious figures or emblems, on which the worshippers prostrated themselves;[22] till finally the various images themselves, and not the idols they represented, were by the ignorant multitude looked upon as powerful beings able to save or to ruin;[23] they were invoked with sacrifices and incense,[24] libations[25] and cake-offerings,[26] with prostrations and kisses;[27] they were honoured by processions and dan-

---

[13] Called כְּמָרִים, 2 Ki. XXIII. 5; Hos. X. 5; Zeph. I. 4; comp. 1 Ki. XVIII. 19.

[14] 1 Ki. XII. 32; XIII. 33; 2 Ki. XVII. 32; XXIII. 9, 20, probably with distinctive official garments (comp. 2 Ki. X. 22), those of Baal with *red* robes; comp. *Tertull.* De Pallio, c. 4.

[15] Hos. IV. 12; Jer. II. 27; X. 3, 4; Isai. XLIV. 12—17; etc.

[16] *Vatke*, l. c. p. 271.

[17] Isai. II. 20; XXXI. 7; etc.; comp. Judg. XVII. 4.

[18] Hos. X. 1; 1 Ki. XIV. 23; 2 Ki. XVII. 10; comp. XVIII. 4; XXIII. 14.

[19] Comp. *Herod.* II. 10, *τὰς δὲ στήλας ... ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ Συρίῃ αὐτὸς ὥρεον ἐούσας, καὶ τὰ γράμματα τὰ εἰρημένα ἐνέοντα, καὶ γυναικὸς αἰδοῖα.*

[20] Comp. Gen. XXVIII. 18, 19; XXXI. 13, 45; XXXV. 14; comp. *Juven.* Sat. XVI. 38 (sacrum effodit medio de limite saxum); Comm. on Gen. pp. 523, 524; *Selden*, De Diis Syr. Synt. II. c. 1, p. 224; *Münter*, Rel. der Karth., pp. 72—75; *Creuzer*, Symb. IV. 639; *Nork*, Vergl. Mythol. pp. 234, 235; *Ewald*, Alterth. pp. 124, 234. The words בחלקי נחל חלקך וכ׳ (Isai LVII. 6) appear to refer to the same custom; though a variety of other explanations has been proposed (comp. Gesen., Rosenm., Knobel and Delit. in loc.).

[21] מַשְׂכִּיּוֹת or אַבְנֵי מַשְׂכִּית, Num. XXXIII. 52; Lev. XXVI. 1; comp. Ezek. VIII. 12. Ebn Ezra (on Lev. l. c.) remarks, "this is the manner of worshipping Mercury" (מרקולים), that is, by *Ἑρμαί*, or, according to the Mishnah (Sanh. VII. 6), by throwing stones to the pile consecrated to him (הזורק אבן למרקולים וכ׳, comp. *Maimon.* De Noxiis VII. 1); Targ. Onk. and Jonath. בית סגדתהון or בית סגידהון and אבן סגיד or אבן מציור, Targ. Jerus. inaccurately טעותהון and אבן דטעו, but Sept. *λιθὸν σκοπόν*, hence Saalschütz (Mos. Recht, I. 384) "stone of contemplation", that is, a high stone for the observation of the stars (comp. templum), which is hardly probable.

[22] Lev. l. c., "neither shall you set up any memorial stone in your land to bow down upon it" (עליה); comp. in general, *Spencer*, l. c. l. II. c. 22.

[23] Deut. IV. 28; Isai. II. 8; XLIV. 17; comp. Hab. II. 18, 19; Ps. CXV. 4—7; CXXXV. 15—17; 2 Macc. II. 2.

[24] 2 Ki. XVII. 11; XXIII. 12; XXXII. 29; Isai. LXV. 3; Hos. IV. 13; Jer. III. 24; Zeph. I. 5; etc. etc.

[25] Jer. VII. 18; XIX. 13; XLIV. 17; etc.

[26] Jer. VII. 18 (כַּוָּנִים); comp. Isai. LXV. 11.

[27] 1 Ki. XIX. 18; Hos. XIII. 2 (עֲגָלִים יִשָּׁקוּן); that is, not merely by *προσκυνεῖν* equivalent with *adorare*, but literally by kissing; as Cicero (Verr. Accus. IV. 43 or 94) remarks with respect to the brazen image of Hercules in Agrigentum, that "its mouth

ces,[1] and in some instances, as at the rites of Baal, by incisions with knives "till the blood gushed forth";[2] they were appealed to in confirming oaths[3] or consulted for prophecies;[4] adored by the rich and the poor,[5] by men and women,[6] by kings and chiefs, priests and people,[7] throughout the country, not only "in the towns of Judah and the districts of Jerusalem",[8] but "from Geba to Beer-sheba",[9] and "in all their towns from the watch-towers to the fenced cities",[10] "in every street" and "at the corner of every road",[11] so that the altars were countless in number "like the heaps in the furrows of the field",[12] or as Jeremiah exclaimed, "The number of thy towns, o Judah, is the number of thy gods, and like the number of the streets of Jerusalem you have set up altars to the abomination, altars to burn incense to Baal";[13] on heights (בָּמוֹת), often artificially constructed in the form of lofty cones,[14] sometimes even in valleys,[15] and provided with their proper altars,[16] or "upon every high hill",[17] and on the roofs of houses, where permanent temples[18] were built,[19] or tents were fixed and spread over with varied hangings and curtains,[20] in such vast numbers that the

---

and chin are a little worn away (attritus), because the people in addressing to it their prayers and thanks are accustomed not only to worship but to kiss it" (non solum id venerari verum etiam osculari solent) — a classical parallel to the worn-off great toe of St. Peter's colossal statue in his church at Rome; comp. also Job XXXI. 27 (וחשק ידי לפי).

1 Comp. 1 Ki. XVIII. 26, where the dancing is, perhaps ironically, called "halting" (וַיְפַסְּחוּ).

2 1 Ki. XVIII. 28, see p. 343.

3 Jer. XII. 16; comp. Josh. XXIII. 7.

4 2 Ki. I. 2; Jer. II. 8; Zech. X. 2; comp. Ezek. XXI. 26.

5 Jer. V. 4, 5. 6 Jer. XLIV. 15, 17.

7 2 Chr. XXXVI. 14.

8 2 Ki. XXIII. 5; comp. ver. 13.

9 2 Ki. XXIII. 8. 10 2 Ki. XVII. 9.

11 Ezek. XVI. 24, 25, 31, 39.

12 Hos. XII. 12.

13 Jer. XI. 13; II. 28; comp. Ezek. XVI. 24, 31; see, however, Isai. X. 10.

14 Comp. *Ewald*, Gesch. III. 110; see also Alterth. pp. 234, 235.

15 See 2 Ki. XXIII. 15.

16 Jer. VII. 31; XXXII. 35; Ezek. XVI. 24 (ותבני לך גב ותעשי לך רמה בכל רחוב), 31; though the word בָּמָה imperceptibly took the general meaning of *altar* (Num. XXXIII. 52; etc.), which is in itself an elevation or "a height" (comp. *Winer*, Real-W. I. 508; *Spencer*, l. c. l. II. c. 23).

17 Hos. IV. 13; X. 1; Isai. LXV. 7; Jer. II. 20; III. 6; VI. 13; XIX. 5; Ezek. VI. 3; XVIII. 11, 15; XX. 28, 29; 1 Sam. IX. 12; 2 Sam. XV. 32; 1 Ki. III. 2; XII. 31; XIV. 23; 2 Ki. XV. 4, 35; XVI. 4; XVII. 10, 32; XXI. 3; XXIII. 5, 8, 13, 15; comp. Num. XXII. 41; XXIII. 28, 29; XXXIII. 52; Jer. XLVIII. 35; comp. also Gen. XXII. 2; XXXI. 54; Exod. III. 12; Ps. CXXI. 2.

18 בתי במות, 1 Ki. XIII. 32; 2 Ki. XVII. 29, 32; XXIII. 29.

19 1 Ki. XI. 7; XIV. 23; etc. So also the temple of Pallas on the citadel of Troy, and on the Acropolis of Athens, that of Jupiter on the Capitol of Rome, and of Jehovah on mount Moriah (comp. Ps. XV. 1; XXIV. 3), etc.; comp. *Lobeck*, Aglaophanus, p. 691; *Keightley*, Mythol. of Anc. Greece and Italy, p. 109.

20 2 Ki. XXIII. 7; hence called בָּמוֹת טְלֻאוֹת "chapels of divers colours",

**God of the Hebrews was described by the Aramaeans as "a god of the mountains and not a god of the valleys",[21] because the celestials were supposed to live on high mountains,[22] and to attend better to prayers addressed to them from an eminence;[23] "under every green tree", in groves and in gardens,[24] "because its shadow is pleasant",[25] or because the mysterious darkness of groves and forests impressed a childlike imagination with awe and marked them as the fit abodes of the deity;[26] on the corn-floors, where at harvest-time homage was paid to the gods of fertility, especially Ashtarte, by abusing her priestesses[27] for money and presents;[28] nay idols were revered in the very Temple of Jerusalem which was defiled by detestable images of every description,[29] by altars erected in both Courts to Baal, Ashera, and all the "host of heaven",[30] and by carriages and horses there kept and consecrated to the Sun,[31] and the sanctity of which was so recklessly despised that within its precincts the Hebrews erected houses of prostitute priests,[32] where the**

---

Ezek. XVI. 16. It is, therefore, unnecessary to read in 2 Ki. l. c. בגדים for בתים (*Ewald*, Gesch. III. 367).

[21] 1 Ki. XX. 23, 28.

[22] Comp. the *Albordsh* or "Mountain of Meeting" (הר מועד) of the Babylonians (Isai. XIV. 13), the *Meru* of the Hindoos, the *Tireh* of the Parsees, the *Kulkun* of the Chinese, the *Caf* of the Arabians, the *Olympus* of the Greeks, etc. (see Comm. on Gen. p. 21).

[23] Comp. *Lucian*, Syr. Dea c.18; see also *Herod*. I. 131; *Xenoph*. Memor. III. viii. 10 (*ναοῖς γε μὴν καὶ βωμοῖς χῶραν ἔφη εἶναι πρεπωδεστάτην ἥτις ἐμφανεστάτη οὖσα ἀστιβεστάτη εἴη*); *Gesen*. Thes. p. 188; Preface to *Gramberg's* Relig. Ideen I. pp. XIX—XXI. In *Tacit*. Ann. XIII. 57 not heights but places yielding salt are declared to be divine (comp. *supra* Sect. IX. 1).

[24] 1 Ki. XIV. 23; 2 Ki. XVI. 4; XVII. 10; Isai. I. 29; LXVI. 17; Jer. II. 20; III. 6, 13; Ezek. VI. 13; comp. Gen. XII. 6, 7; XIII. 18; XXI. 33; and *supra* pp. 17, 18; *Tacit*. Germ. 9, 39, 40; *Curt*. IV. 7 or 31; *Diod. Sic*. XVII. 50. The heathen temples were commonly surrounded by sacred groves convenient also, if not necessary, for the sacrificial meals; hence *ἄλσος* is both grove and temple; comp. *Strab*. IX. ii. 33, p. 412 (*ἄλση καλοῦντες τὰ ἱερὰ κἂν ᾖ ψιλά*); XIII. i. 65, p. 613; Deut. XVI. 21 (לא־תטע לך אשרה כל־עץ אצל מזבח יהוה אלהיך); see *Münter*, l. c. p. 10; *Hüllmann*, l. c. p. 134.

[25] Hos. IV. 13.

[26] Proceritas silvae, says Seneca, et secretum loci et admiratio umbrae in aperto tam densae atque continuae fidem numinis facit (quoted by *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. II. 5).

[27] קְדֵשׁוֹת, Hos. IX. 1; comp. IV. 14, where קדשות (properly "dedicated women") is employed as a synonym of זנות.

[28] Which enlightened writers termed אֶתְנַן זוֹנָה (Deut. XXIII. 19; Mic. I. 7; comp. Ezek. XVI. 31, 34; Hos. IX. 1); comp. *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. II. cc. 35, 36.

[29] See p. 19 note 11.

[30] 2 Ki. XXI. 5; XXIII. 4, 12.

[31] 2 Ki. XXX. 11.

[32] קְדֵשִׁים, scorta virilia; 1 Ki. XIV. 24; XV. 12; XXII. 47; rendered by the English version "sodomites", by Luther "Hurer", by De Wette "Buhler" (Vulg. effeminati), which translations however express only one side of the notion; the wages of their shame are called מְחִיר כֶּלֶב "the reward of a dog" (Deut. XXIII. 19), a term indicative of the utmost contempt (comp. 1 Sam. XVII. 43; XXIV.

women wove tents for Ashtarte.[1] Therefore the prophets might justly declare that the whole land was polluted, and that the ground devoted to sanctity had become an abomination.[2]

Nor did the Hebrews remain strangers to the belief in demons and spectres; they professed their faith in the existence of SHEDIM (שֵׁדִים),[3] that is,[4] *lords* or *masters*, implying various kinds of foreign deities or evil spirits,[5] and to them they offered not only sacrifices,[6] but slaughtered their children;[7] they attributed reality to the LILITH (לִילִית), a night-spectre (לַיִל) dwelling in desolate ruins,[8] and, according to eastern legends, rushing forth in the dead of the night, in the form of a beautiful woman to seize children and to tear them to pieces.[9]

Besides, SOOTH-SAYING of every variety and description prevailed among the people from early ages up to the times of the Roman empire, when Jews wandered through the western provinces in quest of a modest livelihood by the practice of the art.[10] Their wise men or wizzards[11]

---

15; 2 Sam. III. 8; IX. 8; XVI. 9; 2 Ki. VIII. 13; Prov. XXVI. 11); comp. *Spencer*, l. c.

1 2 Ki. XXIII. 7, see *supra*; comp. 1 Ki. XV. 12; XXII. 47; Deut. XXIII. 18, 19; those בתי הקדשים probably correspond with the סֻכּוֹת בְּנוֹת of the Babylonians (see *supra* p. 360).

2 Jer. II. 7, and the entire chapter, etc.

3 From the root שׁוּד to govern, to rule.

4 Like בְּעָלִים; comp. Arab. سيد, سايد.

5 Sept. *δαιμόνια*, Vulg. *daemonia*.

6 Deut. XXXII. 17. 7 Ps. CVI. 37.

8 Isai. XXXIV. 14.

9 Comp. among the Greeks *Ἔμπουσα* (with the epithets *ὀνοσκελίς* and *ὀνοκώλη*), *Λάμια*, *ὀνοκένταυροι* (*Aristoph.* Ran. 293; Eccles. 1056; Vesp. 1177; *Diod. Sic.* XX. 41; *Demosth.* De Coron. c. 130, p. 270; *Horat.* Ars Poet. 340 (in Isai. XXXIV. 14, the Sept. renders both אים and לילית by *ὀνοκένταυροι*, the Vulg. the former by onocentauri, the latter by lamia, Luther Feldteufel and Kobold); among the Romans Striges (*Ovid*, Fast. VI. 131—140; *Plin.* H. N. XI. 39 or 95; *Tibull.* I. v. 52; *Petron.* CXXXIV. 1); among the Arabs the Ghuls (الغول); see *Bochart*, Hieroz. II. pp. 831—840; *Buxtorf*, Lex. Talm. pp. 1140, 1141; *Eisenmenger*, Entdeckt. Judenth. II. pp. 413—426, 434, 452; *Gesenius* on Isai. XIII. 21, 22 and XXXIV. 14 (I. 2. pp. 465—468, 915—920); *Braun*, l. c. I. 124, 354; II. 144, 164; comp. also עֲלוּקָה (Prov. XXX. 15), probably *leech*, and then, like vampire, denoting a female monster, a sucker of blood, and therefore deemed identical with Ghul, as Kamus interprets the one by the other; comp. *Bochart*, l. c. p. 869.

10 *Juven.* VI. 542—547; comp. *Plut.* Vit. Marii c. 17 (*καὶ γάρ τινα Σύραν γυναῖκα, Μάρθαν ὄνομα, μαντεύεσθαι λεγομένην κτλ.*); Acts XVI. 16; see also VIII. 9; XIII. 6—8; *Joseph.* Antiqq. VIII. ii. 5.

11 יִדְּעֹנִים (from יָדַע, possessors of hidden knowledge; *Ewald*, Lehrbuch § 3 *c*, "Vielwissenwollende"; compare in Lat. sagus, saga, sagana; *Cic.* De Divin. I. 31, sagire enim sentire acute est ... id est futura ante sentire; Sept. *τερατοσκόποι*), Lev. XIX. 31; XX. 6; Deut. XVIII. 11; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 3, 9; though ידעני is also a daemon living and working in a man, Lev. XX. 27. The Mishnah (Sanhedr. VII. 7) explains untenably ידעוני זה המדבר בפיו (comp. *Rashi* in loc.).

practised DIVINATION[12] to predict the future, especially by *rhabdomancy* (*ῥαβδομαντεία*) by means of *rods* or *wands*,[13] of which two were placed upright, and then allowed to fall on the ground; the direction in which they fell involved the omen; or a rod was on one side stripped of the bark and thrown into the air; if in coming down, first the covered and then the bare side appeared uppermost, the augury was happy; if in the reverse order, unlucky.[14] They were addicted to ENCHANTMENT[15] by spells muttered in a mysterious whisper,[16] to WITCHCRAFT[17] and to

---

[12] קֶסֶם or קְסָמִים, Sept. *μαντεία*, Num. XXII. 7, 23; Deut. XVIII. 10; 2 Ki. XVII. 17; Isai. III. 2; XLIV. 25; Jer. XXIX. 8, XXVII. 9, Ezek. XIII. 6; and still in Zechar. X. 2. In Jer. XXIX. 8 and Ezek. XIII. 6 at least, קסם plainly means to practise *divination*, not *sorcery*; in the former passage it is coupled with prophets and dreams, the latter says distinctly "they see vanity וקסם כזב; although in Num. XXII. 7 it seems rather to refer to sorcery (comp. ver. 6; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 8); so that the root is evidently comprehensive and generic in sense.

[13] Hos. IV. 12, "My people ask counsel at their wood, and their staff teaches them."

[14] Comp. also *Herod.* IV. 67; *Tacit.* Germ. 10; *Rosenm.* on Hos. IV. 12. The king of Babylon is related (Ezek. XXI. 26—28) to have sought oracles by "shaking the arrows" (קלקל בחצים, Sept. *ἀναβράσαι ῥαβδία* i. e. *βελομαντεία*) and by "inspection of the liver" (רָאָה בַּכָּבֵד, *ἡπατοσκοπία*, *Herodian.* VIII. iii. 7; *Philostrat.* Apollon. VIII. vii. 15—"the liver is the true tripos of all mantic art"—; *Arrian*, VII. 18; *Cic.* De Divin. II. 13; or *ἱεροσκοπία*, extispicia, haruspicia from harviga victim; comp. *Aeschyl.* Prometh. 493—499; *Herod.* IX. 38; *Diod. Sic.* I. 73; II. 29; *Strabo*, III. iii. 6, p. 154; *Cic.* l. c. 12—17; *Juven.* VI. 549—551); see *Movers*, Opferwes. der Karth. pp. 65, 66; and in general, *Spencer* l. c. I. II. cc. 16, 17; *Carpzov*, App. Crit. pp. 104—107; *Rosenmüll.* Morgenl. IV. 333—337; see also *supra* p. 313; and on divining by a cup (*κυλικομαντεία*), see Comm. on Gen. p. 673.

[15] נַחַשׁ, Num. XXIII. 23; Deut. XVIII. 10; from נָחַשׁ *to whisper* (2 Ki. XVII. 17; XXI. 6).

[16] Isai. VIII. 19; XXIX. 4 (Sept. *οἰωνίζεσθαι*; in Isai. VIII, *τοὺς κενολογοῦντας, οἳ ἀπὸ τῆς κοιλίας φωνοῦσιν*) comp. *γόητες* (2 Tim. III. 13; see *Herod.* VII. 191; *Hor.* Sat. I. viii. 25), *κατᾴδειν, ἐπᾴδειν, ἐπῳδή, ἐπῳδός*, incantare, excantare, esp. carmen (*Hor.* Epod. V. 45 *sqq.*; XVII. 4—6; *Tibull*, I. ii. 43—46; *Lucan*, Phars. VI. 439, 452; *Tacit.* Ann. II. 28; *Plin.* H. N. XXVIII. 3 or 6; comp. *Theocrit.* II. 17 *sqq.*; *Virg.* Ecl. VIII. 67 *sqq.*); it is with less probability traced to נָחָשׁ *serpent*, so that it would be *ὀφιομαντεία*, divination by the movements of serpents (comp. Gen. XLIV. 5); though לַחַשׁ which is a synonym of נַחַשׁ (Isai. III. 3, נבון לחש), being derived of לָחַשׁ *to whisper* or *mutter* (whence מְלַחֵשׁ enchanter), seems to have been predominantly used with regard to the enchantment of serpents (Jer. VIII. 17; Eccl. X. 11); comp. also אִטִּים whisperers (from אטט *to murmur*, or *to utter gentle sounds*; Isai. XIX. 3), that is, *necromancers.* In Num. XXIV. 1, נחשים seems to be *inspiration* generally (comp. XXIII. 3, 15), it may be, induced by magical artifices.

[17] כְּשָׁפִים, 2 Ki. IX. 22; 2 Chr. XXXIII. 6; Mic. V. 11; and even Mal. III. 5; hence מְכַשֵּׁף (Exod. VII. 11; Deut. XVIII. 10; Dan. II. 2) or כַּשָּׁף (Jer.

Magic,[1] to an extent not inferior to any of the eastern nations;[2] they indulged in Incantations[3] by which venomous serpents were supposed to be rendered harmless and obedient,[4] and very largely in Necromancy[5] often practiced while "sitting on graves",[6] by means of a person[7] who was considered to be prophetically inspired by a daemon;[8] as in the very instructive instance of the "witch of Endor", who first learnt by the rising of Samuel's shade, that her guest was the king,[9] and when

---

XXVII. 9) *one who exercises witchcraft*, from כשף nearly synonymous with with לחש, to mutter magical speeches (the same root signifying in Syriac *to pray* or *worship*), not from the Arabic stem used of eclipses of the sun which it was supposed the מכשפים had the power to call forth; Sept. φάρμακα, φαρμακεύεσθαι, and φαρμακός, so that כשפים would mean enchantments brought about by means of herbs.

1 חֲרָשִׁים (Isai. III. 3, חכם חרשים), properly artifices, from חָרַשׁ *to devise*. Another term for magician is עוֹנֵן (Isai. II. 6; LVII. 3; Jer. XXVII. 9; 2 Ki. XXI. 6) or מְעוֹנֵן (Deut. XVIII. 10; Mic. V. 11), which is hardly, as has been supposed, connected with עַיִן, so that it would mean *one who fascinates with the eye* (comp. *Virg*. Ecl. III. 103; *Plin.* H. N. VII. 2; *Gell.* IX. 4), nor with עָנָן cloud, as if it meant divining from the course of the clouds (comp. *Hengstenb.* Gesch. Bileams, p. 123) or the phenomena of heaven (comp. Jer. X. 2).

2 Isai. II. 6; Mic. V. 11.

3 חֶבֶר or חֲבָרִים (from חבר *to bind*, properly to make a knot while pronouncing incantations, Germ. Nestelknüpfen, French nouer l'aiguillette; comp. *Virg*. Ecl. VIII. 76—78, necte tribus nodis ternos, Amarylli, colores ... Veneris dic vincula necto); Deut. XVIII. 11; Isai. XLVII. 9, 12; Ps. LVIII. 5, 6.

4 Jer. VIII. 17; Eccl. X. 11. The serpents were by the Psylli goaded to bite at a cloth, whereby they lost their poison and became for a time weak, and often motionless (comp. *Bochart*, Hieroz. II. 384—394; *Rosenm.* Morgenl. IV. pp. 55—76; *De Wette* on Ps. l. c.

5 אוֹב (of uncertain etymology; comp. *Saalschütz*, Mos. Recht, I. 517, 518; *Hoelemann*, Bibelstudien, I. pp. 160—163), properly the *spirit* of divination (Lev. XX. 27; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 7 אשת בעלת אוב; ver. 8 קסם באוב), then the *person* possessing that spirit or practicing divination by its help (1 Sam. XXVIII. 9; Isai. VIII. 19; XIX. 3; Lev. XIX. 31; XX. 6: in Deut. XVIII. 11; 2 Ki. XXI. 6; Isai. XXIX. 4; 1 Chr. X. 13; 2 Chr. XXXIII. 6, it is uncertain whether the spirit or the person is meant), signifying originally ventriloquist, then necromancer (Sept. ἐγγαστρίμυθος, νεκρόμαντις, νεκυόμαντις).

6 Isai. LXV. 4, הישבים בקברים; comp. *Hor.* Epod. XVII. 47; Sat. I. viii. 20—29; *Ovid*, Heroid. VI. 89, 90 (per tumulos errat, etc.); *Lucan*, Phars. VI. 511, 512 (desertaque busta Incolit, et tumulos expulsis obtinet umbris).

7 Lev. XIX. 31; XX. 6; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 3, 9; comp. 2 Ki. XXI. 6; Isai. VIII. 19; XXIX. 4; 1 Chr. X. 13; 2 Chr. XXXIII. 6; the Mishnah (Sanhedr. VII. 7) explains strangely בעל אוב זה פיתום (πνεῦμα πύθων Acts XVI. 16) המדבר משחיו (see Rashi in loc.).

8 Comp. Lev. XX. 27; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 7, 8; hence שאל אוב or דרש אל־האבות (Isai. VIII. 19) is equivalent to דרש אל־המתים; but as the consultation of the dead took place by the agency of an אוב, it was possible to enumerate as two distinct things שאל אוב ... ודרש אל־המתים (Deut. XVIII. 11), since both the one and the other were "asked."

9 1 Sam. XXVIII. 12.

asked by the latter what she saw, she replied "I see a god rising (אלהים ראיתי עלים) out of the earth",[10] whose "appearance" she then described as that of "an old man wrapped in a mantle",[11] probably the "hairy garment" (אַדֶּרֶת שֵׂעָר) ordinarily worn by seers.[12] And their prophets (נְבִיאִים), adopting that distinctive garment of the class "for deception",[13] misled the multitude by vain and fictitious DREAMS,[14] which were often sought by sleeping on tombs, in sacred caves or edifices,[15] generally on the hides of sacrificed animals,[16] and by FALSE PREDICTIONS, whether pronounced in the name of Jehovah[17] or of heathen gods.[18] Most of these frauds and delusions were successfully carried on not only by men but by women, especially witchcraft,[19] prophecy,[20] and necromancy;[21] and they were coupled with all the absurd and superstitious rites associated with them among the heathen nations; as, for instance, the false prophetesses "fastened cushions to all the joints of their hands, and laid pillows on their heads", a sign of the utmost luxury and effeminacy.[22]

And all these idolatrous practices flourished from the earliest periods of Israel's history to the latest; during their sojourn in Egypt[23] and during their wanderings in the desert under Moses;[24] in the time of the

---

10 Ver. 13. 11 Ver. 14.

12 Zech. XIII. 4; comp. *Hom.* Od. XI. 24*sqq.; Cic.* Tusc. I. 16 or 37; *Dion Cass.* LXXVII. 15; *Herodian.* IV. xii. 4; *Spencer*, l. c. l. ii. c. 15.

13 Zech. XIII. 4, למען כחש; comp. 2 Ki. X. 22, לבוש לכל עברי הבעל.

14 Jer. XXIII. 25, 27, 28, 32; XXIX. 8; Zech. X. 2; etc.; comp., however, Num. XII. 6; Joel III. 1; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 6.

15 בנצורים ילינו (Isai. LXV. 4), that is, by ἐγκοίμησις or incubatio; *Herod.* IV. 172; comp. *Diod. Sic.* I. 53; *Strabo*, VI. iii. 9; XI. vii. 1; XVI. ii. 35; *Cic.* Divin. I. 43 or 96 (somniandi causa incubabant, quia vera quietis oracula ducebant); *Plut.* Consol. ad Apoll. c. 14 (ψυχομαντεῖον); *Mela* I. 8 (Augilae manes tantum deos putant; per eos dejerant; eos, ut oracula, consulunt; precatique, quae volunt, ubi tumulis incubuere, pro responsis ferunt somnia).

16 *Virg.* Aen. VII. 85—95, Sacerdos Pellibus incubuit stratis, somnosque petivit; Multa modis simulacra videt volitantia miris, Et varias audit voces, fruiturque deorum Colloquio; comp. *Hieron.* in Isai. XLV. "ubi (sc. in delubris idolorum) stratis pellibus hostiarum incubare soliti sunt, ut somniis futura cognoscerent; quod in fano Aesculapii usque hodie error celebrat Ethnicorum."

17 Mic. III. 11; Jer. XXIII. 25, 30—32; XXIX. 9; Ezek. XIII. 16—18; even Zechar. XIII. 2—4; etc. 18 Jer. II. 8.

19 Comp. מְכַשֵּׁפָה witch, Exod. XXII. 17.

20 Ezek. XIII. 17, 18.

21 Comp. אֵשֶׁת בַּעֲלַת אוֹב, 1 Sam. XXVIII. 7; see vers. 7—19.

22 Ezek. XIII. 17, 18; *Mart.* III. lxxxii. 5—7; comp. 1 Ki. XIX. 18; 2 Ki. XXIII. 7; Hos. XIII. 2; Zeph. I. 9; Ezek. VIII. 16, 17; see *Douglaei*, Anal. Sacr. pp. 279, 280; and in general, *Goodwin*, Moses et Aaron, studio J. H. Hotting. Lib. IV. pp. 646—752; *Colquhoun*, History of Magic, Witchcraft, and Animal Magnetism; *Hoelemann*, Bibelstudien, I. pp. 154—175.

23 Josh. XXIV. 14; Ezek. XX. 7, 8; XXIII. 3, 8; see p. 24 note 6.

24 Num. XXV. 1—9; Am. V. 25, 26;

Judges and the Kings, both in Judah and in Ephraim; even under the latest sovereigns of Judah, under Joahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah, who succeeded the pious and ardent reformer Josiah;[1] indeed in the long line of Judah's kings, four only, Asa, Joshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah were active in promoting the service of Jehovah; a few others adhered to it themselves, but displayed no zeal for its diffusion; while all the rest were sunk in heathen aberrations, which were kept up in the Babylonian exile and after the return to Palestine,[2] so that even when Jeremiah reproved his obstinate brethren who had forced him to accompany them to Egypt, they contumaciously answered, "We will not hearken to thee; but we will...burn incense to the Queen of Heaven, and pour out drink-offerings to her, as we have done, we, and our fathers, our kings, and our princes, in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem; for then had we abundance of food, and were prosperous, and saw no evil: but since we left off to burn incense to the Queen of Heaven, and to pour out drink-offerings to her, we have wanted all things, and have been consumed by the sword and by famine."[3] So deeply were pagan notions ingrained in the minds of the people, and so fatal to a healthful morality were the effects of those perversities! And yet have we reason to believe that the records preserved to us in the Hebrew canon are far from complete with respect to the idolatry of the Israelites. For instance, the worship of the *brazen serpent* (נְחֻשְׁתָּן), certainly very old and incessantly carried on,[4] is mentioned for the first time together with the account of its abolition by Hezekiah.[5] Again, the author of the Books of Kings states that Josiah "defiled" and thus rendered unfit for the further worship of Moloch "the Topheth in the valley of the children of Hinnom";[6] yet he had never stated by whom the valley had been consecrated for that purpose.[7] It may, therefore, be safely supposed that paganism pre-

Ezek. XX. 24; comp. Exod. XXXII. 1—6; Num. XXI. 8, 9; XVIII. 4; see *supra* p. 365; comp. also *G. Unruh*, Der Zug der Israeliten aus Aegypten nach Canaan, pp. 89—120, where the most hazardous combinations are ventured, in Nork's extravagant method of etymological mythology.

[1] 2 Ki. XXIII. 32, 37; XXIV. 9, 19.

[2] Comp. *supra passim*; esp. Judg. II. 2; 1 Ki. XXI. 25, 26; XXII. 53, 54; 2 Ki. XVII. 7—23; Am. II. 4; Mic. I. 5, 7; VI. 16; Isai. II. 6, 8; Jer. II. 4 *sqq*; VI. 10; VII. 9; XLIV. (administering an elaborate and severe reproof to the Jews who had settled in Egypt); Ezek. VI. 4—6; XIV. 1—8; XX. 5—44 (reviewing the obstinate and continual idolatry of the Hebrews from the earliest periods up to the prophet's time); XLIII. 7—9; Zechar. XIII. 2—4.

[3] Jer. XLIV. 17, 18.

[4] Comp. Num. XXI. 4—9; see *supra* p. 368.

[5] 2 Ki. XVIII. 4; comp. *Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. p. 518.

[6] 2 Ki. XXIII. 10.

[7] It was perhaps so consecrated by Manasseh.

vailed among the Israelites in various other forms besides those described or hinted at in the Scriptures, which of course refer to idolatry but incidentally, without aiming at a systematic and complete account of its multifarious practices.

Let us, then, in a few rapid outlines, survey the history of Hebrew idolatry. Up to Solomon's reign, Baal and Ashtarte only are mentioned as Canaanite divinities; but a large portion of the people were addicted to their service at least from the earlier time of the Judges. By Samuel's influence, their images were indeed removed,[8] and the religious reform seems to have extended up to the northern boundaries of the land;[9] but his measures remained without enduring consequences. Then Saul is related to have banished from his dominions the sooth-sayers and wizzards;[10] but this course would have been impossible without completely extirpating idolatry, which yet immediately afterwards is found in full blossom. Moreover, Solomon, besides consolidating the old, sanctioned or established various new forms of idol worship. Induced by his heathen wives, he built on the heights before Jerusalem temples for the Phoenician Ashtarte, with whose service probably that of Baal was coupled, for Chemosh of Moab, for Moloch or Milcom of Ammon,[11] for the gods of the Egyptians, the Edomites, and Hittites.[12] In the empire of Israel, Jehu indeed caused a general slaughter of the priests of Baal;[13] but we find, shortly before its termination, besides the older *cultus* of Baal, Ashtarte, and Moloch, also the adoration of the Sun[14] and all the heavenly hosts;[15] and the colonists, who were transplanted from Assyria into Samaria, imported with them numerous native superstitions which tainted the faint remnants of the service of Jehovah.[16] In the empire of Judah, the pious king Amaziah is related to have brought to Jerusalem Edomite idols, to have adopted their worship, and honoured them with incense on their proper altars.[17] Ahaz, devoted to Baal and Ashtarte and burning his son to Moloch, removed from its usual place in the Court of the Temple the brazen altar hallowed by age, and set up in

8 1 Sam. VII. 3, 4. It is difficult to see the grounds for Ewald's assertion that "the worship of Baal was only introduced by the kings of the house of Omri, and that it existed, in both empires, hardly half a century" (Alterth. p. 236); comp. Judg. II. 11, 13; III. 7; etc.; see *supra* p. 357.

9 Judg. XVIII. 31; comp. *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 233.

10 1 Sam. XXVIII. 3.

11 1 Ki. XI. 5—7; 2 Ki. XXIII. 13, 14.

12 1 Ki. XI. 1, 8. It is no more than an ingenious combination to assert that the erection of heathen altars by Solomon was a result of his praiseworthy toleration of foreign religions, since "in a great world-empire toleration of all forms of worship is indispensable" (*Ewald*, Gesch. III. 100).

13 2 Ki. X. 18—28.

14 Isai. XVII. 8.

15 2 Ki. XVII. 17; see *supra* p. 361.

16 2 Ki. XVII. 29—33.

17 2 Chr. XXV. 14.

its stead another structure,[1] besides encouraging the adoption of eastern rites, especially those of Assyria and Babylon.[2] Hezekiah indeed abolished "the heights", broke the images of idols, even that brazen serpent that had been worshipped from the time of Moses.[3] But his son Manasseh, passionately devoted to foreign superstitions, in which he saw the true source of wisdom and of wealth,[4] not only restored the heights, but practised every variety of sooth-saying, burnt his son to Moloch,[5] placed an image of Ashtarte into the very Temple,[6] and built those small houses for her licentious priestesses, in which they wove curtains for her service,[7] nay he seems to have entirely banished from the Court the old and sacred altar of Jehovah,[8] and in its stead he erected in both Courts altars of the stars, made accessible to the whole people,[9] while at the entrance he placed the chariot with horses dedicated to the Sun:[10] the sidereal worship, principally performed on the roofs of houses, took the strongest hold upon the nation, and required the perpetual warnings of subsequent teachers.[11] The well-meant exertions of Josiah were unable to eradicate pagan abominations, which soon returned and were embraced with the old zeal. The image of Ashtarte was probably erected again in the inner Court;[12] within the precincts of the Temple women mourned the death of Tammuz;[13] the Sun and the signs of the Zodiac were revered, and honoured with fumigations;[14] and most of these idolatries were not only maintained, but deemed indispensable for prosperity, by the exiled Jews in Egypt.[15]

Thus it is manifest that the history of Hebrew idolatry runs parallel with the growth of the purer religion of Jehovah; and without the former, the development of the latter cannot be rationally understood or appreciated. The cosmical creeds and the ethical faith fought an obstinate struggle for many centuries. Heathen elements of every variety could not be kept aloof; they could still less be repudiated; if they were modified, and it may be refined, so as not to clash with the fundamental truths of a monotheistic system, they were admitted without reluctance even by the better and profounder teachers, well

---

[1] 2 Ki. XVI. 3, 4, 12—16; see p. 34.

[2] Comp. *Ewald*, Gesch. III. 323, 324.

[3] 2 Ki. XVIII. 3, 4. [4] Comp. *Ewald*, Gesch. III. 366. [5] 2 Ki. XXI. 6.

[6] 2 Ki. XXI. 3, 7; Jer. VII. 30; XV. 4; comp. Ezek. VIII. 3—6.

[7] 2 Ki. XXIII. 7.

[8] 2 Chr. XXXIII. 16. That he removed also the Ark from the Holy of Holies, cannot be safely inferred from Jer. III. 16.

[9] 2 Ki. XXI. 5; XXIII. 12.

[10] 2 Ki. XXIII. 11.

[11] Jer. VIII. 2; XIX. 13; XXXII. 29; Isai. LXV. 3; Zeph. I. 5; comp. Job XXXI. 26—28; Deut. IV. 19; XVII. 3.

[12] Jer. XXXII. 34; Ezek. VIII. 3—6.

[13] Ezek. VIII. 14; see *supra* p. 362.

[14] Ezek. VIII. 7—11, 16, 17; comp. 2 Ki. XXIII. 5.

[15] Jer. XLIV. 1—29; see the declarations quoted *supra* p. 378.

aware that the contrast lived and rooted deep in the consciousness of the nation, that it was manifest even in the worship at the central Temple, but that it was capable of being, in some manner, harmonised, and perhaps gradually removed. In this active and vehement warfare, extended for at least a millenium, between the sensual and spiritual forms of religion lies the chief and most absorbing interest of the Biblical records — an interest of which it is utterly deprived by that mechanical and unhistorical view which assumes a pure and perfect religious system proclaimed at an early age, and, though exposed to heathen inroads, always safe and certain of victory because embodying the highest possible wisdom of man, if not supernaturally communicated by God.

## XXIII. HUMAN SACRIFICES AMONG THE HEBREWS.

Can it after the preceding sketch be surprising to find the custom of human sacrifices prevailing among the Hebrews during protracted epochs? It would indeed be almost unaccountable if just that custom had been singled out by them for rejection among the numerous heathen rites which they eagerly embraced,[16] since, from a fatal confusion of religious ideas, human victims were regarded as the most meritorious and most acceptable of all offerings. Now we learn that the Hebrews "burnt their sons and their daughters in the fire",[17] or "offered them as burnt-offerings",[18] or "made them to pass through the fire."[19]

---

[16] Comp. Deut. XII. 30, 31.

[17] Jer. VII. 31 (לשרף את־בניהם ואת־בנותיהם באש); comp. ver. 32; XIX. 5; 2 Chr. XXVIII. 3 (ויבער את־בניו באש); see also 2 Ki. XVII. 31.

[18] Jer. XIX. 5 (עלות לבעל); comp. ver. 6; 2 Ki. III. 27.

[19] ויעבירו את בניהם באש (Deut. XVIII. 10; 2 Ki. XVI. 3; XVII. 17; XXI. 6; XXIII. 10; 2 Chr. XXXIII. 6; Ezek. XX. 31; etc.; comp. 2 Sam. XII. 31) or simply ויעבירו (Jer. XXXII. 35; Ezek. XVI. 21; XX. 26; Lev. XVIII. 21), that is, "they made them pass" through the hands of the idol, in order to let them fall into its blazing interior (see p. 366); for the act of laying the child into the hands of Moloch's statue, was a distinct and separate rite; comp. *Mishn.* Sanh. VII. 7, מסר למולך ולא העביר באש העביר באש ולא מסר למולך וכו'. The term העביר or העביר באש admits indeed, in itself, the sense of drawing the body rapidly through the fire, without materially injuring it (comp. Num. XXXI. 23); and it has been so understood by many antiquarians, who suppose that the custom was merely intended as a means of purification or lustration (comp. Sept. Deut. XVIII. 10, οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται ἐν σοὶ περικαθαίρων τὸν υἱὸν ἐν πυρί; Vulg. qui lustret filium suum aut filiam, ducens per ignem; comp. Sept. 2 Ki. XVI. 3; Ezek. XXIII. 37; Vulg. Lev. XVIII. 21, ut consecretur; etc.; *Talm.* Sanh. 64 *b*; *Rashi* on Lev. XVIII. 21 — comp. however, *Nachmanid.* on Lev. XVIII. 21; *Abarban.* on Deut. XVIII. 10 — *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 37; see also *Ovid*, Fast. IV. 727, 781, 782; etc.), or as a fire-ordeal analogous to that of walking on red-hot coals, employed in remote times (comp. *Soph.* Antig. 265, πῦρ διέρπειν; *Heliod.* X. 8—10; etc.), and still known in the Middle Ages (see

But our estimation of the culture of the Hebrews must, in a great measure, depend upon the question *to what deities* they offered human sacrifices. It is indeed true, that, in most cases, they presented them in honour of *Moloch*[1] and *Baal*,[2] described as the "idols of Canaan"[3] or their "abominations",[4] or "evil demons",[5] and in the Assyrian period, perhaps imitating the colonists settled in Samaria, in honour of Adrammelech and

---

*Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 38; *Beyer*, Additament. ad Selden De Diis Syris, p. 257; *Münter*, Rel. der Karthager, p. 19; *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. II. xiii. 2—4, pp. 363—370; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 308—311; *Gesen.* Thesaur. p. 985; *Braun*, l. c. I. 350, 351). But in the connexion in which that expression occurs, it is most unquestionably equivalent to *burning the children;* in 2 Chr. XXVIII. 3, ויבער is substituted for העביר used in the parallel passage 2 Ki. XVI. 3 (as on the other hand, the Syr. and Chald. translations, the Sept. and Vulg. render in 2 Chr. XXVIII. 3 ויבער by ויעבר); in Ezek. XXXIII. 37 לְאָכְלָה *for food* is added to העבירו (comp. XVI. 20); and a number of passages is clear and conclusive; compare Deut. XII. 31 (את־בניהם ··· ישרפו באש); Jer. VII. 31; XIX. 5 (לשרף את־בניהם ··· באש); Ps. CVI. 37 (ויזבחו את־בניהם ··· לשדים), 38 (וישפכו דם נקי); Wisd. XII. 5, 6 (*τέκνων τε φονέας ἀνελεήμονας ··· καὶ αὐθέντας γονεῖς ψυχῶν ἀβοηθήτων*); XIV. 23 (*τεκνοφόνους τελετάς*). The fact that Ahaz was succeeded by his son Hezekiah (2 Ki. XVI. 20), although he is reported to "have made his son to pass through the fire" (ver. 3), proves nothing, as he probably had several sons. — From some expressions it might appear that the victims were first slaughtered before they were burnt (Ezek. XVI. 20 וחזבחים; ver. 21 ותשחטי; XXIII. 39 ובשחטם; Isai. LVII. 5 שחטי ילדים), which would somewhat diminish the atrocity of the proceeding; but the phrases, too vague to warrant any safe conclusion, are possibly no more than a poetical paraphrase for sacrificing generally.

[1] 2 Ki. XVI. 3; XVII. 17; XXI. 6; XXIII. 10; Jer. VII. 31; XIX. 5, 6; XXXII. 35; Isai. LVII. 5; Ezek. XVI. 20; XX. 31; Ps. CVI. 37, 38; Wisd. XII. 5, 6; XIV. 23.

[2] Jer. XIX. 5, ובנו את־במות הבעל לשרף את־בניהם באש עלות לבעל; this passage is too clear to admit of any doubt; compare *Pliny*, Hist. Nat. XXXVI. 5, ad quem (Herculem, i. e. Baal, see *supra* p. 358) Poeni omnibus annis humana sacrificaverant victima. The words in Jer. XXXII. 35 "and they built the high places of Baal which are in the valley of the son of Hinnom, so as to cause their sons and their daughters to pass (into the fire) to Moloch", mean they arranged the heights of Baal so as to render them fit for the rites of Moloch; it is therefore unnecessary to understand Baal here as Moloch, either because the former word was by mistake or inadvertency employed for the latter (*Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. 487), or because Moloch and Baal are identical (*Abarbanel* on Deut. XVIII. 10 שני השמות היו לו מלך ובעל ושניהם קרובים בהבנתם; *Goodwin*, Mos. et Aar. IV. ii. 2, 3; comp. also *Creuzer*, Symb. II. 446), or because Baal means in general idol (*Ewald*, Alterth. p. 235) or ruler like מלך (comp. *De Wette*, Archaeol. § 235 *a*; *Rosenm.* Schol. ad Jer. XIX. 5).

[3] עצבי כנען, Ps. CVI. 38; comp. Deut. XII. 31.

[4] גלוליהם, Ezek. XXIII. 37, 39; XVI. 36; XX. 31.

[5] שדים, Ps. CVI. 37.

Anammelech.[6] Yet we have at least two clear and unquestionable instances of human sacrifices offered to *Jehovah*. The first is the immolation of Jephthah's daughter.[7] A calm examination of the Biblical account proves that the subject is unmistakable and admits of no doubt whatever. After Jephthah had been graced by the "spirit of Jehovah" (רוח יהוה),[8] and had set out on his expedition against the Ammonites, "he vowed a vow to the Lord (יהוה), and said, If Thou shalt indeed deliver the children of Ammon into my hands, then it shall be, that whoever comes forth (הַיּוֹצֵא אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא) of the door of my house to meet me (לִקְרָאתִי), when I return in peace from the children of Ammon,[9] shall surely be Jehovah's and I will offer him up for a burnt-offering" (וְהַעֲלִיתִיהוּ עוֹלָה);[10] and when he returned victorious, and his daughter, his only child, went out to welcome him, he was indeed overpowered by grief; he rent his garments, and exclaimed, "Thou hast brought me very low and art the cause of my misery"; for he does not seem to have considered the probability of just his daughter coming out to meet him, but to have expected to see first a slave of his household; but with creditable ingenuousness he declared, "I have opened my mouth to Jehovah, and I cannot go back";[11] he neither thought of substitution nor of redemption;[12] and his daughter herself pronounced that view not only as justified but as conclusive and imperative; for she replied, "My father, thou hast opened thy mouth to Jehovah, therefore do to me according to that which has proceeded out of thy mouth";[13] she only asked for a delay of two months, in order to bewail her short and

6 2 Ki. XVII. 31; see p. 367.

7 Judg. XI. 30, 31, 34—40.

8 L. c. ver. 29.

9 It is on the whole indifferent whether the *first* who would meet him is meant or not; though the Hebrew text is indistinct, the former alternative is probable from the context, since Jephthah certainly intended no more than *one* sacrifice, and to take היוצא in a collective sense ("eine Heerde Vieh", *Ewald*, Gesch. II. 399) is unwarranted; hence Josephus (Ant. V. vii. 10) already expresses the passage, *πᾶν ὅ,τι καὶ πρῶτον αὐτῷ συντύχοι*; Vulg. quicumque primus fuerit egressus; Augustin. (De Civ. D. I. 21) quod ei redeunti . . . primitus occurrisset; and similarly nearly all later writers.

10 Vers. 30, 31.

11 Ver. 35.

12 Even according to the Levitical law, the daughter could not have been redeemed; she was not a mere נדר (Lev. XXVII. 2—8), but חרם which irrevocably belonged to God (ibid. vers. 28, 29); the words וידר נדר (Judg. XI. 30) being general and comprehensive in import (comp. Num. XXI. 2). Therefore, the fiction that the daughter fell a victim to the pride of Jephthah and of the High-priest, neither of whom could be induced to do the first step towards her redemption, falls to the ground as unbiblical (comp. *Targ.* on ver. 39, "if Jephthah had asked the priest Phinehas, the latter would have redeemed her by money"; see also *Midr. Rabb.* LX. 5, בין דין לדין אבדה הנערה ההיא).

13 Ver. 36.

unwedded life, together with her companions; the reprieve was granted; Jephthah's intention of sacrificing his daughter was publicly known for two full months; no priest, no prophet, no elder, no magistrate interfered or even remonstrated,[1] and at the end of the stipulated time, the father "did with her according to the vow which he had vowed";[2] the act of immolation is alluded to rather than described, because a detailed record of the horrid act was shunned by the theocratic historian.[3] The event gave rise to a popular custom annually observed by the maidens of Israel:[4] Jephthah's deed evidently met with universal approbation; it was regarded as praiseworthy piety; and indeed he could not have ventured to make his vow, had not human victims offered to Jehovah been deemed particularly meritorious in his time; otherwise he must have apprehended to provoke by it the wrath of God, rather than procure His assistance. Nothing can be clearer or more decided. Therefore Josephus[5] admitted the literal truth of the story, though he naturally added reprovingly that Jephthah "presented an offering neither lawful nor pleasing to God";[6] in a similar manner the subject was viewed by the Talmud[7] and the Fathers of the Church;[8] and Luther, honest and keen-sighted, but helplessly harassed between his conviction and the tradition of the Church, observed in a marginal note, "It is assumed that he did not sacrifice her; but the text stands clear."[9] It may be that Jephthah, the offspring of an illegitimate connexion, expelled from his father's house, reared in the east of the Jordan where the relations with the Tabernacle and the religious observances of Israel were lax and feeble, and depraved by the society of frivolous and reckless outlaws,

---

[1] It is an evasion to say, that the priests were unable to use force against the powerful and famous leader (so *Rosenmüller*, Schol. in loc. p. 286; *Munk*, Palestine, p. 240, sans que personne ôsat y mettre obstacle); their authority, supported by a Divine law, would have been willingly respected by the agonised father.

[2] Ver. 39.

[3] The conclusions, therefore, drawn from this circumstance by Kimchi a.o. (לא אמר ויעלה עולה), are untenable. A similar reserve in the preliminary measures was not necessary in the narrative of Isaac's sacrifice (Gen. XXII), because there the immolation itself did *not* take place.

[4] Ver. 40. According to a questionable account of Epiphany, a festival in honour of Jephthah's daughter was even in his time celebrated at Neapolis or Shechem (Haeres. 55, 78; comp. *Cassel*, in Herzog's Real-Encycl. VI. 476).

[5] Ant. V. vii. 10.

[6] *Θύσας τὴν παῖδα ὡλοκαύτωσεν, οὔτε νόμιμον οὔτε τῷ θεῷ κεχαρισμένην θυσίαν ἐπιτελῶν.*

[7] *Talm.* Taan. 4*a*; comp. *Midr. Rabb.* LX. 5; *Kohel. Rabb.* on Eccl. IV. 17 (הכסיל אינו יודע להפריש בין נדר לנדר מנין מיפתח); *Yalk. Shim.* on Jer. VII. 31, p. 61*b*.

[8] Comp. their opinions recounted in *Nicol. Serarius*, Comment. in libr. Josuae, Judic. etc. 1609, pp. 321 *sqq*.

[9] Man will, er habe sie nicht geopfert, aber der Text stehet da klar.

though described as a man of sturdy honesty and piety,[10] might have been induced to believe that a vow common and prized among many nations, was an act of piety among the Israelites also, if made in honour of their national god Jehovah, though such fundamental error is not easily explicable in a man so thoroughly familiar with Hebrew history and Hebrew law as Jephthah is represented to have been:[11] but the fact stands indisputable that human sacrifices offered to Jehovah were possible among the Hebrews long after the time of Moses, without meeting a check or censure from the teachers and leaders of the nation — a fact for which the sad political confusion that prevailed in the period of the Judges is insufficient to account.

Thus the vow of Jephthah is in many respects parallel to that of Idomeneus who, imperilled by a violent storm at sea on his return from Troy, pledged himself to sacrifice to Poseidon the first living being he should meet on his safe arrival in his Cretan home, and accordingly sacrificed his son.[12] Nor are other, though less complete, analogies wanting in classical literature: an oracle commanded Alexander the Great to sacrifice "the first he should meet after passing through the gate" of a certain town,[13] although by the shrewdness of the ass-driver whom Alexander met first, he was readily induced not to kill this person but his donkey;[14] and — at least according to one version — Agamemnon vowed to devote to Diana "the most beautiful offspring in his kingdom,"[15] and therefore believed it his duty to sacrifice to the goddess his daughter Iphigenia.[16]

Very numerous apologetic devices have been propounded in ancient and modern times, but they are, without any exception, repudiated by the plain laws of a sound exegesis. It has been fancifully supposed that, when Jephthah uttered the vow, he had in mind his dog, the animal most likely to await with impatience the return of the absent master — but the dog, an unclean animal, is unfit for sacrifice; or that he thought of a beast of his flocks or herds — but that could hardly be expected to come "out of his house." The Hebrew words in fact abso-

[10] Comp. Hebr. XI. 32.

[11] Judg. XI. 15—27, 35, 36.

[12] See p. 331.

[13] Sorte monitus ut eum qui sibi porta egresso primus occurrisset, interfici juberet; *Val. Max.* VII. iii. 1 exter.

[14] Comp. also many similar German legends, in *Müllenhof*, Sagen, pp. 384, 385, 395; *Sommer*, Sagen, pp. 87, 131; *Grimm*, Deutsche Myth. p. 973; *Wolf*, Deutsche Sagen, pp. 417 *sqq.*

[15] *Ὅ,τι γὰρ ἐνιαυτὸς τέκοι κάλλιστον εὔξω φωσφόρῳ θύσειν θεᾷ*, *Eurip.* Iphig. Taur. 20, 21; quod in suo regno pulcherrimum natum esset illo anno, *Cic.* De Offic. III. 25 or 95.

[16] Some, as Capellus (Diatriba de voto Jephtae, Salm. 1683) and Ewald (Gesch. II. 400), go so far as to suppose an historical affinity between the three names Iphigenia (Jephti-genia), Idomeneus, and Jiftah.

C C

lutely exclude any animal whatever;[1] they admit none but a human being, who alone can be described as going out of the house to meet somebody;[2] for though the restrictive usage of the East binds girls generally to the seclusion of the house, it seems to have been a common custom for Hebrew women to proceed and meet returning conquerors with music and rejoicing;[3] and the sacrifice of one animal, an extremely poor offering after a most signal and most important success, would certainly not have been promised by a previous vow solemnly pronounced. Again, it has been supposed that Jephthah's daughter, though killed according to the law of "devoted" persons (חֵרֶם), was not actually sacrificed to God,[4] but dedicated to His service at the Sanctuary, by means of a kind of nazariteship, and under the supervision of the High-priest;[5] or that she was destined to isolation and seclusion,[6] or to perpetual virginity which was considered "a living death."[7] But all these opinions are arbitrary evasions utterly opposed to the tenour of the Hebrew text. Jephthah had distinctly promised "a burnt-offering."[8] Vows of celibacy were entirely unknown among the Hebrews. In Jephthah's time, the Tabernacle was at Shiloh, in the land of the Ephraimites, against whom he was engaged in deadly warfare, and to whose hands therefore he was not likely to entrust his daughter.[9]

---

1 An explanation first proposed by David Kimchi.

2 So Sept. ὁ ἐκπορευόμενος ὃς ἂν ἐξέλθῃ; Vulg. quicumque primus fuerit egressus; *Augustin.* Quaest. XLIX in Jud. (ubi procul dubio nihil aliud quam hominem cogitavit); De Civ. Dei I. 21; *Rosenm.* Schol. in Jud. p. 278; *Hengstenb.* Auth. d. Pent. II. 129, 130; *Bertheau* in loc.; *Hävernick*, Einleit. in den Pentat. p. 500; *Keil*, Comm. p. 293; etc.

3 Comp. 1 Sam. XVIII. 6; see also Exod. XV. 20.

4 So Capellus (l. c.), Dathe, Jahn, Eckermann, Hävernick; comp. Num. XXXI. 40 (ומכסם ליהוה שנים ושלשים נפש); see against this view *Hengstenberg*, Auth. des Pent. II. 127, 128.

5 Clericus, Whiston (Translat. of Joseph. p. 119); Hengstenberg, Cassel, E. Gerlach (Zeitschr. von Rudelb. und Guer. 1859, pp. 417 *sqq.*); O. v. Gerlach (in loc.); Reincke (Beiträge, I. 425 *sqq.*); Auberlen (Stud. und Krit. 1860, pp. 540—543); Keil (in loc. p. 300); comp. 1 Sam. I. 28 (השאלתיהו ליהוה); Exod. XXVIII. 8; *Strabo*, V. iv. 12 (children were dedicated to Mars, that is, to his *service*).

6 David Kimchi, Ralbag, Abarbanel.

7 Benson, Maltby, Saalschütz (Archaeol. I. 232), Clericus, Grotius, a. o.

8 עולה, ver. 31, not חרם generally; comp. *Keil* in loc. p. 295.

9 As has been justly remarked by Michaelis (Mos. R. III. § 145, pp. 12—15; notes in loc. pp. 123—125), who, on the whole, correctly understands the narrative under discussion; comp. also *Sulp. Sever.* I. 51 (mori non recusans), and the notes in G. Horn's edition, pp. 132, 133; *Calmet*, Dictionnaire, and Introduct. to Judg.; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 302; *Vatke*, l.c. p. 275; *Rosenm.* Schol. in loc. (although his unsettled principles of criticism betray him into a remark entirely destroying the historical importance of the narrative, see *supra* p. 384, note 1); *Munk*,

Jephthah's grief and despair[10] are explicable only on the supposition of his daughter's actual death; had she been dedicated to the service of Jehovah, the satisfaction he must have felt at the holiness of her office and of her future life would have almost counter-balanced his pain at her childlessness, especially as her offspring would not have borne his name. Moreover, it is even doubtful, whether dedicated women were obliged to remain single; the example of Samuel proves at least that no such restriction was imposed upon dedicated *men*. The daughter herself laments expressly and strongly "her virginity", as Antigone and others did under similar circumstances,[11] because, in harmony with Eastern views on the mission of women, she mourned partly the misfortune and partly the disgrace of her childlessness. But both the misfortune and the disgrace were so fully outweighed by the glory of her obedience to the claims of the paternal vow, that the maidens of Israel praised the fate of the *sacrificed* virgin, and perpetuated its honour and distinction by annual festivals.[12] If she was not to suffer death, why did she demand

Palestine, p. 240 (le texte ne permet pas de douter que Jephté n'ait réellement offert sa fille en holocauste); *Studer*, Buch d. Richter erklärt, pp. 290 *sqq.*; *Winer*, Real-W. I. 541; *Hoffmann* in Ersch und Gruber's Encycl. II. xv. 249; *Kitto* in loc. (though he prefers to leave the question undecided); *Bertheau* in loc.; *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 76; Gesch. II. 400 (die des Helden würdige Tochter geht in den Opfertod durch des Vaters Hand), and he adds with decision, "the timid view of modern writers that Jephthah did not really sacrifice his daughter, deserves no refutation" (though in another place, Alterth. p. 87, he ventures himself the questionable remark, that Jephthah might have retracted his vow by expiating it through a trespass-offering, if he had not been "too proud" to do it — which view involves several grave misconceptions); *Bunsen* in loc. (Bibelwerk, II. p. 75, es ist klar, dass Jephthah seine Tochter Gott zu Ehren schlachtete, und dann als Opfer verbrannte); comp. also *Kurtz*, Luther. Zeitschr. 1853, pp. 209 *sqq.*; etc. etc.

10 Ver. 35.

11 Comp. *Soph.* Antig. 810—816 (*ἀλλά μ' ὁ παγκοίτας Ἅιδας ζῶσαν ἄγει τὰν Ἀχέροντος ἀκτάν, οὔθ' ὑμεναίων ἔγκληρον, οὔτ' ἐπινύμφειός πώ μέ τις ὕμνος ὕμνησεν, ἀλλ' Ἀχέροντι νυμφεύσω*); Oed. Tyr. 1501, 1502; Electr. 961, 962, 1183 (*φεῦ τῆς ἀνύμφου δυσμόρου τε σῆς τροφῆς*); *Eurip.* Hecuba 416 (*ἄνυμφος, ἀνυμέναιος ὧν μ' ἐχρῆν τυχεῖν*); *Lucret.* I. 98, 99 (on Iphigenia, sed casta inceste, nubendi tempore in ipso, hostia etc.); comp. *Dion Cass.* LV. 22 (*ἐπειδή τε οὐ ῥᾳδίως οἱ πάνυ εὐγενεῖς τὰς θυγατέρας ἐς τὴν τῆς Ἑστίας ἱερατείαν ἐπεδίδωσαν*); *Sueton*, Aug. 31 (ambirentque multi ne filias in sortem darent).

12 For לתנות is not *to bewail* or *lament* (so again *Fürst*, Hebr. Handwörterb. II. p. 535, in lauten Klagen betrauern; Sept. *θρηνεῖν*, Chald. לאלאה, Luther, Engl. Vers., Michael. etc.), but *to praise* Judg. V. 11 (שם יתנו צדקות יהוה "there they praise the blessings of the Lord"); comp. *Soph.* Ant. 817—822, where the chorus similarly consoles Antigone, *οὐκοῦν κλεινὴ καὶ ἔπαινον ἔχουσ' ἐς τόδ' ἀπέρχει κεῦθος νεκύων κτλ.*; also *Eurip.* Hippol. 1428, 1429, *ἀεὶ δὲ μουσοποιὸς εἰς σὲ παρθένων ἔσται μέριμνα κοὐκ ἀνώ-*

a delay of two months for bewailing her unmarried state, which she would have been free to do during the rest of her life?[1] The passages that have been adduced to prove the metaphorical use of the words "offering up for a burnt-offering" in the sense of dedicating to the service of God,[2] are inconclusive, as they occur either in poetical compositions or in writings of a very late date when prayer, good works, and other pious exercises, were figuratively described as substitutes for the sacrificial service then impossible.[3] The words "and she knew no man" (ver. 39), which once more depict the heroic death of the pure virgin with quiet pathos and emphasis, are asserted to form "the subject of the vow", and therefore to mean, she devoted herself to God or to His sanctity[4] — but celibacy and sanctity were in the Hebrew Scriptures nowhere equivalent or correlative terms, and were never understood as such by the Israelites to whose life and notions the idea of the celibacy of women was utterly abhorrent.[5] Again, it has been contended that the narrative is designed to point out the complete contrast that existed between the institutions of the Ammonites and those of the Israelites; therefore, as human sacrifices were sanctioned among the former, they cannot be supposed among the latter[6] — a systematic contrast which no unbiassed reader of the narrative has yet discovered. Or it is averred that the pious Jephthah was not to be punished but to be enlightened; in making the vow he thought of some external possession; he was to learn that man must be ready to surrender his blood, the dearest treasure of his heart:[7] but the plain story, evidently communicated as historical, could not have been employed by the author as the vehicle

---

*νυμος πεσὼν κτλ.*; and *Paus.* II. xxxii. 1; Engl. Vers. rehearse (comp. Aram. תנן and תנא to repeat, Arab. ثنى II. iv. x; comp. *Gesen.* Thesaur. p. 1511); *Sulp. Sever.* (l. c.) renders feebly and erroneously, ut aequales suas prius videret; Engl. Vers. marg. to talk with. The forms תַּנָּה and תַּנּוּ in Ps. VIII. 2 and Prov. XXXI. 31, belong to the root נתן.

[1] Comp. *Rosenmüller* Schol. in loc. p. 285.

[2] Hos. XIV. 3; Isai. XXXIV. 6; Ps. XL. 7—9; LI. 19; CXIX. 108; Sir. XXXV. 1, 2; Wisd. III. 6.

[3] See pp. 61, 62. The remarks of Hengstenberg (l. c. II. 137, 138) designed to prove the contrary, are untenable; Keil (l. c. p. 300) confesses that it is impossible to find entirely corresponding parallels in the O. T.

[4] *Cassel*, l. c. p. 475, "sie lebte der Weihe Gottes."

[5] Comp. 2 Sam. XX. 3; see also *Talm.* Sotah 22*a* (בתולה צליינית ··· הרי אלו מבלי עולם).

[6] *Cassel*, Buch der Richter und Ruth, in loc.

[7] *Cassel*, in Herzog, l. c. p. 469, and in general pp. 468—478; Buch der Richter und Ruth, pp. 107—114; he is closely followed by Keil (Comment. pp. 292—301), who also believes that the literal acceptation of the narrative is impossible from insuperable difficulties (p. 206), and that the spiritual interpretation is demanded "almost imperatively" (p. 300); but like his

of an abstruse doctrine, much less as the text of an edifying discourse. Indeed the propounder of the last mentioned singularities, confounding again by far-fetched subtleties what preceding writers had set into a clearer light, cannot be expected to furnish satisfactory arguments; his observations, involving a *petitio principii,* move in a circle; "the fact", he says, "that Jephthah is not released from the sacrifice, but has actually to fulfil his vow, is a manifest proof that no bloody sacrifice is meant; this would attribute to God the impossible intention of demanding a child's sacrifice in the manner of idols"; what is here assumed as an axiom — viz. that human sacrifices were never sacrificed to Jehovah — is just the very question under dispute. Others again have recommended the translation, "whatsoever comes forth of the doors of my house to meet me... shall surely be the Lord's, OR I will offer it up (והעליתיהו) for a burnt-offering";[8] that is, if a human being, he or she shall be devoted to the Lord's service; if an animal fit for sacrifice, it shall be presented as a burnt-offering. Never has an elliptical expression like this been heard of in any language; it is certainly rejected by the spirit of Hebrew; and yet it does not include or provide for a third contingency — if an *unclean,* or a clean but *faulty* animal were to meet Jephthah: thus another and a strong reason is afforded to prove that he could have had in his mind a human being only. Equally objectionable are the translations, "that shall belong to the Lord, and I will (besides) offer to Him a burnt-offering"; and "or I will offer *to Him* a burnt-offering;"[9] for they are excluded by the grammatical construction of the words.[10] — Of the many other apologetic artifices suggested by a misplaced zeal, and revealing by their singularity the hopelessness of the struggle, it may suffice to quote one more. Jephthah, it is supposed, had indeed vaguely imagined that his only daughter would hasten to welcome him, but he had yet secretly hoped that "God would

---

predecessor he starts from dogmatic premises, "it is inconceivable that God should have selected for the performance of His work a man capable of vowing a human sacrifice" (p. 298) — after which all arguments are indeed superfluous.

[8] So Kimchi, Ralbag, Grotius, Glassius, Drusius, Waterland, Dodd, Wesley, a. o.; the Engl. Version has *and* in the text, and *or* in the margin; comp. Gram. §. 107. 1*e*; *Rosenm.* Schol. in loc. pp. 279, 280; *Winer*, Real-Wört. I. 541 note 5; *Bertheau* in loc.

[9] Randolph, J. S. Keddell (a dissertation on the Vow of Jephthah, London, 1840, pp. 32 *sqq.*).

[10] The suffix in והעליתיהו disclaims the meaning *to Him;* and in similar phrases the simple accusative עולה is at least as frequently employed as לעולה (1 Sam. VI. 14; VII. 9; 2 Ki. III. 27; Ezek. XLIII. 27; Job XLII. 8; Judg. VI. 26), in accordance with the usage of Hebrew syntax (comp. Gram. § 102. 5, and CII. 5); see on the other hand, Gen. XXII. 2, 13; Lev. XII. 6; XXII. 18; etc.

not demand from him so great a sacrifice, and would so direct things that, what was most improbable in itself, would come to pass, and that not she but one of his most devoted slaves would come to meet him"[1] — a subtle casuistry which, in utter dissonance with the character and culture of a Jephthah, covets the merit of heroic piety, but in truth involves hypocrisy and cowardice.

We have dwelt at such length on the history of Jephthah's vow, because the conclusions which it suggests are of the highest importance. From the tenour of the narrative it is manifest that the deed was no isolated case, but that human sacrifices were on emergencies of peculiar moment habitually offered to God, and expected to secure His aid. One instance like that of Jephthah not only justifies but necessitates the inference of a general custom. Pious men slaughtered human victims not to Moloch nor to any other foreign deity, but to the national God Jehovah. The intended sacrifice of Isaac clearly points to the same inference, although that story is designed to teach the Hebrews an important lesson on the true spirit of sacrifice.[2] Again, it is not sufficient to concede that, in the time of the Judges, the "Mosaic Law" was little known and not strictly observed, as is admitted even by orthodox writers; it can, at that period, absolutely not have existed at all; had it existed, a God-fearing leader could not have uttered a vow cursed as an abomination in the Pentateuch; and had he uttered it, he would have been prevented by the appointed guardians of that code from publicly executing the impious and detestable act.[3]

The second recorded instance of human sacrifices killed in honour of Jehovah, forms a remarkable incident in the life of David.[4] It has above been proved that this distinguished monarch held images of Jehovah to be entirely inoffensive, and considered them a lawful means of ascertaining the future.[5] But he advanced another and most serious step in his misconception of the attributes of a Divine being. For when famine distressed the land and he had been informed by an oracle,[6] that God's anger was roused on account of Saul's unjust and cruel slaughter of the Gibeonites, to whom protection had been guaranteed

[1] *Hengstenberg*, l. c. p. 131.

[2] See Sect. XXV.

[3] The remarks of Hävernick (Einleit. in den Pentat. pp. 501, 502) to prove the reverse, are extremely feeble; his embarrassment compels him to suppose that the vow of Jephthah was "not altogether anti-mosaic"; for however rash, it was inevitably to be fulfilled: but if a High-priest had weighed, in the one scale, the neglect of a heedless pledge, and in the other the atrocity of a child-murder in honour of Jehovah, to which side would the balance have turned?

[4] 2 Sam. XXI. 1—14.

[5] See pp. 353, 354.

[6] *Jos.* Ant. VII. xii. 1, τῶν δὲ προφητῶν εἰπόντων; others, he sought God by prayer.

by Joshua,[7] he delivered up to the men of Gibeon, on their request, seven descendants of Saul — "seven being the holy number suitable at the performance of a godly work"[8] — "to hang them up to Jehovah", or "before Jehovah":[9] and when thus "atonement" had been wrought,[10] Jehovah's wrath was appeased, and the famine ceased. This story gives rise to very serious reflections. We dismiss with a passing allusion a few points not directly connected with the present enquiry. If *Saul* had committed a misdeed, why did David allow the punishment of his *descendants*, whereas the Pentateuch plainly teaches, "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin"?[11] And why had the whole nation to suffer the direst misery for a treachery of which the king alone bore the responsibility? It is here not the place to remark on the deep stain which the transaction casts upon David's character, who readily seized so terrible an expedient for ridding himself of the surviving and dangerous scions of the preceding dynasty, whom he was pledged by the most solemn oaths to spare and to protect,[12] while he saved none but the lame, harmless, and unwarlike Mephibosheth. Nor is it necessary to examine, whether

[7] Ver. 2; Josh. IX. 15, 19, 20; comp. on the other hand, Deut. VII. 2, 24.

[8] So observes Keil (in loc. p. 334)!

[9] והוקענם ליהוה, ver. 6; ויקיעום לפני יהוה, ver. 9; comp. Num. XXV. 4; Deut. XXI. 22, 23; the latter injunction not to allow the corpse of a hanged person to remain on the gallows over night — is at variance with our narrative (ver. 10), but it can have no force for the *Gibeonites*; Sept. *ἐξηλιάσωμεν* (expose to the sun; comp. Num. XXV. 4 נגד השמש) *αὐτοὺς τῷ Κυρίῳ* (*ἐνάντι τοῦ Κυρίου*); Vulg. crucifigamus eos Domino (coram Domino).

[10] Comp. במה אכפר, ver. 3; Sept. *ἐν τίνι ἐξιλάσομαι*; Vulg. quod erit vestri piaculum? Joseph. (l. c.) vaguely *τίνος βούλονται τυχεῖν*, and, evidently anxious to cover the deed of David, he concludes *παραλαβόντες δὲ οἱ Ἰαβαωνῖται τοὺς ἄνδρας, ὡς ἐβούλοντο ἐκόλασαν*.

[11] Deut. XXIV. 16; 2 Ki. XIV. 6; 2 Chr. XXV. 4; Num. XXXV. 33 (ולארץ לא־יכפר לדם ··· כי אם בדם שפכו); see p. 297; comp., however, p. 296 note 4. The supposition that Saul's *whole family* participated in the execution of the crime (*Clericus* in loc. ver. 1, Libr. Hist. p. 341), is futile, since his *grand-children* cannot be proved to have been implicated in the act; the remark of the same writer (p. 342) retains therefore its full force and application, "certa enim et constans est haec justitiae regula innocentes pro noxiis sine iniquitate poenas dare nullo modo posse." Keil (in loc. p. 334), utterly ignoring the whole difficulty, merely remarks "weil nach dem Gesetze die Blutschuld nur durch das Blut des Schuldigen (sic) gesühnt werden konnte."

[12] 1 Sam. XXIV. 22, 23; comp. XX. 15, 42; see also *Grotius*, De jure Belli et Pacis, cap. XXII. num. 14. It is certainly too much to assert that "such a suspicion is disproved by all the other acts of David" (*Thenius* in loc. p. 231); his proceeding against Uriah alone is sufficient to show that his nature was not incapable at once of cunning and heartless cruelty.

Saul was really guilty of the alleged attack upon the Gibeonites, or whether he was merely charged with it by the oracle as a pretext for the inhuman retribution;[1] it is not mentioned at all in the Hebrew records;[2] and if it yet took place, it was probably too trifling an affair to deserve the historian's notice. But it particularly concerns us to observe that the whole matter was, in the first instance, referred to Jehovah;[3] that David was plainly informed of the intention of the Gibeonites of "hanging up" the seven persons "before Jehovah" as an "atonement";[4] that he willingly surrendered them for that atrocity;[5] that he evidently expected from that act a cessation of the famine; and that this calamity is reported to have really disappeared in consequence of the offering.[6] The sacrifice was indeed performed by the Gibeonites, but it was performed with the knowledge and consent of David. Thus human offerings were presented to Jehovah, not, as in the case of Jephthah, in a time of political or religious anarchy, but after the establishment of a strong monarchical government; nor countenanced by an untutored outlaw, but by one of the most cultivated minds that adorned the history and literature of the Israelites. It is of little consequence whether the narrative is literally historical, or whether it has been framed by the author of the second Book of Samuel, who utters no word of reprobation, in accordance with an old tradition;[7] the latter alternative would be more significant still; for as the

---

[1] Comp. *Charles Voysey*, Is every statement in the Bible about our Heavenly Father strictly true? Sermon, 3rd. ed. pp. 16—21, containing a manly and forcible protest against "the unrighteous and unholy ways and works" ascribed to God in this narrative and that concerning the pestilence caused by David's numbering the people (2 Sam. XXIV. 1 *sqq.*; 1 Chr. XXI. 1 *sqq.*).

[2] It is an idle conjecture that the massacre of the priests and people at Nob ordered by Saul (1 Sam. XXII. 18, 19) included that of the Gibeonites who served at the sanctuary as menials (Josh. IX. 21, 23, 27; comp. *Talm.* Bab. Kam. 119 *a*; *Saad.* and *Abarban.* in loc.; *Clericus*, l. c. p. 340), for Saul is stated to have persecuted the Gibeonites "throughout the whole territory of Israel" (ver. 5, בכל־גבול ישראל); or that Saul, "seeing the offence he had given by sparing the Amalekites, sought to atone for it by destroying the Gibeonites" (Kitto, Philippson), a confusion of ideas which we are not justified in attributing to that unhappy king; comp. Deut. VII. 2, 24; see also *Thenius*, in loc. and *Talm.* Yevam. 79 *a*, (מיפיים ולא פייסינהו).

[3] Ver. 1, ויבקש דוד את־פני יהוה ויאמר יהוה.

[4] Ver. 3—6.

[5] Ver. 6, ויאמר המלך אני אתן; jussu nempe Dei, qui eos reos esse norat, adds Clericus (p. 342) on his own authority.

[6] Ver. 14, ויעתר אלהים לארץ אחרי־כן.

[7] It has been justly observed, "We have here evidently a mythical conception before us" or "a mythical notion of the divine government of the world" (*Philippson*, in loc. p. 468); but unless the proper inferences be drawn, it avails little to point out such

Books of Samuel were composed at a very late period,[8] they would argue the prevalence of most objectionable notions during many subsequent ages.[9]

No case of a human sacrifice offered to Jehovah is chronicled later than the time of David; but this absence of express testimony does not prove absence of the practice, since the Hebrew Scriptures are far from complete in their record of public and private worship.[10] The more explicit are the statements of the Bible with regard to human victims slaughtered in honour of Moloch. This idol, probably worshipped by the Hebrews from early times and even in the desert under the eyes of Moses,[11] and provided with a formal service by Solomon,[12] received constant sacrifices by all sections of the nation, both in the empire of Israel and of Judah.[13]

Under one of Solomon's immediate successors a remarkable event took place well calculated to prove the pre-eminent efficacy attributed to human offerings. Mesha, the king of Moab, was besieged in Kir-haraseth, and hopelessly pressed by the joint armies of Israel, Judah, and Edom, the two former being led by the kings Jehoram and Jehoshaphat: in this critical position "he took his eldest son that should have succeeded him on the throne, and offered him for a burnt-offering upon the wall", that is, publicly in the sight of the besieging army;[14] after which — so continues the historian — "a great wrath came upon the Israelites,[15] and they departed from him, and returned to their own land."[16] It is uncertain whether the king of Moab slaughtered the sacrifice to his own national deity Chemosh, or, as is indeed less probable, to

---

pregnant premises; for the attempt at bringing into a causal connection bad harvests and the supposed misdeed of a king long defunct, implies indeed "a mythical conception."

[8] Comp. *De Wette*, Einleit. I. § 180; *Davidson*, Introduct. I. 523—529; a. o.

[9] On the chiefs of the people "hung up to the Lord against the sun" in the time of Moses by God's command (Num. XXV 4), and about Samuel, who "hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal" (1 Sam. XV. 33), see Sect. XXV.

[10] See p. 378.

[11] Comp. Am. V. 26; see p. 365. This opinion is for instance maintained and defended by the learned Vitringa (Obs. Sacr. pp. 266, 267), and it is admitted even by Öhler (in Herzog's Real-Encycl. XVI. 621), although from his biassed and uncritical point of view he supports his remarks by a reference to Lev. XVIII. 21 and XX. 2—5 — which passages have a very different scope (see Sect. XXIV; on Ezek. XX. 25 and 26, see Sect. XXV).

[12] 1 Ki. XI. 5, 7; see p. 365.

[13] 2 Ki. XVII. 17, 19; comp. Jer. XXXII. 30, 32; Hos. XIII. 2 (see *Rosenmüller*, Schol. in loc.); see also Mic. VI. 7.

[14] *Joseph*. Ant. IX. iii. 2, *ὥστε πᾶσι φανερὸν γενέσθαι τοῖς πολεμίοις*.

[15] ויהי קצף גדול על־ישראל; comp. Eccl. V. 16, וכעס הרבה ··· וקצף.

[16] 2 Ki. III. 27.

Jehovah,[1] who had till then so effectually assisted the Hebrews, and whose favour he might, therefore, have been anxious to secure for himself; it may also be admitted that Jehoshaphat, the pious king of Judah,[2] had no decisive voice in the military councils, since he was only an ally of Jehoram, the idolatrous ruler of Israel,[3] and the chief originator of the war; and that he can, therefore, not be made responsible for the hasty and infatuated return of the army; and granted even that the Edomites, confederated with the Hebrews,[4] were particularly affected by the apprehended consequences of the king of Moab's deed: yet it remains an undeniable fact that the Israelites were terrified by the power, supposed to be irresistible, of the human sacrifice to such a degree, that they abandoned the certain prospects of victory, and retreated ignominiously, enraged at the extreme device of the heathen monarch, who had preferred to devote his heir[5] to the deity, rather than lose his land or independence. The words which we have rendered, "a great wrath came upon the Israelites",[6] neither mean, "and there was a great wrath (of God) against Israel", since they had *occasioned* the horror of the human sacrifice, that is, they were smitten by a plague or suffered a defeat,[7] which, if brought into causal connection with Mesha's sacrifice, would aggravate the superstitious conception of the historian; nor can they signify "and there was a great indignation (of the enemies) against Israel",[8] which had existed long before the sacrifice in utmost intensity;[9] they can, according to sound exegetical rules, only point to the consternation into which the sacrifice, designedly performed in public, threw the troubled Hebrews; and the efforts

---

[1] Josephus (τῷ Θεῷ), Ephr.Syr., Rashi.

[2] 1 Ki. XXII. 2—51.

[3] 2 Ki. III. 2, 3, 13, 14.

[4] Comp. ver. 26.

[5] It is entirely against the context to understand that he sacrificed the son of the king of *Edom* (so Engl. Version in the summary to the chapter; Michaelis, Übersetzung mit Anmerk. in loc., a. o.); the sortie of the Moabites is expressly stated to have been unsuccessful, and the words ויקח את־בנו הבכור cannot possibly be translated, "yet he made his firstborn son *a prisoner*."

[6] ויהי קצף גדול על־ישראל.

[7] Comp. Num. XVIII. 5; 2 Chr. XXIX. 8; 1 Macc. I. 64; *Hengstenb.* Auth. des Pent. II. 148; *Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, pp. 569—572, see also p. 200; Keil (in loc. p. 229, "diese Gräuelthat brachte über Israel ein schweres göttliches Gericht), although in writing this he seems to have forgotten that in his remarks on Judg. XI. 39, 40 (p. 298), he had adopted a different interpretation (that of Cassel, see *infra*).

[8] English Version and others.

[9] The Sept. renders inaccurately *μετάμελος μέγας ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ* (though it translates קצף elsewhere, as Deut. XXIX. 27, Jer. XXXII. 37, by *παροξυσμός*, which would have been more appropriate in our passage also); Vulg. indistinctly, indignatio magna in Israel; see also *F. Field*, Otium Norvicense, p. 1.

**that have been lavishly made to avoid this conclusion are necessarily forced and futile.[10]**

**And as if to remove every doubt on the awful subject, the Hebrew annals mention acts similar to that of the king of Moab as having been performed by several subsequent kings of Judah themselves, perhaps even without that urgency of the occasion which stimulated the pagan monarch. For it is related that Ahaz, the king of Judah (B. C. 743—728), "caused his son to pass through the fire, in accordance with the abominations of the heathens";[11] and the same execrable deed is recorded of Manasseh, the son of the pious Hezekiah.[12] Indeed Manasseh seems to have established, as a new and special place for the regular and permanent service of Moloch, that Topheth (תֹּפֶת) in the valley of Hinnom which, up to the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign (B. C. 642—611), remained untouched.[13] And though the detestable worship was then temporarily interrupted, it was soon afterwards resumed in its accustomed form. For Jeremiah again had occasion to break forth in the complaint, "The disgrace (i. e. the disgraceful idols, הַבֹּשֶׁת) devoured the labours of our fathers from our youth, their flocks and their herds, their sons and their daughters; we lie down in our shame, and our confusion covers us; for we have sinned against the Lord our God, we and our fathers, from our youth *even to this day*."[14] Nay even Ezekiel, writing during the Babylonian exile, inveighed against his obdurate co-religionists, "Thus says the Lord God, Do you pollute yourselves after the manner of your fathers? . . . for when you offer your gifts, when you make your children to pass through the fire, you pollute yourselves with all your idols *even up to this day;*[15] and the**

[10] See, for instance, those of Jewish expositors in *Philippson's* Comment., those of modern critics in the Exeget. Handbuch, although in the latter work, Thenius also misinterprets the passage in paraphrasing, "the Israelites, filled with abhorrence at Mesha's deed, abandoned the advantages obtained, rather than remain longer in a country defiled by such abominations", and he is followed in this erroneous view by later expositors, as Cassel (in Herzog's Real-Encycl. VI. 472, "die Gräuel des Kinderopfers waren ein Gegenstand des Schreckens und des Abscheu's), a. o.; but the sentiments thus attributed to the immoderate idol-worshipper Jehoram, are against historical probability, or rather evidence, as will at once be demonstrated.

[11] וגם את־בנו העביר באש כתעבות הגוים, 2 Ki. XVI. 3; 2 Chr. XXVIII. 3.

[12] 2 Ki. XXI. 6, והעביר את־בנו באש; the Chronist, true to his usual bias, attributes to the untheocratic Manasseh the sacrifice of several sons (את־בניו, 2 Chr. XXXIII. 6).

[13] Comp. 2 Ki. XXIII. 10; Jer. VII. 31; XIX. 6, 14; see p. 366.

[14] Jer. III. 24, 25; comp. VII. 31, 32; XIX. 2—6 (ומלאו את־המקום הזה דם נקים and לשרף את־בניהם באש עלות לבעל), 13, 14; XXXII. 35 (להעביר את־בניהם ואת־בנותיהם למלך).

[15] Ezek. XX. 30, 31; comp. XVI. 20, 21, 36.

same prophet reproached the people that blood was in their hands, for they burnt the very children whom they had born to their abominable idols "for food"; and when they had committed such revolting impiety, they had the hardihood to enter the Temple of Jehovah, and to profane it by their presence.[1] The hundred and sixth Psalm, composed in the captivity during the dispersion of the people,[2] and offering a brief survey of the people's destinies with reference to their religious career, confesses in general, that the Hebrews "sacrificed their sons and their daughters to the demons (לַשֵּׁדִים), and shed innocent blood, the blood of their sons and daughters, whom they sacrificed to the idols of Canaan, so that the land was polluted with blood."[3] And even the second Isaiah, who wrote at Babylon in the latter part of the exile, exclaimed, "Are you not children of iniquity, a seed of falsehood who are inflamed for the idols under every green tree, who slay the children in the valleys,[4] under the clifts of the rocks?"[5]

It is, therefore, undoubted that human sacrifices were offered by the Hebrews from the earliest time up to the Babylonian period, both in honour of Jehovah and of heathen deities, not only by depraved idolators but sometimes even by pious servants of God; they probably ceased to be presented to Jehovah not much before they ceased to be presented at all; for being prized as deeds of singular piety, they were efficiently opposed and ultimately abolished only when the notions of piety itself were purified and refined. This was accomplished mainly by the diffusion and growing authority of the Pentateuch and the increased zeal of devoted reformers and leaders. Then at last Jehovah was conceived and taught in a manner more compatible with the attributes of an omnipotent and eternal spirit, the Creator and Ruler of the Universe, and then that religious system was finally developed, which bears the distinctive name of Mosaic or Hebrew, and which is fundamentally different from that of the other ancient nations.

This will be more obvious, if we briefly state

[1] Ezek. XXIII. 37, 39. This passage which merely denounces the duplicity, so often rebuked, of combining the most nefarious practices with a deceitful worship of Jehovah (see p. 51), has been understood, by a very extraordinary process of reasoning, to prove that it was customary among the Israelites to repair, on every Sabbath which is the day of Saturn, to the Topheth in the valley of Hinnom, there to offer human sacrifices, and then to come into the Temple, where, "a part of the ashes was strewn before the statue of Moloch, while the bones of the victims were preserved *in the Ark of the Covenant*" (see *Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, pp. 221, 355—358; *Movers*, Phoen. I. 357) — a combination as remarkable as it is groundless.

[2] See Ver. 47.

[3] Vers. 37, 38.

[4] Probably in imitation of the same hideous worship in the valley of Hinnom, to which they had been accustomed in Palestine.

[5] Isai. LVII. 5.

## XXIV. THE VIEWS OF THE PENTATEUCH AND THE HEBREW PROPHETS ON IDOLATRY AND HUMAN SACRIFICES.

THE idols were designated by names which alone are almost sufficient to prove in what light they were regarded by the more discerning minds among the Israelites. They received appellations expressive either of scornful contempt or of vehement abhorrence; for they were called, on the one hand, NONENTITIES,[6] that is, *gods that are no-gods,*[7] powerless and mute,[8] empty and unreal shadows (תֹּהוּ) that cannot help nor save,[9] while Jehovah (יהוה) is the only One that *is* or *exists* for ever,[10] or VANITIES,[11] lying and deceitful,[12] because the work of human hands,[13] made of metal or wood,[14] or BLOCKS and TRUNKS,[15] whereas Jehovah is man's "strength and fortress, and refuge",[16] or the "rock of help";[17] and on the other hand, they were termed ABOMINATIONS,[18] or DETESTATIONS;[19] and they were, together with those who manufactured them, derided by the prophets with the bitterest and most taunting sarcasm, in passages which belong to the most exquisite compositions of the whole canon.[20] Therefore, terms like "Jehovah is the God of gods",[21] or "awful above all gods",[22] or "the highest God",[23] or "none is like

---

[6] אֱלִילִים, Lev. XIX. 4; XXVI. 1; Isai. II. 8, 18, 20; 1 Chr. XVI. 26; Ps. XCVI. 5; XCVII. 7; comp. 1 Cor. VIII. 4, *οὐδὲν εἴδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ*; see also X. 19; Isai. XIX. 1, "the nonentities of Egypt tremble before Jehovah"; see XXI. 9.

[7] אלהים לא אלהים, Jer. XVI. 20; V. 7; or *no-deity* (לֹא־אֵל), Deut. XXXII. 21.

[8] אלילים אלמים, Hab. II. 18.

[9] 1 Sam. XII. 21.

[10] Exod. III. 14, אהיה אשר אהיה.

[11] הֲבָלִים, Deut. XXXII. 21; 1 Ki. XVI. 13, 26; 2 Ki. XVII. 15 (וילכו אחרי ההבל ויהבלו); Jer. II. 5; LI. 18.

[12] הַבְלֵי שָׁוְא, Jon. II. 8.

[13] Hence also called עֲצַבִּים, from עצב, to work, to fashion; Jer. X. 3, חקות העמים הבל הוא כי עץ מיער כרתו מעשה ידי חרש במעצד.

[14] Jer. X. 2, 8, 15; LI. 18.

[15] גִּלּוּלִים, Lev. XXVI. 30; Deut. XXIX. 16; 2 Ki. XVII. 12; XXI. 21; Ezek. VI. 4, 6; XIV. 6; XVI. 36; XX. 7, 8, 39; XXIII. 39; XXX. 13; etc. — Sept. *ἐπιτήδευμα, διανόημα*, or *ἐνθύμημα* (fiction or invention); Chald. טַעֲוָתָא (nothingness).

[16] Jer. XVI. 19; comp. X. 6, 7.

[17] צור ישועה, Deut. XXXII. 15; comp. Acts XIV. 15, *τὰ μάταια*, in opposition to *τὸν θεὸν ζῶντα*.

[18] תּוֹעֵבוֹת, Deut. XXXII. 16; 2 Ki. XXIII. 13; Ezek. XI. 21; etc.

[19] שִׁקּוּצִים, Hos. IX. 10; Deut. XXIX. 16; Jer. IV. 1; Ezek. V. 11; XX. 7, 8; 1 Ki. XI. 5, 7; 2 Ki. XXIII. 24; comp. Comm. on Exod. pp. 103, 104. On מִפְלֶצֶת (1 Ki. XV. 13; 2 Chr. XV. 16) properly *terror* comp. *Ewald*, Gesch. III. 182, 183.

[20] Isai. XLIV. 9—19; XL. 19, 20; XLI. 6, 7; XLV. 16, 20; XLVI. 6, 7; Jer. X. 3—5; etc.; comp. *Hor.* Sat. I. viii. 1—7 (Olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum, etc.).

[21] אלהי אלהים, Deut. X. 17.

[22] עַל־כָּל־אלהים, Ps. XCVI. 4.

[23] אלהים עליון or אל עליון, Gen. XIV. 18—22; Ps. VII. 18; IX. 3; XLVII. 3; LVII. 3; etc.

Thee among the gods",[1] wherever they occur in later writings, do not involve a recognition of other deities, but mean simply that Jehovah, the acknowledged God of the Hebrews, is mightier than the beings whom other nations consider as gods, and from whom they expect help and deliverance.[2] It is indeed probable that those terms point to a time when the veneration of the Hebrews was divided between Jehovah and other deities as between rival gods, and when the latter were not yet looked upon as "nonentities"; thus Jephthah, in his message to the king of the Ammonites,[3] attributed to their god Chemosh power to procure for them victory and conquest, in the same manner as Jehovah assists the Hebrews;[4] for the absolute sovereignty of Jehovah was a notion gradually arrived at by severe intellectual struggles. But when the victory was gained at last, Jehovah was so exclusively worshipped as the Lord of all nature and all mankind, that He was described not only as the source of light but also of darkness, nor only as the author of "peace" but also of "evil",[5] lest a temptation be left of adopting a good and an evil principle in the world, after the manner of the Persian, Egyptian, and other heathen creeds. Then it was that all divinities besides Him were designated as *strange*[6] or simply as *other gods*,[7] though the Hebrew pantheon was constantly enlarged by *new* deities that had not been revered in preceding generations.[8] To express the intimacy and holiness of the relation that was to exist between Jehovah and the Hebrews, it was often represented by the figure of a matrimonial alliance — God as the husband or father, Israel as the wife or the children, as the son or firstborn son; every deviation from His precepts was conjugal faithlessness or "fornication";[9] God was supposed to send to His undutiful people "a letter of divorce";[10] and in many other points that simile was carried out with elaborate minuteness;[11] or Israel was described as God's people or inheritance, His peculiar nation or treasure,

---

[1] אין כמוך באלהים, Ex. XV. 11; Ps. LXXXVI. 8; comp. XCV. 3; XCVII. 7, 9; etc.; *Spinoza*, Tr. theol. pol. II. 37, 38.

[2] Comp. 2 Ki. XIX. 15—19; Dan. II. 47.

[3] Judg. XI. 15 *sqq.*

[4] Ver. 24, "Dost thou not take possession of that which Chemosh thy god gives thee to possess? so whomsoever Jehovah our God drives out before us, them will we possess"; comp. also 2 Ki. V. 19.

[5] Isai. XLV. 7, אני יהוה עשה כל־אלה; comp. ver. 5, אני יהוה ואין עוד זולתי אין אלהים; etc.

[6] זרים; Deut. XXXII. 16; Ps. XLIV. 21; LXXXI. 10; Jer. VIII. 19 (הבלי נכר); Deut. XXXI. 16; Josh. XXIV. 23.

[7] אלהים אחרים; Exod. XX. 3; Deut. VI. 14; XI. 16; XXX. 17; etc.

[8] חדשים, Deut. XXXII. 17; comp. Judg. V. 8.

[9] זנות, זנונים, תזנות; Exod. XXXIV. 15; Lev. XVII. 7; Num. XIV. 33; Judg. VIII. 27; Hos. I. 2; II. 4, 7, 21, 22; IV. 12; V. 7; Isai. I. 21; Jer. II. 2, 25; LI. 5; etc.

[10] ספר כריתות, Jer. III. 8.

[11] Comp. Ezek. XVI. XXIII.

His chosen ones or His flock.[12] Meanwhile the notions of theocracy were developed and practically applied in the organisation of the state. Then Jehovah was conceived not merely as the God, but as the king of the people, and then a leaning towards other deities was not only treachery but treason. A public curse was to be pronounced against those who revered idols in secret.[13] The mere attempt at seducing others to unlawful worship, though the attempt was made with a brother, a son or a daughter, a beloved wife or a friend, was to be visited with lapidation,[14] even if it were supported by dreams and prophecies, by real and undeniable miracles.[15] A town that had been induced to adopt idolatrous rites, was to be destroyed, both men and beasts together with all property; it was to remain "an eternal heap of ruins, never to be rebuilt."[16] Prostration before idols or swearing by their divinity was a heinous crime;[17] their very names should not be familiarly uttered.[18] Idolatry itself became synonymous with "iniquity" (אָוֶן).[19] As, therefore, idol-worship in whatever form implied revolt against Jehovah's absolute supremacy, it was interdicted on penalty of death for individuals,[20] and of excision and dispersion for the nation.[21] It was menaced with the most fearful woes and troubles, especially in the Books of Deuteronomy and Leviticus, which were completed at a time when public calamities and national disasters could fitly be represented as the Divine retaliation for hardened disobedience: not only were those general terms which had almost become conventional in pourtraying Divine retaliation, employed to pronounce that all nature will be visited by the curse of God — that ample seed would yield scanty produce, and the trees bear no fruit, since the locust, the cricket, and the vermin, blast and mildew would destroy the vintage and the harvest; that the sky would be like brass, and the earth like iron; that sand and dust would descend instead of rain and dew; that man and beast would be afflicted with barrenness; that pestilence would rage with every fearful and incurable disease, and the minds of men be overwhelmed by confusion, anguish and madness —; but it was distinctly declared, that the land of the Hebrews would be deluged by foreign

---

12 On these and other metaphors see Comm. on Exod. pp. 332, 333.

13 Deut. XXVII. 15.

14 Deut. XIII. 7—12; XVII. 2—7.

15 Vers. 2—6.

16 Deut. XIII. 13—18.

17 Exod. XX. 5; XXIII. 24; Deut. V. 9; *Josh*. XXIII. 7; etc.

18 Exod. XXIII. 13.

19 1 Sam. XV. 23; Isai. LXVI. 3; comp. בית־און for בית־אל, see p. 353.

20 Exod. XXII. 19; Deut. XVII. 2—7; XIII. 2—6; XII. 29—31; see Comm. on Exod. p. 427.

21 Deut. VI. 14, 15; VIII. 19, 20; XXX. 17, 18; XXXI. 16—18; comp. Josh. XXIII. 7, 16; XXIV. 14, 15; 1 Ki. IX. 6—9.

hosts whom "God should bring from afar, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flies, and whose tongue they would not understand"; that they would suffer the most terrible sieges, when, in helplessness and despair, they would "eat of the fruit of their own bodies, the flesh of their sons and their daughters", and refuse to grant a share of the horrid food even to their nearest and most beloved kinsmen; that their corpses would lie unburied and unheeded; and that then the land would be occupied by the relentless enemy, who would seize their houses and vineyards, their flocks and herds, carry away their wives, their sons, and daughters, their kings and chiefs into a strange country, there to suffer distress and want and ignominy, and to be scattered among all nations, from one end of the earth to the other, yea to be sold again into Egypt as bondmen, though despised and rejected even for the meanest services, till their name became a horror and a by-word among all nations:[1] all this was sure to befall them if they swerved from Jehovah and His precepts;[2] and all transgressors were warned not to indulge in the delusion of being exempted from the awful chastisements of idolatry.[3] So faithfully did the authors of the Pentateuch describe, as eye-witnesses, the fearful misfortunes that crushed Israel and Judah in the Assyrian and Babylonian periods.

But it is not enough to acknowledge Jehovah as the only God;[4] He must be adored under no visible form whatever, not by any image (פֶּסֶל), figure (תְּמוּנָה), or likeness (תַּבְנִית), whether of man or woman, of beast or bird, of fish or reptile;[5] because, according to the writer's account, the people, when communing with God at mount Horeb, had only heard a voice, but seen no figure.[6] Moreover, nearly all the manifold forms of idolatry which prevailed among the Hebrews in the author's times, or had been practised by them in former periods, were individually interdicted — the worship of the heavenly bodies, of sun, moon and stars,[7] of Ashtarte[8] with her licentious service,[9] and of the animals held sacred by the Egyptians,[10] the worship on "high places",[11]

---

[1] Deut. XXVIII. 15—68; Levit. XXVI. 14—43.

[2] Comp. vers. 15, 20, 45, 47, 48; comp. also Deut. IV. 25—27; VI. 14, 15; VIII. 19, 20; XI. 16, 17; XXX. 17, 18; 1 Ki. IX. 6—9.

[3] Deut. XIX. 16—21.

[4] Exod. XX. 3; Deut. V. 7; comp. Isai. XLII. 8; etc.

[5] Deut. IV. 16—18; comp. ver. 25; V. 28; Exod. XX. 4; Isai. XL. 18; XLVI. 5.

[6] Deut. IV. 12, 15; comp. Exod. XX. 18—21.

[7] Deut. IV. 19; XVII. 3; Lev. XXVI. 30 (חמנים, see p. 361); see also Jer. X. 2.

[8] Deut. XVI. 21.

[9] Lev. XIX. 29; Deut. XXIII. 18, 19; comp. 1 Ki. XXII. 47; 2 Ki. XXIII. 7 (סכות בנות, קדשים and קדשות, אתנן זונה and מחיר כלב), see p. 360.

[10] Lev. XVII. 7 (שעירים); comp. XVIII. 3; Deut. XXXII. 17; see p. 368.

[11] במות, Lev. XXVI. 30; comp. Ezek. VI. 3; XX. 29.

and the erection of altars and images, statues and memorial stones, *for* idolatrous purposes,[12] while their absolute destruction, wherever they should be found,[13] was commanded with such uncompromising severity that not even the gold or silver with which they were made or adorned, was allowed to be used, but was to be detested like a curse and an abomination;[14] nay the Canaanite tribes themselves were to be extirpated, and all alliances with them scrupulously shunned, lest they should seduce the Hebrews to adopt their gods and their superstitions.[15] The Pentateuch forbids incisions and other mutilations of the body customary among heathens;[16] it brands divination and enchantment, witchcraft and magic, incantation and necromancy,[17] which arts, if practiced secretly, are menaced with excision (כָּרֵת), if publicly, are to be punished with death by stoning,[18] since they belong to those abominations (תּוֹעֵבוֹת), on account of which the tribes of Canaan had been doomed to perdition,[19] and which would preclude the Israelite from being "perfect with his God."[20] But it denounces the heinousness of human sacrifices with a vehemence of indignation which proves at once how deeply they were detested by the enlightened, and how inveterately they were upheld by the mass of the Israelites. It ordains that any man, whether a stranger or a Hebrew, who offers up his child to Moloch, shall be stoned to death, for "he has defiled the Sanctuary of the Lord and His holy name"; it adds that, if anyone encourages, were it only by his silence, such deeds of horror, God threatens, "I will set My face against that man, and against his family, and will cut him off and all that go astray after him, from among

---

12 אבן משכית, Exod. XX. 23; Lev. XIX. 4; XXVI. 1; Deut. XVI. 22.

13 Exod. XXIII. 24; XXXIV. 13; Num. XXXIII. 52; Deut. VII. 5; XII. 2, 3; comp. Isai. XXVII. 9; 2 Ki. XVIII. 4; XXIII. 24.

14 Deut. VII. 25, 26; comp. Isai. XXX. 22: a trace of the gradual growth of this severity is preserved in 1 Chr. XIV. 12, "the Philistines left there their gods, and David commanded and they were burnt in fire"; whereas the second Book of Samuel (V. 21) has instead of the last words, "and David and his men carried them away", וישאם דוד ואנשיו, the modification of the Chronist being made in his usual unhistorical spirit: it is remarkable that the authorised English version injudiciously follows the Chronist, since it renders in Samuel also, *and David and his men burnt them*, a translation which the verb וישאם repudiates.

15 Exod. XXIII. 32, 33; Deuter. VII. 2—4, 24; XX. 16—18; comp. Exod. XVII. 14; 1 Sam. XV. 2, 3.

16 Lev. XIX. 28; XXI. 5; Deut. XIV. 1.

17 נחש and קסם in Num. XXIII. 23; Deut. XVIII. 10; comp. Lev. XIX. 26; 1 Sam. XV. 23; אבות and ידענים in Lev. XIX. 31; מכשפה and מכשף in Exod. XXII. 17; Deut. XVIII. 10; מעונן and חובר חבר in Deut. XVIII. 10, 11; see also *supra* pp. 375, 376.

18 Lev. XX. 6, 27; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 3, 9; 2 Ki. XXIII. 24.

19 Deut. XVIII. 10, 11; comp. 2 Ki. XXIII. 24.

20 Deut. XVIII. 13; תמים תהיה עם יהוה אלהיך.

their people"[1] — an addition which renders it evident that, on the part of the people, an indulgent connivance at the rites of Moloch was to be apprehended; and it repeats the same injunction with sustained emphasis;[2] while the prophets inveigh against the revolting practice with implacable bitterness, and predict, as an inevitable punishment, death and pestilence, affliction and mourning, and general desolation,[3] famine in sieges and disaster in battles,[4] subjection and ignominy.[5]

Thus, in spite of the perpetual and decided prevalence of idolatry, there always existed among the Hebrews a small band of clear-sighted men, who by a fine intuition were capable of forming purer notions, and often proclaimed them at the peril of their lives; they were the "holy seed" that was to grow into a towering tree; they were the spark that was to light the torch of progress; for long epochs their voice was heard in isolated accents only, or in prophetic speech, such as the requirements of the moment called forth; till at last their doctrines were laid down in a collected code, if not systematically, at least comprehensively, enjoined with earnestness and authority, and, if necessary, shielded by the arm of worldly power. Therefore, while other nations remained sunk in superstition and disappeared tracelessly as soon as they had lost their national independence, the Hebrews, from the beginning endowed with the germ of intellectual advancement,[6] flourished and developed their true strength in exile and persecution. By adopting the canon of the Scriptures, compiled and sanctioned by their spiritual leaders, they were familiarised with the ideas that had so long been preached in vain, and which found a welcome support in the influence of the almost Puritanical spirit of the Persian religion suffering no image or representation of its deities. Then the task could be undertaken, so consistently accomplished in the Books of Chronicles three or four generations after Zerubbabel,[7] of composing the anterior history of the Israelites from a Levitical point of view, of treating it in accordance with the principles set forth in the Pentateuch, and of colouring, nay of modifying the narrative of the events by a constant regard to the observance or neglect of the "Mosaic Law." A later work, the Book of Daniel, written in the second century before the present era, and carrying the thread down to the last years of the reign

1 Lev. XX. 2—5.

2 Lev. XVIII. 21; Deut. XII. 31; XVIII. 10; comp. *Philo*, De Vict. c. 14, *τὸν δὲ ἱερὸν βωμὸν οὐ θέμις αἵματι ἀνθρωπίνῳ μιαίνεσθαι*; see *Hengstenb.* Auth. des Pent. II. 144, 145.

3 Jer. VII. 31—34.

4 Jer. XIX. 1—13; XXXII. 35.

5 Ezek. XVI. 36 *sqq.*

6 Comp. Judg. V. 2—5; VI. 8; 1 Sam. II. 27.

7 See 1 Chr. III. 19—24; some count five, others even nine generations (comp. *Zunz*, Gottesd. Vorträge, p. 31).

of Antiochus Epiphanes, represents the complete triumph of the worship of Jehovah over that of all idols, and describes how even heathen kings, lost in the grossest superstitions, are forced to acknowledge the grandeur and the supremacy of the God of Israel, and to command His service within their dominions.[8] And this glorious and fondly cherished hope is finally realised in the Books of the Maccabees, especially the first, which record the exploits of the champions of Israel's faith, and the persecution and partial annihilation of idolatry, and which disclose the firm hold which the Pentateuch, hallowed by the authority of the name of Moses, had then already gained upon the thoughts and the lives of the Jews.[9]

## XXV. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON THE HUMAN SACRIFICES OF THE HEBREWS.

As the extent to which human sacrifices prevailed among the ancient Hebrews, has often been much exaggerated, and as they have even been represented to have obtained legislative sanction, it may be expedient briefly to examine the arguments that have been adduced in support of this view; and we believe that an unbiassed enquiry will lead to no other result than that at which we have arrived by a historical analysis of the idolatries that generally predominated in Israel.

It is indeed admitted on all hands that "the Old Testament nowhere literally authorises human sacrifices"; that in fact not many clear cases are mentioned;[10] but this absence of positive proof is attributed to "the reformers after the exile", who allowed few traces of objectionable customs to remain in the sacred Books.[11] So, for instance, it is ordained in Deuteronomy, that all the firstling males of the herd and the flock shall be sanctified to God and eaten every year in the town of the national Temple;[12] this command is asserted to have originally included the sacrificing and eating of the firstborn sons also, but to have been suppressed at the "revision" of the Book by the "reforming party."[13] Few will attach value to such hazards. It lies at present beyond the reach of criticism to ascertain, what, if anything, has been blotted out from the Hebrew records in their original form. Yet great ingenuity has been displayed in defending what is hardly more than a bold paradox, and an unexpected array of arguments has been put forth which require impartial scrutiny. — "There were religious institutions among the Hebrews very clearly proving that, before the Babylonian exile, human sacrifices were employed, in the service of the national God, not only occasionally and in isolated instances, but that they were offered regularly and

---

[8] Compare, among other passages, Dan. II. 47; III. 28—30; IV. 31—34; V. 23; VI. 11, 26—28.

[9] Comp. 1 Macc. II. 17—25; IV.43; V. 68; X. 83, 84; XIII. 47, 48. On the Talmudical teaching with regard to idolatry, see *Hamburger*, Geist der Hagada, pp. 14—20, and Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talm. pp. 13—19.

[10] *Ghillany*, Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer, Nürnberg 1842, pp. 31, 492, 518.

[11] L. c. p. 492.

[12] Deut. XV. 19, 20.

[13] *Ghillany*, l. c. p. 649.

in large numbers."[1] This is the text of long and minute discussions which we cannot indeed here follow in all their intricacies, but of which we shall introduce the most striking features, in order to attempt a refutation. The task, though uncongenial, may not be unprofitable, because the views which we shall endeavour to combat, imply a complete distortion of Biblical theology, though they number among their adherents some of the most learned and most acute critics.

I. "It is impossible to determine how far the custom of slaughtering the *firstborn children* reaches back into the past; but Moses has surely prescribed this sacrifice of the firstborn as a law of Jehovah."[2] How, *surely?* By what proof has this conjecture been substantiated? We can find none beyond the bare assertion. It is even added that Moses commanded the firstborn sons to be *burnt* to Jehovah; this is inferred from the alleged fact that the Egyptian king Amasis, who lived at least nine centuries after Moses, ordered three wax-tapers to be burnt daily in the Temple of Heliopolis, instead of the three men who had previously been sacrificed;[3] but not wax-tapers but wax-images were by Amasis substituted for the men.[4] It is contended that, during the wanderings in the desert, "the firstborn were regularly killed" at the bidding of Moses and as far as his authority could enforce the law:[5] but from the only sources we possess on the subject, we know that Moses neglected even the circumcision of his own son,[6] and allowed the whole nation to neglect it during the time of his leadership.[7] It is supposed that the people commenced to free themselves from the worship of Moloch in the period of the Judges; that from the time of the completion of the Temple, the parents were permitted to choose between the sacrifice and the redemption of their children; that, lastly, although from the building of the second Temple to the capture of Jerusalem by the Romans, sacrificing was interdicted, and redemption or circumcision alone allowed, yet the firstborn had to undergo a "baptism of fire", which consisted in drawing the child over or through the flames of the burning victim that was offered in his stead.[8] We seek in vain for a single argument in corroboration of this detailed theory, unless it be based upon the erroneous acceptation of a Hebrew term.[9]

It is impossible to deny that the firstborn sons were frequently sacrificed, not only by idolatrous Israelites in honour of foreign gods, as Moloch and Baal, but by pious men in honour of Jehovah;[10] but the Pentateuch, the embodiment of the more enlightened and advanced creed of the Hebrews, distinctly commanded the redemption of the firstborn.[11] Yet here again "the reformers after the exile" are vaguely taxed with corruption of the original words, and substitution of their own severer views for those of the elder historian.[12] The

---

[1] L. c. p. 452. [2] L. c. p. 505.

[3] See *supra* p. 347 note 12.

[4] *Porph.* Abst. II. 55, *ἐθύοντο δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας τρεῖς, ἀνθ᾽ ὧν κηρίνους ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Ἄμωσις τοὺς ἴσους ἐπιτίθεσθαι.* [5] L. c. p. 506.

[6] Exod. IV. 24—26. [7] Josh. V. 6, 7.

[8] L. c. pp. 503—510.

[9] העביר, see p. 381. [10] See p. 390.

[11] Exod. XIII. 2, 13; see Comm. in loc.

[12] *Ghillany*, l. c. pp. 495, 497—499, a deduction which may fairly be taken as a specimen of that author's baseless argumentation combining unscrupulous boldness of assertion and inaccuracy of information or statement: considering such and many other arguments, we can hardly be surprised that Öhler speaks of the "toll gewordene Kritik eines Ghillany" (in Herzog's Real-Encycl. XVI. p. 621). Kindred to Ghillany's work is that of G. Fr.

firstborn, as the chief of the household, was so indispensable to its efficient management, that he was even relieved from the priestly functions naturally devolving upon him. From the time that the theocratic organisation existed and was recognised, the eldest sons were unquestionably redeemed. Occasionally the precept is indeed stated in general terms, as, "Sanctify to Me all the firstborn, whatsoever opens the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and beast, it is Mine",[13] or "The firstborn of thy sons shalt thou give to Me";[14] but it is with sufficient distinctness defined by the context;[15] and a fair interpretation renders misconception impossible. It is even probable that the laws just quoted were designed to counteract the prevailing horrors of Moloch by substituting a religious devotion of the life of the firstborn for their immolation in honour of the deity; and that therefore the terms of those precepts were advisedly chosen so as to recall to the reader's mind that intended substitution;[16] but the injunction itself is distinct and unequivocal, and read in connection with other and corresponding commands, renders it indubitable that the Pentateuch disclaimed human sacrifices as utterly abhorrent to the attributes of Jehovah. There is no foundation for the opinion that the sacrifice of firstborn children was, at any period, regulated by a law or a binding custom; and it is at least generally allowed, that in the time of Micah, in the eighth century, it was not compulsory, but existed as a self-imposed act of piety.[17] Therefore, all later passages must be construed accordingly. A few figurative expressions, as "Israel is the firstborn son of God",[18] or "the firstfruit of His increase",[19] have been urged as a proof of the singular eagerness with which Jehovah, "the king, Saturn or Melech of the Israelites", claimed their firstborn children.[20] It is needless to offer a retort.—Ezekiel thus reproves the people in the name of God, "Moreover, thou hast taken thy sons and thy daughters, whom thou hast born to Me, and hast sacrificed them to the heathen gods for food."[21] From these terms it has been concluded that Jehovah was believed to require the children of the Israelites in the same manner as Moloch demanded them; but the prophet, on the contrary, declares that the children were intended to *live* for Jehovah and His service instead of being nefariously sacrificed to idols. In view of these unmistakable testimonies, a contrary meaning ought not to be attached to an uncertain passage of the same prophet, "And I gave them also statutes that were not good,[22] and judgements whereby they should not live; and I polluted them in their own gifts when they caused to pass through the fire all that opens the womb."[23] This passage can not imply a permission, much less an injunction, to offer the

Daumer, Der Feuer- und Molochdienst der alten Hebräer, als urväterlicher, legaler, orthodoxer Cultus der Nation historisch-kritisch nachgewiesen, Braunschweig 1842 (comp. *Ghillany*, l. c. p. 231, note 3), the leading view of which Lengerke (Kenaan p. 250) characterises as a conception which "an Abgeschmacktheit und Unkritik ihres Gleichen sucht"; while Kurtz (Geschichte des Alten Bundes, pp. 204, 205) charges Daumer with "unerhörte Frechheit und Brutalität", a "verbranntes Gehirn", and "Plumpheit und Dummheit."

[13] Exod. XIII. 2.

[14] Exod. XXII. 19.

[15] Comp. Exod. XIII. 12, 13.

[16] והעברת כל־פטר רחם ליהוה, ibid. ver. 12; for העביר is the peculiar word for offering to Moloch, see p. 381.

[17] Micah VI. 6, 7; comp. *infra*.

[18] Exod. IV. 22.

[19] ראשית תבואתה, Jer. II. 3.

[20] *Ghillany*, l. c. p. 504.

[21] Ezek. XVI. 20.

[22] חקים לא טובים.

[23] Ezek. XX. 25, 26.

firstborn children as sacrifices.[1] It can only mean that the "statutes" given to the Israelites did not prove or turn out to be good or beneficial for them, since they became occasions for transgression and disobedience; and that the "judgments" enjoined by the Law, called forth death and destruction, since the firstborn children were offered and burnt to idols.[2] Immediately afterwards, Ezekiel calls the gods to whom such disgraceful sacrifices were presented, detestations (שִׁקּוּצִים) and blocks (גִּלּוּלִים), by which the Hebrews contaminated themselves;[3] he certainly does not refer to Jehovah; and Jeremiah observes distinctly and repeatedly, the Israelites "have built the high places of Baal to burn their sons with fire for burnt-offerings to Baal, *which I did not command nor speak of, nor did it enter into My mind.*"[4] The same conclusion is suggested by a much debated passage in Micah.[5] The prophet, after having rebuked the people for neglecting their duties to God, introduces them exclaiming, "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? shall I come before Him with burnt-offerings, with calves a year old? will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with myriads of rivers of oil? shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" The people, guided by imperfect notions of Divine worship, ask whether the Deity would be pleased and conciliated by abundant drink- and burnt-offerings and by the sacrifice of children, at that time evidently deemed the chief acts of pious devotion; but the prophet replies in terms so pre-eminently distinguished for spiritual purity that they have been considered to comprise the whole circle of religious duties, "God has disclosed to thee, o man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of thee, but to act justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God"? So far, therefore, from sanctioning the abomination of *human* sacrifices, he attaches but subordinate value to sacrifices in general and to every external form of worship, and insists above all upon piety of the heart and rectitude of life.[6] Though the people shared for many ages the idolatries

[1] Comp. *Ghillany*, l. c. pp. 79, 387, 500, comp. p. 399; *Hitzig*, Exeget. Handbuch, Ezek. p. 136.

[2] It is therefore not even necessary to understand that God *permitted* the practice of all iniquities of idolatry and superstition by the Hebrew nation, and thus, according to a frequent Hebraism, *caused* it; comp. Exod. IV. 21 (and Comm. on Exod. p. 78); VII. 3; X. 1, 20, 27; XI. 10; Josh. XI. 20; especially Isai. VI. 10; LXIII. 17; Rom. I. 24, 28; 2 Thess. II. 11, 12; Acts VII. 42. — The interpretation of Spencer (De Legg. Ritt. I. viii. 2), "eos una cum victimis eorum pollutos habui et declaravi", is untenable for many reasons, among which it is sufficient to point to the erroneous separation of the 25th from the 26th verse, so that the meaning of "the statutes that were not good" is not at all explained; comp. also *Vitringa*, Obss. Sacr. lib. II. c. 1, pp. 262—266.

[3] Vers. 30, 31.

[4] Jerem. XIX. 5; comp. VII. 31; XXXII. 35.

[5] Mic. VI. 6, 7; comp. *Ghillany*, l. c. pp. 502, 503; *Vatke*, l. c. I. 276; *Hitzig*, Exeg. Handb., Klein. Prophet., p. 212.

[6] It has been supposed that the question of the people exhibits, with a tinge of irony, their irritation and bitterness at the perpetual rebukes of God through His prophets, whom nothing seemed able to satisfy; that that indignant disposition explains and justifies the exaggerations of "thousands of rams" and "myriads of rivers of oil"; and that therefore the offering of the firstborn, mentioned in the same spirit of hyperbole, was merely an oratorical illustration impossible or inconceivable in

of heathens, they were constantly warned against them by those noble teachers who insisted upon the service of Jehovah in sincerity; for the nature of Jehovah is not identical with that of Saturn or Moloch, and the religious views of a Samuel or an Isaiah were not identical with those of a priest of Baal or of Chemosh. It is therefore difficult to repress a feeling of surprise at the blunt assertion, "The sacrifice of the firstborn was a chief dogma of the ancient Hebrews, the only strong bond of union between Jehovah and His people, the foundation on which all the hopes of the Israelites were built"[7]—in support of which paradox no passage could have been quoted with less propriety than the glowing promise which God made to Abraham after his last and greatest trial.[8]

II. The *Passover* is presumed to have been adopted by the Hebrews from the Phoenicians in Solomon's time, and to have been retained in the same form down to the reign of Josiah; it is stated to coincide with an annual festival of atonement solemnised by the Phoenicians, in honour of Saturn, with human victims whose blood was meant to win the favour of the god for the ensuing year.[9] But a *regular* or *annual* festival of that description is very doubtful, even among the Phoenicians;[10] as regards the Hebrews, there is no trace of it whatever. No less precarious is another theory on the same subject. It is asserted that the Passover was of *Egyptian* origin; that it was kept, at the beginning of April, as a harvest-feast in honour of the Sun, and was designed to celebrate his triumph over the winter, whence firstfruits and firstborn sons were offered to the god, and houses, trees, and animals were dyed red, the colour of fire and the sun: in harmony with these customs, it is supposed, the door-posts of the houses of the Hebrews were marked with blood, which was besides a symbol of expiation, since Jehovah, when he saw it, declared Himself satisfied; while the name Pesach (פֶּסַח) is believed to denote either the *saltation* of the priests of Baal,[11] or the *burning* or *passing through* the fire![12] Indeed a long tissue of irrelevant conjectures. For we are here not concerned about the probable origin of the Hebrew Passover and its possible connection with festivals of other ancient nations, but about its character *such as it is described in the Pentateuch* and the other acknowledged writings of the Hebrews. And in these accounts, it is impossible to discover any astrological or other pagan element.[13] We can, therefore, only smile at the following wild and fantastical view set forth as a final result: "At the time of the first Temple, a man was killed on Passover for each division of the Israelites; his blood was mixed with the bread, instead of leaven, and this bread was eaten in the conviction that it possessed a peculiar power of expiation; then the corpse of the victim was roasted, and every Israelite was obliged to eat a small piece of the flesh, for the expiation of his sins."[14] But the smile of incredulity is changed into feelings

---

reality: but no irony or exaggeration is manifest in the first part of the question, "shall I come before Thee with burnt-offerings, with calves a year old"? and no irritation whatever is visible in the prophet's mild and calm reply, which would have been necessarily coloured by the tenour of the question.

7 *Ghillany*, l. c. p. 506.

8 Gen. XXII. 16, 17; see *infra*.

9 *Ghillany*, l. c. pp. 510 *sqq.*

10 Comp. *Plin.* Hist. Nat. XXXVI. 4; *Euseb.* In laud. Const. M. c. 13; Praep. Ev. IV. 16; *Porph.* De Abst. II. 54.

11 With reference to 1 Ki. XVIII. 26.

12 Like עָבַר, הֶעֱבִיר; *Ghillany*, l. c. pp. 510—518; *Bohlen*, Genesis, Einl. p. CXL; *Nork*, Bibl. Mythol. II. 408.

13 See Comm. on Exod. pp. 184, 185.

14 L. c. p. 518.

of sorrow and indignation, if we remember that crude speculations like these have, up to very recent times, occasioned sanguinary outbreaks of fanaticism and fierce persecution. How can moderation be expected from unreasoning and excitable multitudes, if refined scholars coldly frame the most hideous theories, without foundation, without a semblance of proof or a shadow of probability? If it were declared that Israelites practised those horrors among many other forms of foreign idolatry, it would only be a groundless opinion, because unsupported by any recorded fact; but the assertion becomes a sin against history, if it is extented to the party from which the Pentateuch emanated, and which interdicted even the blood of animals by the severest of all penalties.[1]

The second Book of Kings[2] speaks of the scrupulous celebration of Passover, in the spirit of the "Book of the Law", which had just been discovered, and it hints at the necessity of reforms in the regulations of that festival. Now, which were the abuses that had to be removed? "Human sacrifices", is the ready answer.[3] And why? Because the reform could neither relate to sexual excesses, nor to sacrifices offered to heathen gods. It is needless to attack such logic. Yet it is admitted that the change might have referred to the interdiction of pork, since pigs were frequently sacrificed instead of men on account of the similarity in the taste of pork and human flesh! — an opinion which it is impossible to criticise with seriousness.[4]

III. *Human sacrifices offered as vows.* In Leviticus[5] it is ordained, "If a man shall make a vow to Jehovah, the souls shall belong to God according to thy estimation; and thy estimation shall be of the male from twenty years old to sixty years old, fifty shekels of silver, after the shekel of the sanctuary", etc. It is asserted that this law implies the permission granted to every Israelite of vowing his slave, his child, or himself to Jehovah; that the persons so pledged, occupying a position analogous to that of the hieroduli attached to heathen sanctuaries,[6] were obliged, at the pleasure of the priests, to perform the menial services of the Temple, but, whenever human sacrifices were required, and in default of other victims, were killed to Jehovah; it is admitted that, in later times, redemption was indeed allowed, but was, on important emergencies, refused. Here again a lofty fabric has been reared on no other foundation than fancy: the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures does not offer a single instance of such vows; the Gibeonites, though destined for servants of the Sanctuary, were so scrupulously protected that an alleged onslaught on them was supposed to have caused a protracted famine and required a fearful expiation;[7] the vow of Jephthah stands in no connection whatever with the laws of the Pentateuch;[8] and it is difficult to understand how that horrid custom can be supported by a Psalm breathing the gentlest meekness;[9] for the words, "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His pious men",[10] are strangely interpreted to mean that the sufferer had been rescued from his danger, because he sacrificed in his stead his firstborn son to Jehovah.[11] — On no more solid grounds, the Nazarites[12] are contended to have originally killed themselves as sacrifices to Jehovah,

---

[1] See Sect. IX. 7. [2] XXIII. 21—23.
[3] *Ghillany,* l. c. p. 521.
[4] Comp. the whole section l. c. pp. 510—561.
[5] XXVII. 1—8.
[6] See the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. I. [7] See pp. 390 *sqq.*
[8] See pp. 383 *sqq.* [9] The 116th.
[10] Ver. 15. [11] L. c. pp. 562—568.
[12] Num. VI. 1 *sqq.*

while later their hair, most highly prized, was commonly accepted as a substitute![13]

The Pentateuch enjoins, "No devoted thing (חֵרֶם) that a man shall devote to the Lord, of all that he has, both of man and beast... shall be sold or redeemed; every devoted thing is most holy to the Lord; none devoted, who shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed; but shall surely be put to death."[14] This law has been confidently asserted to ordain human sacrifices.[15] However, like all similar precepts or vows,[16] it implies merely, that every thing so devoted shall be destroyed; the extirpation of the men, as a rule heathen enemies in Canaan, or Hebrew idolators,[17] is indeed referred to a command of Jehovah, but it is not intended as a *sacrifice* to Him.[18] Whether such command is justifiable before the tribunal of humanity, whether it is derived from old customs shared by the Israelites with other ancient nations[19] and dating from the earliest times of barbarism, or whether it can be palliated by the supposed necessity for removing every possible cause of seduction to idolatry[20] — these questions do not here occupy us; thus much is certain that the *Cherem*, however cruel and ruthless, was no "grand human sacrifice vowed beforehand to Jehovah, in order to secure His assistance in impending struggles", and wherever it concerned human beings, it applied to none but malefactors, religious offenders, or political foes in open warfare.

IV. *Circumcision* is stated to have been a mitigated form of castration, which again was a milder substitute for human sacrifices originally presented to Jehovah, "the consecration of a member being accepted for the entire body."[21] The rite of circumcision, where it was not dictated by sanitary motives, was connected with the worship of the generative powers of men and nature; it bore nowhere the remotest relation to human sacrifices.[22]

---

13 L. c. pp. 572—575.

14 Lev. XXVII. 28, 29.

15 L. c. pp. 575—592.

16 Comp. Exod. XXII. 19; Num. XXI. 1—3; XXXI. 7—10, 17; Deut. II. 33, 34; III. 6; XIII. 7—18; XX. 13—17; Josh. II. 10; VI. 17—19; VII. 11, 12, 24; VIII. 2, 8, 24, 26; X. 28—41; XI. 14; Judg. I. 17; XXI. 11; 1 Sam. XV. 3, 8, 9; XXVII. 9; Mic. IV. 13; Mal. III. 4; see, however, Deut. II. 35; III. 7; Josh. VIII. 2; X. 28, 40; 1 Sam. XV. 8, 9, 14 *sqq.*; Zech. XIV. 11; Ezra X. 8; also 1 Ki. XX. 31.

17 Comp. *Ewald*, Alterth. pp. 81—85.

18 Öhler (l. c. p. 622) observes justly with reference to 1 Sam. XV. 21 and 33, "The cherem which is a *removal* from before Jehovah, is directly opposed to a sacrifice in the stricter sense, which is a *gift* offered on the altar"; though he is inclined to class the cherem with "sacrifices in a wider sense" because "performed for the glorification of Divine retribution"; but what is utterly destroyed with no other object than the destruction itself, can in no sense be called a sacrifice. The expressions in Isai. XXXIV. 5, 6 are poetical and figurative, "My sword shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of My curse (חרמי), to judgment . . . for the Lord has a sacrifice (זבח) in Bozrah, and a great slaughter (טבח) in the land of Idumea"; so also in Isai. XLVI. 10, כי זבח לארני · · · בארץ צפון.

19 Comp. *Caes.* Bell. Gall. VI. 17; *Diod. Sic.* V. 32; *Tac.* Ann. XIII. 57.

20 See pp. 399 *sqq.*

21 L. c. p. 596; comp. *Meiners*, De circumcisionis origine et causis, in the Comment. Soc. Gott. XIV. p. 207; *Böttiger*, Ideen zur Kunstmythologie, p. 375; *Vatke*, Rel. des A. T. I. 382.

22 See Comm. on Gen. pp. 386—392.

V. We read in Numbers,[1] "Only do not rebel against the Lord, nor fear the people of the land, for they are our bread,[2] their protection is departed from them, and the Lord is with us, fear them not." From this verse, in which the words "for they are our bread" figuratively convey the subjugation and destruction of the Canaanites,[3] it has been concluded that "the Hebrews, like the Egyptians and Carthaginians, drank the blood and ate the flesh of their human victims"![4] The same result is by every contrivance of painstaking ingenuity extracted from various other expressions; but it falls to the ground on the slightest examination. For some of these terms are obviously poetical metaphors,[5] against which fact, reluctantly acknowledged, opponents urge that the metaphors grew out of the actual custom, and prove therefore that in "early times" the enemies were really flayed and devoured,[6] overlooking that our present enquiry relates to the age of the composition of the Pentateuch, and not to "early times" indefinitely; other passages refer to the practices of *heathens*;[7] and others to the *wicked* among the Israelites who have revolted against Jehovah;[8] while none of them has any affinity whatever with sacrifices.[9]

VI. And finally, the ancient Hebrews are again and again taxed with a bloodthirsty and barbarous religion, on the following grounds. *The New Testament* regards the symbolical partaking of the flesh and blood of Christ as an emblem of expiation and remission of sins. Now, it is asked, "How could the idea of a Messiah arise who was destined for a sacrifice, that his death might be an atonement for the world, and that a morsel from his body, and a draught from his blood might efface the sins of individuals"?[10] This idea, it is maintained, originated in the religion of the Jews, and resulted more especially from the human sacrifices killed of old at Passover. It is true that the notion was gradually developed among the Hebrews that pious men might, by their death or suffering, avert the dangers and obliterate the sins of others;[11] but the Messiah forshadowed in the Old Testament was to fulfil his mission neither by death nor suffering, but was expected to live in triumph and in glory, and to restore the worldly greatness of the house of David, as we have proved in a preceding section.[12] The Christian ideas of a "son of God" in a literal sense and of incarnation are so utterly un-Hebrew that they are not even found in so late a work as the apocryphal Book of Enoch;[13] and they were adopted from very different religious systems and spheres of thought.

A few cases are recorded to the effect that the Israelites, in times of distressing famine and desperate siege ate human flesh:[14] but do they

---

1 XIV. 9.

2 כי לחמנו הם.

3 As in most languages metaphors are found like "a consuming fire"; "a devouring sword", etc.; comp. Isai. I. 20; Jer. XLVI. 10; Ezek. XXIII. 25; etc.

4 L. c. p. 639; comp. pp. 603—656.

5 As Zechar. IX. 15; comp. XI. 9.

6 L. c. p. 641.

7 Isai. XLIX. 26; Jer. V. 17; the *Canaanites* are described as "merciless murderers of children, and devourers of man's flesh and the feasts of blood" (Wisd. XII. 5).

8 Mic. III. 2, 3; Ps. XIV. 4.

9 Comp. Zech. XI. 9; *Jos.* Bell. Jud. V. x. 4.

10 L. c. p. 643, "dass sein Blut die Welt, ein Bissen von seinem Leibe, ein Trank von seinem Blute die Sünden des Einzelnen tilge."

11 See pp. 295, 296.

12 See pp. 302—307.

13 See Comm. on Genes. p. 166 and the passages there quoted; *Lawrence*, Book of Enoch.

14 See p. 324 note 5.

warrant the conclusion that the practice existed as a general custom? It is extremely precarious, to argue, "a nation that abominates the eating of human flesh, will detest it even in the calamity of a siege; it will surrender or die."[15] Jewish contemporaries denounced, with mingled grief and abhorrence, the enormities engendered by maddening despair;[16] the same excesses were occasioned, by similar troubles, in much later times, and among nations that have never been accused of cannibalism; and some passages in the Pentateuch,[17] though partially based on experience, are rhetorical and emphatic descriptions of fearful tribulations threatened to follow the neglect of the Law, and unavoidably leading to repulsive atrocities. A further proof, if one be needed, to show that similar occurrences were appalling exceptions among the Israelites, looked upon as the direst chastisement of reckless iniquity, is involved in the following words of Ezekiel, "I will do to thee *that which I have not done*, and *like which I will not do any more* . . . The fathers shall eat the sons in the midst of thee, and the sons shall eat their fathers; and I will execute judgment in thee and the whole remnant of thee will I scatter into all the winds."[18] As regards the alleged atrocities of the Jews during their sedition under Trajan (A. C. 116), we have no means of ascertaining how far they are based on truth;[19] they are by Eusebius[20] not mentioned at all; moreover, acts stimulated by the combined sting of political hatred and religious fanaticism, cannot be regarded as tests of the ordinary laws and practices of a nation. We are indeed unwilling to admit that "the religion of the Hebrews did not, in the times before the Babylonian exile, differ from that of the Phoenician tribes",[21] because it *tended*, from very early periods, towards a more refined spiritualism, which was incessantly taught by noble-minded and gifted men;[22] nor is it, on the other hand, our object to disprove that the Israelites were free from the idolatries prevalent among their neighbours; but we desire to show that these idolatries and barbarities, though partially not even rejected by worshippers of Jehovah, and freely permitted in His name and in His honour, have never been sanctioned in the Pentateuch, that code which embodies the latest stages of the Hebrew mind, and forms therefore the most perfect exponent of its aims. We do not wish to defend the *practices* of the Hebrews but their *doctrines*, not their *history* but their matured *theology*.

---

[15] L. c. p. 644.

[16] Comp. 2 Ki. VI. 30, 31; *Joseph.* Bell. Jud. V. x. 5.

[17] Deut. XXVIII. 53—55, 57; Lev. XXVI. 29.

[18] Ezek. V. 9, 10.— Ps. CVI. 34—39 states only that the Israelites *killed* their children to the idols, not that they *ate* them. In Ezek. XVI. 20 (וחזבחים להם לאכול) and XXIII. 37 (העבירו להם לאכלה), the words לאכול *to eat* and לאכלה *for food*, do not refer to the Israelites, as if they had eaten their human victims, but to the gods to whom they were slaughtered, especially to Moloch who *consumed* the bodies by fire (see *supra* p. 381). But the inference, "if the gods ate human flesh, those who sacrificed to them, probably ate of it also" (comp. *Plin.* H. N. VIII. 2; see p. 324 note 3), is an untenable process of logic.

[19] *Dion Cass.* LXVIII. 32, *τούς τε Ῥωμαίους καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἔφθειρον, καὶ τάς τε σάρκας αὐτῶν ἐστιοῦντο καὶ τὰ ἔντερα ἀνεδοῦντο τῷ τε αἵματι ἠλείφοντο καὶ τὰ ἀπολέμματα ἐνεδύοντο, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ μέσους ἀπὸ κορυφῆς διέπριον.*

[20] Hist. Eccl. IV. 2, comp. 6.

[21] L. c. p. 617.

[22] See p. 402.

That in this defence we are not biassed by partiality, we believe to have sufficiently proved on various occasions.[1]

VII. After having met the general charges with regard to human sacrifices, we proceed briefly to review the individual instances that have been adduced.

1. *The commanded sacrifice of Isaac.*[2] This much disputed narrative, which has been claimed, as the strongest support, by opposite schools,[3] may calmly be estimated in the following manner. It is indeed obviously framed on the supposition that the sacrifices of children, especially of the firstborn, offered to Jehovah, were not beyond the range of possibility, as they certainly have been presented by the Hebrews, for very considerable periods, in the manner of the Phoenicians, both to Moloch and to Jehovah.[4] But, on the other hand, the command is prominently presented as a *trial* of Abraham,[5] a trial of so extraordinary a nature that it appeared unparalleled and almost superhuman, and that obedient submission to it merited and obtained the most brilliant promises of a glorious future.[6] It must, therefore, be concluded that not only the author of the beautiful narrative but also the people for whom he wrote, had discarded the sacrifice of children as an ordinary custom. In fact, the story is devoid of significance and point, except on the presumption that the worship of Moloch had, at the time of its composition, virtually ceased. Its date must, therefore, be placed much later than is usually supposed. But it serves, moreover, to enjoin, that *Jehovah* requires no such sacrifices under whatever pretence, not even for sealing the most devoted and most ardent piety, that He is satisfied with the heart and faith of His worshippers, and that He crowns with splendid rewards those who show cheerful *readiness* to surrender what they most love and prize: the author desired to point out that this truth was understood and acted upon even in the patriarch's time, although in doing so he is in opposition to the entire history of his nation, since the view he embodied was only the growth of his own more enlightened age. Some critics have indeed discovered that the narrative in its first form, concluded with the real sacrifice of Isaac, for which the later revisors substituted a ram.[7] Be it even so, though it is impossible, on that conjecture, to understand the birth and lineage of Jacob and the genealogy of the Hebrew tribes;[8] the lesson of the story remains, that Jehovah has no delight in human victims, however fre-

---

[1] See Sect. XXVI.

[2] Gen. XXII. 1—19.

[3] Comp. *Ghillany*, l. c. pp. 660—678; *Vatke*, Rel. des A. T. p. 276; *Gramberg*, Rel. Ideen, I. 97; etc.

[4] See Sect. XXIII.

[5] Ver. 1.

[6] Vers. 16—18.

[7] Ver. 13; see p. 346; so *Bohlen*, Genesis, pp. 231, 232; *Ghillany*, l. c. p. 673; *Daumer*, Feuer- und Molochdienst der alten Hebräer, pp. 34 *sqq*.

[8] Older writers palliate the act by the following strange assumptions: 1. Isaac, at that time 25 years old (? comp. *Jos.* Ant. I, xiii. 2), gave his free consent to the sacrifice; 2. Both Abraham and Isaac firmly believed that if God should permit Isaac to be actually slain, he would speedily raise him again from the dead (comp. Hebr. XI. 17—19); and 3. that God intended to typify in Isaac, a beloved and only-begotten son, what was to happen long afterwards "to the great Son and seed of Abraham, the Messiah" (comp. *Whiston*, Translation of Josephus, pp. 673—678). These views, which the authors develop in detail, are interesting with reference to the history of Biblical interpretation.

quently they may have been slaughtered by the Israelites previous to the writer's time.[9]

2. The account of Eliezer's circumcision[10] is not without obscurity and difficulty. It has, therefore, been eagerly employed in support of favourite theories. It is supposed to involve the fact that Moses killed his son Eliezer in honour of Jehovah as an expiatory offering for his deliverance from a severe illness, during which he had vowed that sacrifice, without after his recovery accomplishing it[11] — a conception rendered impossible by the plain grammatical interpretation of the text; for the words, "and she (Zipporah) put it (the foreskin) at his feet and said, Thou art indeed a bridegroom of blood to me" (ver. 25), do not refer to Moses but to Eliezer, who can, therefore, not have been *killed* previously.[12]

3. It may suffice simply to mention the other instances of human sacrifices, that have been suspected in the Hebrew Scriptures; to state is to refute them. The massacre of 3000 Hebrews by the Levites, after the worship of the golden calf,[13] is said to have been "a great human hecatomb to celebrate the legislation of Jehovah."[14] — The death of Nadab and Abihu, who were killed by heaven-sent fire, because "they offered strange fire before the Lord",[15] is supposed to conceal the fact that Aaron killed his two firstborn sons as a sanctification of the Law, *or* as a proof of his devotion to its injunctions, *or* in order to conciliate the favour of Jehovah for the military expeditions that were then impending[16] — a cruel *embarras de richesse* in the motives.—The scouts who had been sent to Palestine to explore the land, and on their return spread discouraging reports, "died by a plague before the Lord":[17] this is explained to mean that they were sacrificed to Jehovah, in order to *cheer* the people, and to inspire them for the approaching attack.[18] — The chiefs who, as the representatives of the people, suffered the death of crucifixion as a *punishment* for the general worship of Baal-Peor in the time of Moses,[19] are asserted to have been offered up to Jehovah as a sacrifice of *atone-*

[9] Comp. *Ewald*, Geschichte, I. 433, 434 (the story teaches "dass Jahveh das Menschenopfer nicht wolle; dass das Gegentheil einmal denkbar, also versuchbar war, ist gewiss"); *Winer*, Real-Wört. I. 13; *Bertheau*, Zur Gesch. der Israeliten, p. 224 (who, however, leaves the path of historical conception by attributing the command to a "Trübung von Abraham's Gottesbewusstsein"); *Kurtz*, Geschichte des Alten Bundes, § 65 (pp. 203—213), and in Herzog's Real-Encycl. I. 74—76 (though of course estimating the matter from his usual dogmatic point of view); *Knobel* on Genes. XXII. pp. 172, 173. Unsatisfactory are Hengstenberg's remarks on the subject (Auth. des Pent. II. 139 *sqq.*): "God is no man that He should repent"; therefore, after having once given the command of the sacrifice (ver. 2), He could later not retract it (ver. 12); or Abraham's trial lay merely in the *ambiguity* of the command (comp. *Lange*, Leben Jesu, I. 120; Posit. Dogmat. pp. 823 *sqq.*); or that a trial like Abraham's is possible only in a state of childlike and undeveloped faith — all which views are against the tenour of the narrative; comp. also *F. D. Maurice*, The Doctrine of Sacrifice, Serm. III; *Colenso*, Abraham's Sacrifice, pp. 5—7.

[10] Exod. IV. 24—26.

[11] *Ghillany*, l. c. pp. 683—687.

[12] See Comm. on Exod. p. 81.

[13] Exod. XXXII. 26—29.

[14] L. c. pp. 687—694.

[15] Lev. X. 1, 2. [16] L. c. pp. 694—699.

[17] Num. XIV. 36—38.

[18] L. c. pp. 699—705.

[19] Num. XXV. 3—6.

*ment.*[1] It is not impossible that "the hanging before the sun"[2] of victims was long employed by the Israelites, as it was employed by other nations, in expiatory offerings; of which view a remarkable confirmation is preserved in the history of David;[3] but it must be understood that the men were hung to the *sun*, and not to Jehovah; for the command "hang them up before the Lord (ליהוה) against the sun",[4] means that they were to die on the cross, because they had sinned against God. The author of the narrative in Numbers evidently retained the usual phrase,[5] without connecting with it the same meaning, since it unforcedly admits of another and purer conception; he would assuredly have shunned it, had he feared that his readers might understand it in a heathen sense. — The statements that Aaron died on mount Hor,[6] and Moses on mount Nebo, by the command of God,[7] are alleged to intimate that both Aaron and Moses offered themselves as holocausts for the atonement of the people, in imitation of a custom prevalent among various ancient tribes, whose high-priests, kings and generals, after having performed their offices for a certain period, sacrificed themselves voluntarily for the public weal.[8] — Joshua, after the defeat of his army, is asserted to have crucified the king of Ai as a propitiatory sacrifice to Jehovah or the sun,[9] simply because he made him a prisoner without killing him at once on the battle-field.[10] In the same manner, Samuel is contended to have, at Gilgal, offered to God Agag, the king of the Amalekites;[11] but the "cutting in pieces before the Lord"[12] does not imply a sacrifice in the stricter sense; the Amalekites were by Divine command to be extirpated;[13] hence, their king was "killed before Jehovah", that is, probably before the Ark of the Covenant, which accompanied Saul on his war-expeditions.[14] The act of Samuel bears therefore chiefly a political character, and was dictated by that unsparing mercilessness from which warfare was, in those times, inseparable.[15] — When Saul was ready to kill his son Jonathan, since the oracle had pointed him out as the cause of the Divine displeasure, the people opposed the king's intention with vehemence, and "rescued Jonathan that he did not die":[16] these words have been understood to intimate that another man was sacrificed *instead* of Jonathan;[17] but though the Hebrew term (פדה) signifies "to redeem",[18] it means as frequently "to deliver" or "to release."[19] — When David intended to bring the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem, Uzzah who touched it was killed by Jehovah, to David's deepest grief;[20] this is supposed to involve the fact that Uzzah was immolated to Jehovah as an expiatory

[1] L. c. pp. 705—708; *Vatke*, Theol. des A. T. I. 355.

[2] הוקע אותם נגד השמש.

[3] 2 Sam. XXI. 1—10; see p. 391.

[4] Num. l. c. ver. 4.

[5] Comp. 2 Sam. XXI. 6.

[6] Num. XX. 22—28; XXXIII. 38.

[7] Deut. XXXII. 49, 50; XXXIV. 1—6; comp. Num. XXVII. 12 *sqq.*

[8] L. c. pp. 709—721; see *supra* p. 338 note 4.

[9] Josh. VIII. 23, 29.

[10] L. c. pp. 722—727.

[11] 1 Sam. XV. 33; see l. c. pp. 738—743; *Vatke*, l. c. p. 355.

[12] וישסף שמואל את־אגג לפני יהוה.

[13] 1 Sam. XV. 2, 3; comp. Exod. XVII. 14; Deut. VII. 2, 24.

[14] See p. 30 note 1.

[15] Comp. 2 Sam. XII. 31.

[16] 1 Sam. XIV. 45, ויפדו העם את־יונתן ולא־מת.

[17] *Ewald*, Gesch. II. p. 483.

[18] Exod. XIII. 13, 15; XXXIV. 20; Lev. XIX. 20; Num. XVIII. 15—17; etc.

[19] Deut. IX. 26; 2 Sam. IV. 9; 1 Ki. I. 29; Isai. XXIX. 22; Job V. 20; XXIII. 28; Ps. LV. 19; etc. etc.

[20] 2 Sam. VI. 5—8.

offering, as many other Israelites were slain in a kindred spirit at various stages of the procession.[21] — David killed two thirds of the captive Moabites,[22] and acted similarly, though more cruelly, towards the subjugated Ammonites:[23] all these *slaughtered enemies* are supposed to have been intended for a sacrifice to Jehovah.[24] — The statement that Elijah slew the priests of Baal at the brook Kishon,[25] and that Josiah killed all "the priests of the high places" on their altars,[26] are averred to mean that the priests were offered as a sacrifice to Jehovah,[27] whereas the spirit of the narratives concerning Elijah and Josiah is that of a pure monotheism; the priests were, in the former case, obviously put to death on account of their merciless massacre of the Hebrew prophets, which act may indeed, in a certain sense, be considered as a glorification of God; if Elijah had intended "to sacrifice" the priests of Baal, he would have done so, not at the brook Kishon, but on the altar of Jehovah which he had erected, and on which the miracle of the heavenly fire had just been wrought before the eyes of the assembled people. — The account that the kings Ahab and Manasseh burnt their sons,[28] is asserted to signify that they sacrificed them to Jehovah,[29] simply because the text does not mention the name of a deity, whereas, in the one instance, the Bible adds immediately, "according to the abominations of the heathen whom the Lord cast out from before the children of Israel"; and Manasseh is described as an inveterate idolator, who cancelled the religious reforms of his pious father.[30] But more extraordinary even than all these hazardous conceits is the following insinuation which can hardly be termed otherwise than malicious and mischievous. It is indeed conceded that the Pentateuch "energetically opposes the abomination of human sacrifices"; but it is added — on what authority we cannot conceive — that the Pentateuch "was not by all Hebrews held to be binding; and that, besides, the Jews have secret traditions, professedly handed down from Moses, which may be supposed to refer to and to recommend the primeval custom of human sacrifices, and to enjoin at least the periodical slaughtering of human victims";[31] then allusion is made to the absurd fable, sufficiently refuted by Josephus,[32] of a Greek captive said to have been found by Antiochus Epiphanes in the Temple, and to have been destined as a sacrifice by the Jews, that, by eating his entrails, they might be confirmed in their hatred against the Greeks; and it is lightly observed, "what Josephus remarks in disparagement of this account, has little weight; he himself was possibly unaware of this secret law; and so it must be remembered in all recent accusations that not all the Jews are ac-

[21] L. c. p. 767—770.

[22] 2 Sam. VIII. 1, 2.

[23] 2 Sam. XII. 31. Even if the reading והעביר אותם במלכן, and not the Keri בַּמַּלְבֵּן, were correct, the sense of the passage would not be "he caused them to pass through their statues of Moloch", as the feminine suffix cannot follow after the masculine pronoun אותם. But בַּמַּלְבֵּן is probably the genuine reading, and the words signify "and he made them pass through (or put them into) the brickkiln" (Engl. Vers.); and so render nearly all the ancient translations (Sept. καὶ περιήγαγεν αὐτοὺς διὰ τοῦ πλινθίου; Vulg. et traduxit in typolaterum; Luther, und verbrannte sie in Ziegelöfen; etc.).

[24] L. c. pp. 770, 771.

[25] וישחטם, 1 Ki. XVIII. 40.

[26] ויזבח, 2 Ki. XXIII. 20.

[27] L. c. pp. 784—786, 789.

[28] 2 Ki. XVI. 3; XXI. 6.

[29] L. c. p. 788; comp. p. 783.

[30] 2 Ki. XXI. 2—9.

[31] L. c. p. 794

[32] Contra Ap. II. 8.

quainted with the custom, but that it is possibly kept up among few only, as a most dangerous tradition."[1] Thus a wild imagination runs riot with unscrupulous accusers, and carries them beyond the pale of historical research into the sphere of heedless and iniquitous conjecture, into which it would be unprofitable to follow them, even if we could hope to learn how they, in our modern age, have arrived at the knowledge of startling facts which remained a secret to the Jewish priest Josephus at the time of the Temple.

## XXVI. CONCLUSIONS AND GENERAL REMARKS ON THE THEOLOGY OF THE PAST AND THE FUTURE.

It would be a matter of regret to us if the preceding observations, misleading attentive and impartial readers, were understood by them to imply an unqualified vindication of the doctrines of the Hebrew prophets and the Pentateuch. Such an inference would be equally opposed to the tenour of our deductions and to truth. It has been our object fairly to contrast the purer views and precepts of a more enlightened class among the Hebrews with the idolatrous habits preserved by the bulk of the nation from the earliest to the latest time. But though we could not but represent the former as immeasurably superior, we have as yet found no occasion for pronouncing an opinion on their absolute truth. We now propose to enter upon this enquiry, which we regard as the chief object of this treatise, and to which all anterior sections were meant to be preparatory. We shall, at present, not enlarge upon the question of the date and age of the Pentateuch, though it might be almost conclusively settled from the facts already adduced;[2] but leaving this momentous point for future and special discussion, we shall confine ourselves to an examination of the theology of the Pentateuch and of those historians and prophets, whose writings embody the conceptions of the most advanced of the nation. It has too long been customary, even for liberal and acute critics, merely to comment on the *facts* contained in the Bible, and to weigh the degree of reliability they merit, while the *ideas* and the *teaching* have either been declared final for all times, or have at least been tacitly assumed as unimpeachable. The time, however, has arrived for abandoning this questionable course, for determining by a searching and calm enquiry the positive value of the notions current in the Scriptures, and for ascertaining by a candid estimate, how far they satisfy the modern mind and correspond with the philosophical and scientific results of the last centuries. This task will either show the entire sufficiency of the Bible for all our spiritual needs; or, if it lead to a different conclusion, it will prove an essential preliminary to constructing a system

[1] L. c. p. 546. [2] Comp. Sectt. III, XV, XXIII.

of theology that shall be in harmony with our general modes and habits of thought, accord with the achievements of science and with the ordinary tenour of modern life, and which shall thus beneficently influence our conduct and progress.

In our age, we are accustomed to look upon every occurrence as the natural and inevitable consequence of human action, or of some other circumstance with which it is connected. We attempt to trace effects to adequate causes. Unchangeable laws regulate the life of individuals and nations, and prescribe the course to universal history. The gradual development of mankind is the necessary result of the abilities, energies, and passions inherent in men. The happiness of the individual depends, in a great measure, on his mental and physical organisation; it is the ordinary concomitant of healthful vigour of body and mind, as wretchedness is the usual fate of weakness and morbidness. Prosperity is the combined product of personal exertion and favourable opportunity. Man is, therefore, in some respects, a free agent, but in a much higher degree, he is a creature of necessity. The works which he produces result from the talents he possesses, and from the activity he is able or willing to display. They are prompted by that internal impulse which is inseparable from his idiosyncrasy. He is capable of improvement and advancement, as he is liable to retrogression and decline. He labours as his powers bid him; he succeeds according to the measure of his gifts or of his usefulness; and he finds his chief reward in the consciousness of having zealously cultivated and honestly employed his faculties.

If, with these notions which underlie our whole life, we turn to the Scriptures, we are at once struck by a different sphere of thought, a strange and unfamiliar spirit. Forced away from the circle of ideas which guide us in our daily pursuits and reflections, we are abruptly transferred to conceptions and views, which indeed occasionally touch a sympathetic chord, whether from their poetical and imaginative beauty or from the ineffaceable impressions of childhood, but which our maturer manhood finds it impossible to acknowledge and to adopt. The affection for a venerable tradition that may linger in our hearts, at last yields to the severer truths dictated by our intellects.

### 1. The Creation.

The Scriptures teach that the universe and all it contains, were called into existence in six days, by God's direct command. This Biblical cosmogony[3] is grand and sublime, but it is erroneous and

[3] Gen. I. 1—II. 4; it is unnecessary here to refer to the second account (Gen. II. 5—24), which is less distinct and impressive, and partly mythical

unscientific; it disregards those attributes of matter which, by their own inherent power, of necessity produce the changes and combinations that constitute the cosmos; therefore, it arbitrarily compresses within the compass of a few days what was effected by the gradual operation of myriads of milleniums, and it transforms into acts of personal agency what we are wont to regard as the result of clear, constant, and unchangeable laws.[1]

### 2. Miracles.

The same personal interference continues in Biblical *history*. For special ends, the eternal course of nature is altered, and *miracles* are performed. Yet the idea of miracles is absolutely opposed to our notions of the universe, as derived from a patient cultivation of the natural and historical sciences. It gains ground whenever men, unable to understand their position as a subordinate though organic part of mankind, consider themselves or their community as the chief end of creation and general government.[2] For it rests virtually on the assumption that nature pays special regard to the deeds and destinies of individuals or single nations, and bestows aid and sympathy, or displays resistance and enmity, according to the pleasure of a ruling power, whereas her whole economy is one and indivisible, embracing the universe, and working in majestic impartiality for all worlds alike. Thus Spinoza might justly use *miracles* and *ignorance* as convertible terms,[3] and he adds the weighty words fraught with significant meaning, "I believe the principal difference between religion and superstition to be this that the former is founded upon wisdom, the latter upon ignorance; and I am convinced that herein lies the reason why the Christians are

---

(vers. 8—17) and partly allegorical (vers. 21—24); see Comm. on Gen. pp. 83 *sqq.*

[1] See the Treatise in Comm. on Genes. pp. 1—52; on the imperfect astronomical notions of the Bible, see ibid. pp. 19—28; and on the early interpretations of the "Mosaic" cosmogony and the manner in which they were successively modified in accordance with the discoveries of astronomy and the study of geology, see *W. E. H. Lecky*, History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe, I. pp. 1—150.

[2] Comp. *Spinoza*, Tractatus theologico-politicus, VI. 4, 5, in hoc usque tempus miracula fingere non cessaverunt, ut ipsi Deo dilectiores reliquis causaque finalis, propter quam Deus omnia creavit et continue dirigit, crederentur. Quid sibi vulgi stultitia non arrogat, quod nec de Deo nec de natura ullum sanum habet conceptum etc.; § 34, utpote qui certe sciunt, Deum naturam dirigere, prout ejus leges universales, non autem prout humanae naturae particulares leges exigunt, adeoque Deum non solius humani generis sed totius naturae rationem habere.

[3] Epist. XXI, ad miracula quod attinet, mihi contra persuasum est, divinae revelationis certitudinem sola doctrinae sapientia, non autem miraculis, hoc est, ignorantia adstrui posse.

distinguished from other men not by an honourable life nor by love nor the other fruits of the holy ghost, but merely by an opinion; because, like all the rest, they fortify themselves only by miracles, that is by ignorance, which is the fountain of all wickedness, and thus convert faith, however true, into superstition."[4] How few are ready to admit the truth of these words even nearly two centuries after they were written! Ancient nations felt strongly the influence of the divine in nature; but as they had explored the latter but imperfectly, all remarkable or unusual phaenomena appeared to them as direct manifestations of the deity, or as miracles, which inspired them alike with terrifying awe and sublime veneration; and these feelings were the more powerful, the more vividly and freshly their minds were affected by all impressions and the more consistently they were accustomed to develop and to apply every new and great idea. The assumption to which we have alluded gave rise to the Roman fictions of *prodigia* or *portenta*, by which the gods were believed to announce impending calamities or important events[5] — the sky appearing in a blaze of fire[6] or flaming torches seen in the air;[7] spears or hands burning but not consumed;[8] men of fire attacking and fighting with each other;[9] flesh or worms, earth, stones or blood raining from heaven;[10] rivers flowing in blood;[11] human monstrosities born;[12] animals speaking,[13] mules

[4] Nempe, quia, ut omnes, solis miraculis, hoc est ignorantia, quae omnis malitiae fons est, se defendunt; atque adeo fidem, licet veram, in superstitionem vertunt; comp. also Epist. XXIII, miracula et ignorantiam pro aequipollentibus sumpsi, quia ii, qui Dei existentiam et religionem miraculis adstruere conantur, rem obsuram per aliam magis obscuram, et quam maxime ignorant, ostendere volunt etc.; and especially Tract. theolog. politicus, cap. VI, De miraculis.

[5] Comp. *Spinoza*, Tract. theol. polit. Praef. § 3, Si quid porro insolitum magna cum admiratione vident, id prodigium esse credunt, quod deorum aut summi numinis iram indicat, quodque adeo hostiis et votis non piare, nefas habent homines superstitioni obnoxii et religioni adversi; eumque ad modum infinita fingunt, et quasi tota natura cum ipsis insaniret, eandem miris modis interpretantur.

[6] *Liv.* III. 10.

[7] *Liv.* XLIII. 13.

[8] *Liv.* l. c.; comp. *Val. Max.* I. viii. 11.

[9] *Plut.* Caes. 63.

[10] *Liv.* III. 10; XXXV. 21; XXXVII. 3; XLIII. 13; *Plin.* H. N. II. 56 or 57.

[11] *Liv.* XXIV. 44.

[12] *Lucan*, Phars. I. 562 (Monstrosique hominum partus numeroque modoque Membrorum etc.); Liv. XXXV. 21 (puerum natum unimanum).

[13] *Lucan*, Phars. I. 561 (Tunc pecudum faciles humana ad murmura linguae); *Liv.* III. 10 (bovem locutam, cui rei priore anno fides non fuerat, creditum); XXXV. 21 (bovem locutum, ROMA CAVE TIBI ... bovem cum cura servari alique haruspices jusserunt); XLIII. 13; *Plin.* Hist. Nat. VIII. 40 or 63 (canem locutum in prodigiis ... et serpentem latrasse), 45 or 70 fin. (est frequens in prodigiis priscorum bovem locutum, quo nuntiato senatum sub divo haberi solitum).

bringing forth young,[1] or wonderful animals, as a snake with the mane of a horse, starting up;[2] trees springing from the soil full-grown,[3] or cut stems suddenly rising to an unusual height;[4] rocks moving of themselves;[5] birds in anguish seeking refuge in private or public buildings; marvellous or alarming sights and sounds produced by delusion of the senses;[6] or images of gods speaking, or shedding tears continuously.[7] The Biblical miracles are founded on similar notions. Heavenly bodies are said to have been arrested in their course by the behest of God;[8] yet we know that such contingency would be inevitably followed by a complete derangement of the sidereal systems, and by incalculable ruin of thousands of worlds. Occasionally even the Bible shows a gleam of the conviction of nature's immutable stability. "He has established the heavens for ever and ever; He gave a law and they trespass it not";[9] "He said to the sea, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed";[10] "I have placed the sand for the boundary of the sea by an eternal law, that it cannot pass it; and though its waves rage, they cannot prevail";[11] but such incidental admissions do not materially influence the spirit and tenour of the narratives. According to Biblical accounts, the Divine will constantly changed the intrinsic properties of things which constitute their very character and essence. But if we read that the water of the Nile was converted into blood,[12] and ordinary water was changed into wine, as at the marriage of Cana;[13] that the waves of the Red Sea were divided and stood upright like a wall,[14]

---

[1] *Liv.* XXXVII. 3; *Plin.* H. N. VIII. 44 or 69.

[2] *Liv.* XLIII. 13; comp. XXXV. 21 (capram sex hoedos uno foetu edidisse); *Plin.* H. N. VII. 3; X. 63 or 83; see also *Val. Max.* I. viii. 2.

[3] *Liv.* XLIII. 13.

[4] *Plin.* H. N. XVI. 32 or 57.

[5] *Plin.* H. N. XXXVI. 18 or 30.

[6] *Lucan*, Phars. I. 568—570 (Compositis plenae gemuerunt ossibus urnae; Tunc fragor armorum magnaeque per avia voces Auditae nemorum, et venientes comminus umbrae); *Val. Max.* I. viii. 1, 2, 5, 6, 8; *Liv.* XXIV. 44.

[7] *Liv.* XLIII. 13 (Cumis in arce Apollo triduum ac tres noctes lacrimavit); comp. *Cic.* De Div. I. 42; In Verr. Act. II. lib. IV. 49; *Plin.* H. N. XI. 37; *Val. Max.* I. viii. 3, 4; *Lucian*, Dea Syr. c. 10 ("In Hierapolis, many miracles occur; the gods appear there to men quite manifestly, their images perspire and move, and often loud sounds are heard in the temple after it has been closed"); *Vopiscus*, Aurelian, cc. 4, 5.

[8] Josh. X. 12—14; comp. Isai. XXXVIII. 8. As a parallel to Joshua's command comp. *Hom.* Od. XXIII. 243—245, *Νύκτα μὲν ἐν περάτῃ δολιχὴν σχέθεν, Ἠῶ δ' αὖτε Ῥύσατ' ἐπ' Ὠκεανῷ χρυσόθρονον κτλ.*

[9] Ps. CXLVIII. 6.

[10] Job. XXXVIII. 11.

[11] Jer. VI. 22; comp. Eccl. I. 10; III. 14.

[12] Ex. IV. 9; VII. 17—20.

[13] John II. 1—11; IV. 46; comp. *Val. Max.* I. viii. 18 exter.

[14] Josephus already (Ant. II. xvi. 5) pointed out the analogy extensively credited in antiquity of the Pamphylian

and the floods of the Jordan, struck by Elijah's mantle, opened a dry path;[15] that an axe, which had sunk to the bottom of the Jordan, rose to its surface by Elijah's will and swam there,[16] and that Christ walked on the water of the lake Genesareth;[17] that the men of Sodom or Bar-Jesus (Elymas) turned suddenly blind,[18] and blind men recovered their sight as suddenly;[19] that a staff became a serpent and a serpent a staff, a healthy hand was at once made leprous, and a leprous hand healthy;[20] that the earth opened its womb to engulf alive a number of offenders,[21] or the dead were revived or raised alive from the grave;[22] that Moses was forty days on Mount Sinai without requiring any food whatever,[23] or that a limited supply of flour and wine was practically unlimited and sufficed for the household of the widow of Zarephath a considerable time;[24] that every vessel which a prophet's wife could possibly procure, filled itself by Elisha's command with oil;[25] that twenty loaves of barley proved more than abundant for a hundred men,[26] or 4,000 men, beside women and children, were satisfied by seven loaves and a few little fishes, and left over seven baskets full of broken pieces;[27] that a fig-tree, covered with leaves and expected to bear fruit, instantaneously withered away;[28] that the ass of Balaam spoke,[29] a raven provided Elijah regularly with bread and meat,[30] and a whale preserved Jonah in its womb three days and three nights, and then threw him unhurt on the dry land:[31] if we read all this, we might be led to the perplexing belief that there is nothing stable and fixed in nature, were we not taught by science to regard undeviating uniformity as nature's

---

sea retreating when Alexander the Great marched against the Persians (comp. *Strab.* XIV. iii. 9, p. 666; *Arrian*, I. 26; *Appian*, Bell. Civ. II. 149; see, however, *Plut.* Alex. 17), and adds, περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων ὡς ἑκάστῳ δοκεῖ διαλαμβανέτω; comp. *Spinoza*, Tract. theol. polit. VI. 72.

15 2 Ki. II. 8, 14.

16 2 Ki. VI. 6.

17 Mark VI. 48, 49.

18 Genes. XIX. 11; Acts XIII. 6—11.

19 Matth. IX. 28—30; XX. 32—34.

20 Exod. IV. 2, 7; comp. 2 Ki. V. 27; Luke XVII. 12—14; Matth. VIII. 2, 3; see also IX. 20—22 (the woman who had an issue of blood for twelve years was instantly healed by touching the garment of Christ).

21 Num. XVI. 30—33; comp. *Apollod.* III. ii. 2 (εὐξάμενος δὲ ὑπὸ χάσματος ἐκρύβη).

22 John XI. 1—44 (on the resurrection of Lazarus); Matth. X. 18, 24, 25; comp. 1 Ki. XVII, 17—22; Acts IX. 40; see esp. Matth. XI. 5 (the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up).

23 Exod. XXXIV. 28; comp. Matth. IV. 1, 2; Luke IV. 2.

24 1 Ki. XVII. 14—16.

25 2 Ki. IV. 3—6.

26 2 Ki. IV. 42—44.

27 Matth. XV. 32—38; comp. Mark VI. 38—44, where the numbers are 5000 men, 5 loaves, 2 fishes, and 12 baskets.

28 Matth. XXI. 19.

29 Comp. *supra* p. 419, note 13.

30 1 Ki. XVII. 4, 6; comp. the legend in XIX. 5—7.

31 Jon. II. 1, 11; comp. also Judg. VI. 36—40.

first principle. All reality is destroyed, and the things, deprived of their clearly defined character, lose their intrinsic value and absolute existence. "The miracle changes the serious code of nature into a merry book of fairy-tales; but for this reason, miracle itself deserves to be ranked no higher than a fairy-tale."[1] Disdaining, like fancy to which it is largely indebted,[2] the fetters of necessity, it capriciously confounds the qualities of matter, combines what is naturally incompatible and disjoins what is inseparable. Every miracle "paralyses reason";[3] for it checks the specific work of the latter, which consists in searching for laws and causes, and, by depriving it of the safe support of experience, renders it valueless even for pointing out the path of practical duty. The miracle attempts to sway nature, but not, like reason, by penetrating into its organism, but by misusing it for arbitrary ends; unrestrained by any limit and unshackled by any condition, it appears infinite and inexhaustible in power;[4] exercising an absolute rule over matter, and reminding man of his own inborn yearning, it is by unreflecting generations easily mistaken as divine. Hence the East is the home of miracles; because the East is most apt to confound fancy and reflection: these two faculties have indeed abstraction as a common element; but fancy sets at naught or renounces reality, while reflection judiciously preserves but spiritualizes it.

It is not only useless but objectionable to reduce the miracles by ingenious and strained interpretations, to the least possible number, or to explain them away altogether, by representing them merely as ordinary occurrences told in a marvellous or imaginative form. This has been done, among others, by Spinoza;[5] he asserted that the Bible contains nothing that is opposed to the rules of nature,[6] and he was thus

[1] *Feuerbach*, Sämmtliche Werke, I. p. 8; instances of miracles among the Greeks and Romans, see ibid. vol. IX. (Ursprung der Götter), pp. 259—263; comp. also *De Wette*, Dogmatik, II. § 24 a ("the common notion of miracles is contradictory in itself") and note *d*.

[2] "Imagination is much akin to miracle-loving faith", observes Bacon.

[3] *Kant*, Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, 2nd edit. pp. 120, 123.

[4] Aptly Plutarch observes, "What is in accordance with nature is regulated and nicely defined, because nature is order or its manifestation; but disorder . . . cannot be counted or calculated, and what is at variance with nature is therefore indefinite and unlimited" (*Sympos.* VIII. ix. 3).

[5] Tract. theol. polit. VI. 39—51, e. g. Quare non dubium est, quin omnia quae in Scriptura narrantur, naturaliter contigerint, et tamen ad Deum referuntur, quia Scripturae non est, res per causas naturales docere, sed tantum eas res narrare, quae imaginationem late occupant, idque eo methodo et stylo, qui melius inservit ad res magis admirandum, et consequenter ad devotionem in animis vulgi inprimendam (§ 44; comp. § 49).

[6] L. c. §§ 52, 64, 69, 70; Praef. § 24; yet in VII. 9 he remarks that "the Scrip-

necessarily misled to explain, for instance, the prolonged day in Joshua's time by the supposition of a large quantity of ice happening to be in the upper region of the air,[7] and causing an unusually strong refraction of the solar rays,[8] and to propound the vague and untenable opinion that all Biblical accounts found to be in opposition to the laws of nature are "either poetical metaphors, or are related according to the opinions and prejudices of the writer,[9] and have been inserted in the Scriptures by sacrilegious hands"[10] — principles which manifestly deprive the narratives of Scripture of all definite meaning and value. Equally questionable is the attempt at separating the "end and essence" of the revelations from the accessory notions associated with them, and of insisting upon the truth of the former, while relinquishing that of the latter,[11] an attempt which would open the floodgates to every variety of arbitrary distinction. Yet the same views have been adopted by later writers, and among them by Reimarus, the famous "fragmentist" of Wolfenbüttel, who by venturing "natural explanations" of what the authors of the Bible manifestly meant to describe as supernatural, was carried away to the most curious fancies, as for instance, that the thunder which accompanied the revelation on Mount Sinai was possibly produced by the sudden explosion of "a sort of gunpowder", while Moses communicated with Joshua, who was in the camp, by means of a speaking-trumpet.[12]

This observation has a wider scope still. It must create the utmost perplexity, if the results of philosophical thought are by strained expositions grafted upon the Scriptures, in the vain hope thereby to save the authority of the latter; thus Spinoza justly maintains that the ceremonies of the Old Testament contribute nothing to virtue or happiness, and that they therefore can form no part of a Divine Law;[13] but it is idle to assert that this is the view of the Old Testament itself, which enjoins moral and civil laws, religious doctrines, and ceremonies as equally binding and equally irrevocable; the attempt to prove the reverse is necessarily futile and unavailing.[14] Yet Spinoza severely denounces, in theory, the method which he himself repeatedly follows;

---

tures treat very frequently of things which cannot be deduced from principles of natural intelligence."

[7] Comp. Josh. X. 11.

[8] *Spinoza*, l. c. II. 27.

[9] Vel poetice dicta sunt, vel secundum scriptoris opiniones et praejudicia relata. [10] Ibid. §§ 50, 51; comp. 53—58, 59—63; VII. 3; VIII. 2; X. 28 (illas fabulas ab aliquo nugatore adjectas fuisse).

[11] L. c. II. 53—57, concludimus itaque, nos prophetis nihil aliud teneri credere praeter id quod finis et substantia est revelationis; in reliquis prout unicuique libet liberum est credere.

[12] See *D. F. Strauss*, Hermann Samuel Reimarus und seine Schutzschrift für vernünftige Verehrer Gottes, p. 108, and *passim*.

[13] Tract. theol. pol. V. 2, 31.

[14] L. c. §§ 4 *sqq*.

he inveighs especially against Maimonides, and justly so, for advocating that method[1], which he describes as "noxious, useless, and absurd";[2] he is equally decided in censuring forced reconciliations of texts manifestly at variance with each other;[3] he declares and proves that Scripture ought neither to be subordinated to theological convictions, nor theological convictions to Scripture, but that both ought to be kept apart in so far as theology is the result of independent reasoning;[4] but such is the bane of vagueness, that in a later section he almost expresses the opposite opinion, "Yet we do not desire to accuse those men of impiety because they accommodate the words of Scripture to their individual conclusions; for as Scripture was once itself adapted (by its authors) to the capacity of the people, thus everyone is permitted to adapt it to his own views, if he sees that he thus is able to obey God, with the fuller consent of his conscience, in all matters that concern justice and love."[5] Who does not see that such principle, or rather such absence of principle, renders all religious knowledge uncertain and fluctuating, and renounces beforehand all absolute truth?

It is equally unavailing to confine miracles to certain periods; Catholicism, in this respect more in accordance with the spirit of the Bible than Protestantism, which attempts an unsuccessful compromise between belief and reason, extends their operation beyond the limits of tradition, and supposes their constant and living manifestation.[6] For

---

[1] Mor. Nev. II. 25.

[2] L. c. VII. 87; comp. §§ 75—87; VIII. 27 (quid cum illis agas qui nihil vident nisi quod lubet? Quid, inquam, hoc aliud est quam ipsam Scripturam negare et novam ex proprio cerebro cudere?); X. 33—36; *Kant*, l. c. pp. 159—161 ("the moral philosophers among the Greeks and Romans understood how to interpret the grossest polytheism merely as symbolical manifestations of the one divine being"); comp. also Comm. on Genes. p. 45.

[3] L. c. X. 33—36, 42, nihil aliud faciunt quam Bibliorum scriptores contemptui exponere . . . imo nihil aliud faciunt quam Scripturae perspicuitatem obscurare etc.; ostendi me hac ratione Scripturae consulere ne ejus loca clara et pura mendosis accomodentur et corrumpantur.

[4] L. c. XV. 1 *sqq.*, 21.

[5] L. c. XIV. 3; comp. §§ 32, 33.

[6] The bodies of the saints, their bones (comp. 2 Ki. XIII. 21), the supposed remnants of their garments (comp. 2 Ki. II. 8, 14; Acts XIX. 12), incessantly work miracles; the holy scapulary of the Carmelites wards off cannon-balls, or makes them to glide innocuously from the body, etc.; comp. also *Kant*, l. c. pp. 118 *sqq.*, who justly remarks that the acknowledgment of the possibility of wonders would expose the civil and political government of commonwealths to the most dangerous uncertainty and confusion. Yet treatises are written in our very days to prove that "miracles are not only possible but necessary" (Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche, fortgeführt von Delitzsch und Guericke, 1866), and that they are in accordance with reason.

the Biblical narrative contains not simply miracles, but is throughout framed in a miraculous spirit. It is entirely compiled on the assumption of a perpetual and immediate intervention of God in the natural course of events. That extraordinary "offering of jealousy", on which we have commented above,[7] and which is manifestly an ordeal involving the regular and miraculous interference of God, is alone sufficient to point out the wide chasm which separates the Biblical from the scientific notions beyond all possibility of agreement. Wonders are freely employed to remove difficulties, even where these might have been overcome by natural agencies. Whether Noah and his family are alone rescued amidst the universal destruction of all living creatures, or Lot is by special messengers of God saved from the calamities which overthrow his entire district; whether Pharaoh is, by unparalleled afflictions, forced to release the Hebrews, or the persons and the property of the latter remain untouched when apalling misfortunes befall the land; whether God personally guides and protects the patriarchs, or at once afflicts the women of Abimelech's household with barrenness because that king takes Sarah into his house;[8] whether He gives to the myriads of Israelites wandering in the desert food and water in abundance for forty years, or makes the Syrian army hear a noise of vast numbers of horses and chariots to delude them into the belief of large hosts approaching, in consequence of which they flee panic-stricken, leaving their whole camp behind them[9] — these and all the numerous traits of a similar kind defy all laws both of reason and experience, and substitute phantasmagoric playfulness for sober historiography to such a degree that even the attempt at harmonizing them with scientific results bespeaks the slothfulness of a mind equally unable to form an independent estimate of the antiquated past, and to keep pace with the growth of modern inquiry.[10] "By the direction of God", observes Spinoza,[11] "I understand the fixed and immutable order of nature or the concatenation of natural things. The general laws of nature, by which everything happens and is determined, are nothing but the eternal decrees of God, which ever involve eternal truth and necessity. Therefore, whether we say that everything happens according to the laws of nature, or that everything is ordained by the will and direction of God,

---

[7] Sect. XVI.

[8] Gen. XX. 17, 18.

[9] 2 Ki. VII. 6, 7; comp. vers. 1, 16; see *Liv.* XXIV. 44, "other illusions of the eyes and ears were credited as realities, an appearance as of ships had been seen in the river at Taracina, when there was none there."

[10] Comp. *W. E. H. Lecky*, History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe, I. pp. 151—205, 306—314, 322.

[11] Tract. theol. polit. III. 7, 8; comp. also § 9; IV. 10.

we say the same thing." These views, whether they be avowed or not, rule our lives and our thoughts. They must form the starting point of all future theories of philosophy or theology. Sometimes indeed the Bible records natural facts in connection with miracles; for instance, Moses threw a certain wood which God had shown him into the bitter waters of Marah, which then became drinkable,[1] and similarly Elisha rendered salubrious for ever a deleterious spring of water while casting into it a quantity of salt;[2] Elisha leaned repeatedly over the dead boy, till the latter grew warm and returned to life;[3] the Syrian general Naaman was healed from leprosy after bathing seven times in the Jordan;[4] and the ten plagues of Egypt are all based on natural phenomena of almost regular occurrence in that country:[5] but these facts, though affording *to us* valuable hints and explanations, were by the Biblical narrators not meant to remove the miraculous character of the events; they prove, on the contrary, that even where a natural explanation offered itself, and was suggested by tradition, it was rejected by miracle-loving generations, and set aside in favour of the assumption of extraordinary agencies. Yet, what natural basis can be discovered for the legends that Miriam became suddenly "leprous like snow" because she had spoken slightingly of Moses,[6] that a corpse which touched the bones of Elisha, became alive and rose from the grave,[7] or that diseases were cured, physical defects removed, and evil spirits expelled by touching the hand or the garment of Christ, or "an handkerchief or apron" of the apostle Paul?[8] that a large number of fiery horses and chariots appeared to rescue Elisha from his pursuers?[9] that fire came out of a rock by striking it with a staff, and consumed the meat and the cakes placed thereon by Gideon as an offering?[10] that the sea raged because it bore the guilty Jonah, and became tranquil as soon as the latter was removed from the ship?[11]

And yet the Bible itself lowers considerably the force and effect of miracles by attributing the power of performing them not only to Hebrews worshipping foreign gods,[12] and to heathens controlled by the might of Jehovah, as in the instance of Balaam, but to idolators who work in opposition to Jehovah himself, as the magicians of Egypt.[13]

---

1 Exod. XV. 25.

2 2 Ki. II. 21, 22; comp. IV. 38—41.

3 2 Ki. IV. 34, 35; comp. also VI. 6; II. 11; IV. 14—17; VI. 12.

4 2 Ki. V. 1—14.

5 See Comm. on Exod. pp. 117 *sqq.* and the notes on the plagues.

6 Num. XII. 10.

7 2 Ki. XIII. 21.

8 Matth. VIII. 13, 15; IX. 20—22; Mark VI. 55, 56; VII. 32—35; Acts XIX. 12.

9 2 Ki. VI. 17; com . II. 11.

10 Judg. VI. 20, 21.

11 Jon. I. 12—15.

12 Deut. XII. 2—6.

13 Exod. VII. 9—12, 22; VIII. 3; see, however, ver. 14.

The New Testament goes even farther; it supposes miracles to be performed by "false Christs and false prophets"[14] to such a degree "that if it were possible they might deceive the very elect";[15] the enemy of the Church, represented under the form of a beast rising out of the earth, "did great wonders, made fire come down from heaven, and thereby deceived many men";[16] and "the spirits of the devils", which betray the kings of the earth and of the whole world, work miracles.[17] Wonders, therefore, neither testify to the greatness of God,[18] nor to the purity or truth of doctrines. It is, moreover, extremely difficult to distinguish between a true and a false miracle; all criteria that have been fixed, are either indefinite or fallacious.[19]

The inference to be drawn from these facts is as decisive as it is significant. Can a gift that an idol is able to bestow, have any value or reality? Can those powers be supernatural which a Hebrew prophet shares with a priest of Baal?

Miracles are both impossible and incredible — impossible because against the established laws of the universe, and incredible because those set forth by tradition, are palpable inventions of unhistoric ages.

The belief in miracles may, in certain periods, not be without advantage and importance; it emanates from a spiritual elevation, perhaps from a moral impulse; it may serve to strengthen the religion of the heart and to sanction those doctrines which the mind recognises as true and eternal; it may thus prove a material aid to a genuine faith; but it can, at best, only be a means to that end; it loses its usefulness, when it loses the connection with the mind; it becomes injurious and dangerous and leads to mechanical ritualism or fanatic vehemence when it is isolated from the moral faculties; and engenders hypocrisy and falsehood when it ceases to be conceived in simplicity and childlike ingenuousness. According to the current and traditional view, miracles were wrought exclusively in the early times of deficient education and imperfect knowledge; they are no longer reported in the more enlightened epochs of progress and research. Why should they have so suddenly and so completely ceased? It is futile to reply that

---

[14] Matth. XXIV. 24; comp. 2 Thess. II. 9 (*οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία κατ' ἐνέργειαν τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις, καὶ τέρασιν ψεύδους*).

[15] Comp. Revel. XIX. 20.

[16] Revel. XIII. 13, 14.

[17] Revel. XVI. 14; comp., however, John III. 2 (no man can do these miracles except God be with him).

[18] Comp. *Spinoza*, Tract. theol. pol. VI. 16—38, where he proves, nos ex miraculis nec Dei essentiam nec existentiam nec providentiam posse intelligere, sed contra haec longe melius percipi ex fixo atque immutabili naturae ordine; see also II. 6.

[19] See, for inst., *Calmet*, Dict. de la Bible, sub Miracle.

they were performed only as long as they were necessary for the training of the human race; for miracles, by confounding and often insulting reason, and hence fostering superstition, especially magic, witchcraft and sorcery, to which they are akin,[1] far from promoting, tend to retard the education of mankind. They are valueless for our advancement, whether in religion or philosophy; for neither the one nor the other can be improved by phenomena which the human mind is unable to understand; those facts and ideas only can influence us which lie within the sphere of our common nature; "from an effect which surpasses the capacity of man, he cannot deduce intelligible truths, and those are silly who, if unable to understand a thing, have recourse to God; forsooth, a ridiculous mode of displaying ignorance."[2]

The notion of "rational wonders" which has been proposed, is preposterous; for all wonders are irrational;[3] they realise their character the more completely, the more irrational they are; for reason penetrates into the depth and essence of things, while the miracles play lightly on their surface. The *love of the miraculous*, innate in human nature, and strongest in imaginative or enthusiastic minds and in the early stages of development, is the parent of miracles; they germinate not in the quality of things but in the propensity of men; "believe you that I am able to do this?" Jesus asked the blind men who came to him to be cured, and "they said to him, Yea, Lord";[4] a leper appealed to him saying, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean", and Jesus said, "I will", and the leprosy was immediately removed;[5] miracles are desired and demanded when they are believed in; their origin lies neither in the sphere of metaphysics nor of theology; they can be truly explained only as psychological phenomena.[6] Mohammed was pressed

---

[1] Comp. Exod. VII. 9—12, 22; VIII. 3.

[2] *Spinoza*, Tract. theol. polit. VI. 21, 23, ex opere et absolute ex eo quod nostrum captum superat, nihil intelligere possumus; ii igitur plane nugantur, qui ubi rem ignorant, ad Dei voluntatem recurrunt; ridiculus sane modus ignorantiam profitendi.

[3] Spinoza (Tract. theol. polit. VI. 29) observes forcibly, Ex quibus de novo concludere possumus, miraculum sive contra naturam sive supra naturam merum esse absurdum; et propterea per miraculum in sacris literis nihil aliud posse intelligi, quam opus naturae, uti diximus, quod captum humanum superat aut superare creditur; and more pointedly still (§ 51), Quidquid enim contra naturam est, id contra rationem est, et quod contra rationem, id absurdum est, ac proinde etiam refutandum.

[4] Matth. IX. 28.

[5] Matth. VIII. 2, 3; comp. IX. 22 (*θάρσευ, θύγατερ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε*); XV. 28 (*ὦ γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις, γενηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις*).

[6] Spinoza (Tract. theol. polit. VI. 13) touches several essential points relative to miracles in the following words. "Ex his itaque, quod in natura nihil contingit, quod ex ejus legibus non sequitur, et quod ejus leges ad omnia, quae et ab ipso divino intellectu con-

on all sides to perform miracles in vindication of his alleged mission; the incessant requests of both friends and foes, justified by the precedents of the Old and New Testament, almost brought him to despair, and in vain he insisted, that the greatest miracles are the creation, the animal and vegetable kingdom, or heaven and sea.[7]

The untutored or youthful mind delights in uncommon and astounding mysteries, the manly intellect endeavours to reduce all uncommon and astounding mysteries to ordinary and intelligible laws. The one is, therefore, prepared to witness miracles before an occasion arises, the other refuses to acknowledge them even after they are supposed to have happened. The childlike believer feels his yearnings unsatisfied by the severe, impartial, and uniform rule of ever-balancing and all-embracing reason; the thoughtful philosopher disdains the insinuating flatteries of aspiring enthusiasm, of exceptional or providential protection, because he divines eternal harmony and order in the stern sameness of nature's working. The former, therefore, requires extraordinary marvels to be awed, since "the miracle is the dearest child of faith",[8] while the latter is impressed with a sense of sublimity by examining the common and daily operations of nature. Confiding apathy beholds in the affairs of life the inscrutable and desultory play of preternatural influences; energetic reason is restless to discover the connecting thread of cause and effect. Hence the former either disregards or reads to no purpose the book of the past, while the latter derives from it the most fruitful lessons for his guidance and training. The feeble-minded, conscious of his own helplessness, constantly tries to support it by some unexpected and unaccountable aid; the resolute man of action glories in his ability of maintaining his due place in the system of creation by his own energy and the legitimate exercise of his strength. And while the one is eager to be lifted, on the wings of fancy and of faith, immeasurably beyond his natural sphere, the other prefers laboriously to conquer, by the sword of thought and science, his proper domain as a rational being, and to desire no more, convinced that he is great only in the same degree as he is independent, and that his conquests are sure and inalienable when he obtains them by his own

---

cipiuntur, se extendunt, et quod denique natura fixum atque immutabilem ordinem servat, clarissime sequitur, nomen miraculi non nisi respective ad hominum opiniones posse intelligi, et nihil aliud significare, quam opus, cujus causam naturalem exemplo alterius rei solitae explicare non possumus, vel saltem ipse non potest, qui miraculum scribit et narrat."

[7] *Koran* XVI. 1 *sqq.*; LXXXVIII. *sqq.*

[8] *Goethe*, "Das Wunder ist des Glaubens liebstes Kind" (Faust, Part I, p. 34 ed. Cotta 1840, vol. XI); comp. also "Wer Wunder hofft, der stärke seinen Glauben" (Faust, Part II, p. 20, vol. XII).

efforts and the unrestrained power of his nature. The contrast, therefore, between the miracle-loving Scriptures and the productions of pragmatic history, is nothing less than the contrast between poetry and truth, between the hazy beauty of the morning-dawn and the clearness of the midday-sun, between the first creditable efforts of reflecting infancy and the safe conclusions of experienced manhood.

History rests on proofs and the internal evidence of facts; the Biblical narrative introduces elements lying beyond the test of ordinary examination, and often directly opposed to all experience, reason, and possibility. While, therefore, the one possesses objective truth, the other may be accepted or rejected according to the general principles adopted by individual readers.

The Scriptures habitually represent drought and famine, pestilence and earthquake, floods and every disaster of the elements, as the results of idolatry and wickedness; they make the cessation of these inflictions dependent on the people's return to God and virtue,[1] and hence speak, for instance, of "the ignominy of famine":[2] but the scourges of nature result from physical laws which, though they should never be fathomed entirely, certainly repudiate the notion of a direct influence of the moral upon the physical world. And with respect to the living creation, the conception of the Bible is so childlike, that it assumes the possibility of moral degeneracy in animals, generally supposes a simultaneous corruption of men and beasts, and includes both in the same exercises of penitence, fasting, and humiliation;[3] nay even the earth, the abode of man, and the material from which his body was framed, may share in the general depravity; and hence the destruction of man, as was the case in the deluge, includes the destruction of the beasts, and at least the temporary devastation of the earth, if not, as in the visitation of Sodom and Gomorrah, its utter annihilation[4] — all which notions are to us like strange and fanciful echoes of a remote past.

The veil which once covered and hid nature, has in a great measure been withdrawn. The awe which man felt at her grandeur, has thereby not been diminished; on the contrary, it has gained in intensity and reality. But the enquirer has become conscious that he must renounce the hope of fathoming a power that rules her working; that she does not enable him to understand the distinction between "a primary cause"

[1] Comp. Exod. XXIII. 25; Lev. XXVI. 6, 7, 10, 19, 20, 26; Deut. XXVIII. 3—5, 11, 12, 16—18, 23, 24; Deut. XI. 13—17; etc.; and the historical and prophetical Books *passim*, which are throughout pervaded by the spirit indicated.

[2] Ezek. XXXVI. 30; comp. XXXIV. 26—29.

[3] Jon. III. 7, 8; comp. IV. 11; Jer. XII. 4; Hos. II. 20; IV. 3; Zeph. I. 3.

[4] Comp. Gen. VI. 12, 13, 17; Comm. on Gen. pp. 174, 179.

and "secondary causes", since, throughout her dominion, she reveals causes that he must consider as primary, and beyond which he cannot pass if he desires to penetrate into the genesis of things; and that, therefore, man's dignity and his happiness depend on the earnestness with which he explores nature's laws and obeys her suggestions and behests.[5]

## 2. Prayer and other Devotions.

From the principles laid down with regard to miracles, it will not be difficult to estimate the value of several other fundamental notions which pervade the Bible. If every effect produced in the material world is the consequence of a commensurate physical cause to which it is intrinsically related, human supplication, sacrifices, fasting, or any other form of devotion or asceticism, cannot possibly exercise an influence on the course of events or on the destiny of men. There exists no conceivable connection between the one and the other. The spiritual aspiration of prayer lies in a sphere totally different from that which causes the changes or the progress of the external world. If we read that Elijah's prayer suddenly called down from heaven a fire to consume his sacrifice,[6] we are startled by a complete overthrow of all the truths to which we are accustomed with regard to the permanent order of things, and we find it impossible to abandon the undisputed results of science in favour of a doubtful tradition, even if the latter did not form part of a narrative coloured throughout by fanciful legends. If the entreaty of Abraham at once removed the barrenness which had afflicted the women in Abimelech's household,[7] if prayers are supposed to effect or to accelerate the recovery of the sick,[8] and even to restore the dead to life,[9] or to cause sudden blindness,[10] we fail to see, how words, however

[5] The arguments adduced by the advocates of Biblical miracles (as Campbell, Paley, Leslie, Douglas, a. o.) are of very little weight; singularly vague also are the observations of De Wette, and little in harmony with his usual decision of thought (Das Wesen des christlichen Glaubens vom Standpunkt des Glaubens dargestellt, pp. 308—319, 388 *sqq.*); comp. also the unconvincing remarks of *F. R. Birks*, The Bible and Modern Thought, 1862, pp. 63—85, 148—162, on prophecy pp. 163—198, on inspiration pp. 215—257; *J. R. Young*, Science elucidative of Scripture, 1863, pp. 150 *sqq.* (who is bold enough to assert that "not a single scriptural miracle can be pointed to which is self-contradictory", and charitable enough to suppose that Baden Powell when he wrote his essay on the Study of the Evidences of Christianity was in a state of dotage, with his mind unhinged, and his intellectual vision obscured (p. 165).

[6] 1 Ki. XVIII. 36—38.

[7] Gen. XX. 17, 18; comp. XXV. 21; 1 Sam. I. 10 *sqq.*

[8] Comp. Num. XII. 13, 14; 2 Chr. XXX. 18—20; 2 Ki. XX. 3, 5, 6; 1 Ki. XIII. 6.

[9] 1 Ki. XVII. 17—22 (on the son of the widow of Zarephath); Acts IX. 40 (on Tabitha or Dorcas); comp. also 1 Ki. IV. 33 (on the son of the Shunamite woman).

[10] 2 Ki. VI. 18; comp. vers. 17—20.

fervent, can affect a physiological process resulting from the complicated operation of the human organism. And yet the New Testament plainly teaches, "Is anyone sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him . . . and the prayer of faith shall save the sick";[1] nay it contends, "If you shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; it shall be done; and all things whatever you shall ask in prayer, believing, you shall receive";[2] and thus it consistently asserts, "all things are possible to him that believes."[3] By what inherent force is prayer able to stay a pestilence[4] or a locust-plague,[5] or to procure the victory in war?[6] If people pray for rain to secure a plentiful harvest,[7] they cannot be aware of their irrational proceeding; or else they would not cherish the impossible hope, that for the sake of the limited district in which they happen to live, the meteorological laws which fix the distribution of rain over the whole globe, should be capriciously upset, a contingency which, were it feasible, would utterly derange the atmospheric

[1] James V. 14—16; comp. 2 Ki. XX. 1—6; Wisd. XVI. 12; the Chronist remarks even, with censure, that king Asa in his illness "did not consult God but the physicians" (2 Chr. XVI. 12); see, however, *Plin.* H. N. XXVIII. 2 or 3, ex homine remediorum primum maxumae quaestionis et semper incertae est polleantne aliquid verba et incantamenta carminum ... sed viritim sapientissimi cujusque respuit fides. On mediatory prayers of the pious see *supra* p. 301; *Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. 325, 326.

[2] Matth. XXI. 21, 22; comp. XVII. 20, 21; Mark XI. 24; Luke XVIII. 1; XXI. 36; Ephes. VI. 18; Rom. XV. 30, 31; 2 Thess. III. 1, 2; Hebr. XIII. 18, 19; etc.

[3] Mark IX. 23, *πάντα δυνατὰ τῷ πιστεύοντι*. On this point Kant (l. c. p. 122) remarks, "The belief that man is able to produce as it were miracles himself by assailing God with his petitions, so far outsteps the boundaries of reason that it is impossible to dwell on so senseless a conceit."

[4] Ps. CVI. 30; Num. XXI. 7; XI. 2; 1 Ki. VIII. 37.

[5] Joel II. 11—14.

[6] 1 Ki. VIII. 33, 34, 44—50; 2 Ki. XIX. 15; Jer. XXXVII. 3; 2 Macc. XII. 36, 37; X. 27—30; comp. Jer. XLII. 20; Deut. IX. 20, 26; Prov. XV. 8, 29; see also p. 182 note 2, p. 301 notes 13—20.

[7] Comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 35; XVIII. 41—45; James V. 13—18; see also *Herod.* I. 87 (concerning Croesus on the burning pile, *τὸν μὲν . . . ἐπικαλέεσθαι τὸν θεόν· ἐκ δὲ αἰθρίης τε καὶ νηνεμίης συνδραμέειν ἐξαπίνης νέφεα . . . καὶ ὕσαι ὕδατι λαβροτάτῳ*); *Pausan.* II. xxix. 6 (*καὶ ὁ μὲν — Αἴακος — θύσας καὶ εὐξάμενος τὴν Ἑλλάδα γῆν ἐποίησεν ὕεσθαι*); *Capitolin.* Marc. Antonin. c. 24 (fulmen de caelo precibus suis contra hostium machinamentum extorsit, suis pluvia impetrata cum siti laborarent); see also *Marc. Aurel.* Meditat. V. 7, *Εὐχὴ Ἀθηναίων, Ὗσον, ὗσον, ὦ φίλε Ζεῦ, κατὰ τῆς ἀρούρας τῆς Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν πεδίων· ἤτοι οὐ δεῖ εὔχεσθαι, ἢ οὕτως ἁπλῶς καὶ ἐλευθέρως*; *Xenoph.* Memor. I. iii. 2; *Talm.* Taan. 23, 24, Rabbi Simeon ben Shetach censured severely R. Choni Maagal, because the latter constantly prayed for rain or its cessation, and called him a spoilt child, that must inevitably profane the Divine name.

relations of our planetary system. In short, the efficacy attributed to prayer lies entirely in the unreal region of the miraculous.[8] When, in 1865, public prayers were appointed to be offered up throughout Great Britain, for the cessation of the cholera, the objections entertained by many of the most educated men were well expressed by Prof. Tyndall. "The great majority of sane persons", he observed, "at the present day believe in the necessary character of natural laws, and it is only where the antecedents of a calamity are vague and disguised that they think of resorting to prayer to avert it"; he calls this a "pagan method of meeting the scourge"; and he adds "the ideas of prayer and of a change in the course of natural phaenomena refuse to be connected in thought."[9]

If the heart of man is filled with humiliation and shame on account of moral transgressions or deficient zeal in the exercise of virtue or of duty, let him, in contrition, confess to himself his weakness or apathy, and atone his guilt by increased energy and diligence in every noble pursuit. If his soul rejoices in the possession of boons and benefits, let him evince his worthiness by an unselfish use of these blessings, by banishing pride, by lending his indefatigable assistance to the less fortunate, and by unostentatiously aiding every excellent scheme. And if his mind is lost in amazement at the grandeur of nature and the admirable fitness of all her parts, let him prove his appreciation of her magnificence by an eager study of her marvellous mechanism and by an ungrudging obedience to the lessons she teaches. But it is vain and irrational to utter supplications for such objects as health, long life or posterity, riches, success or distinction; for they either lie entirely beyond the control of man, or depend on the measure of his abilities and his vigour, or they follow, as an inevitable sequence, from the organisation of society or the order of the physical world. Ancient writers already saw the difficulty that different men of equal earnestness and piety often pray for opposite things, which the deity cannot possibly grant simultaneously. "Some sailors", observes Lucian,[10] "pray for north-wind, others for south-wind; a farmer desires rain, a cloth-worker sunshine, and often Jupiter is uncertain and hesi-

[8] Some deists, however, questioned the usefulness of prayer, since it can contribute nothing to the perfection or beatitude of God; comp. *Angladis* Ethica, Pars II. Diss. 1 (Inter deistas quidam fuerunt, licet perpauci numero, qui omnem cultum etiam internum rejecerunt, asserentes Deum nihil de illo curare, religiosisque actibus non moveri); also *Fr. P. Cobbe*, Religious Duty, pp. 11, 12.

[9] See the *Pall Mall Gazette* of October 12 and 19, 1865, and the discussion carried on in that journal on the same subject during the greater part of the month of October, and evidently rousing much public interest.

[10] *Lucian*, Icaromenipp. c. 25.

tates in his decision." Nay Plato classes the belief in the possibility of moving the gods by sacrifices or prayers among the worst forms of impiety and the unfailing causes of wicked deeds.[1]

Hence we may estimate the value of the prayers sanctioned by the different creeds and sects; and we take as a specimen the chief Christian prayer attributed to Christ himself and partially borrowed from the Hebrew Scriptures and Jewish sources,[2] a prayer which is allowed by common consent to be one of the finest forms of supplication. "Our father that art in heaven." Is that Being which is adored as Divine enthroned in one special abode? does it not pervade the universe and fill all that surrounds us, all nature with her wonders and her wealth? And what is "heaven" in the scientific language of our time? Nothing distinct from sky or air, atmosphere or ether.[3] — "Hallowed be Thy name." What does this traditional phrase and the following one, "Thy kingdom come", express which cannot be conveyed with much greater clearness by terms derived from the sphere of practical ethics — by the terms self-sacrificing devotedness and unswerving rectitude, universal diffusion of peace and virtue, of knowledge and truth? — "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." This absolute power of decision in all things utterly contradicts our well-established views of the general course of events regulated by unchangeable conditions. — "Give us this day our daily bread." Even the most pious sees in these words hardly anything beyond the *wish* that the efforts of his intelligence or activity may be successful, or that the operation of the elements which constitute our social organism, may be favourable for securing his sustenance or establishing his worldly prosperity. — "And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors."[4] Only the latter part of this invocation depends upon ourselves, and if carried out in a free and generous spirit, forms our highest moral glory; but the former part is in many cases unfeasible; for a guilt can only be condoned by those

---

[1] *Plato*, Legg. X. p. 885 *B*, *οὐδεὶς πώποτε οὔτε ἔργον ἀσεβὲς εἰργάσατο ἑκὼν οὔτε λόγον ἀφῆκεν ἄνομον, ἀλλὰ ἕν δή τι τῶν τριῶν πάσχων…ἢ τρίτον εὐπαραμυθήτους εἶναι (θεοὺς) θυσίαις τε καὶ εὐχαῖς παραγομένους*; p. 888 C; 907 B, *Κινδυνεύει πῶς ὁ ταύτης τῆς δόξης αντεχόμενος πάντων ἂν τῶν ἀσεβῶν κεκρίσθαι δικαιότατα κάκιστός τε εἶναι καὶ ἀσεβέστατος*; Polit. II. p. 365 E.

[2] Matth. VI. 9—13; comp. Luke XI. 2—4; comp. *De Wette*, Erklärung des Evang. Matth. pp. 95 *sqq*.

[3] It is, therefore, more than doubtful whether, as De Wette remarks, "the very word heaven moves our heart more effectually than all scientific definitions which the philosopher proposes of the supernatural world" (Ueber die Religion, Vorlesungen, p. 106); especially as he admits that that term easily engenders "false and superstitious notions" (p. 111).

[4] *Καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν.*

against whom it was committed; and very often the commonwealth does not and cannot pardon guilt, but exacts the most rigid retribution, which, however, involves the atonement of the offender. — "And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." It is against the well-known order of things that circumstances and events should be guided with the special view of keeping individuals away from temptation; they take their necessary course, and trials can only be avoided and misfortunes overcome by prudence and moral strength. — "For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever." These words can have a distinct meaning only by depriving both the world of matter of all independence, and human society of all responsibility.

Devotion, in the spirit above indicated, is not only beneficial, but indispensable as a requirement of every moral mind; but prayer in the vulgar sense is at variance with reason and intelligence. "Praying", observes Kant, "taken as a formal act of worship and a means of grace, is a superstitious illusion; a sincere wish to please God in all our ways, that is, the frame of mind accompanying all our actions and making them appear to be performed in the service of God, is the spirit of prayer, which can and ought to work within us incessantly."[5]

Before beginning difficult or uncertain and dangerous enterprises, men feel disposed to pray and to invoke higher assistance. What is the motive and impulse of such prayer? It expresses the wish, that all external circumstances also might be propitious which, no less than man's own strength and ability, his prudence and perseverance, are required for the successful issue; it is, in a word, an appeal to fortune, or if it be preferred, to chance, which consists in an auspicious concatenation of extraneous conditions.

It may be that in many cases prayer, by producing a calm confidence, enhances the energy of man, and contributes to his success; but it does not exercise that influence because it is in reality efficacious, but because he who prays *believes* it to be so; therefore, the strong-minded will prefer earnest reflection, or any other means of rousing his activity, to a fictitious help founded upon delusion and prompted by weakness. Men have indeed at all times wavered on this point. Intelligence and a sense of independence urged them to expect their happiness from their own exertions, but inertness and indolence led them to rely, at least partially, on prayer.[6] This fluctuation gave rise to utterances like "Trust in the Lord and do good",[7] or the time-

[5] *Kant*, l. c. p. 302, comp. pp. 296—319.

[6] Compare the apt illustration of Persius (Sat. II. 41—43): Poscis opem nervis corpusque fidele senectae; Esto age; sed grandes patinae tuccetaque crassa Adnuere his superos vetuere Jovemque morantur. [7] Ps. XXXVII. 3.

honoured injunction *ora et labora*, and many similar adages.[1] In the Bible we meet, on the one hand, the principle, "Whatsoever thy hand finds to do, do it with all thy might",[2] and on the other hand, "Cast thy destiny upon the Lord, and He will sustain thee";[3] or "Unless the Lord build the house they labour in vain that build it, unless the Lord guard the city the watchman wakes in vain";[4] and progressing almost to the verge of paradox, the same text continues, "It is vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late . . . for He (God) gives it to His beloved in his sleep."[5] The Bible indeed attaches prominent weight to *reliance* and *faith*,[6] as might be expected from its eastern origin and from the childlike stage of intellectual development which it represents; and it is, on this account, especially foreign to our present modes of viewing life and the government of the world.

Kindred with prayers are the *blessings* and *curses* pronounced upon others: the blessing of Isaac, even supposed it were not written *post eventum*, was powerless to secure the prosperity of Jacob's descendants, who had to depend on their own conduct and the force of circumstances; nor would the curses of Balaam have exercised any influence upon the career of the Israelites. The belief in the efficacy of blessings and curses,[7] though often emanating from the laudable desire of securing the good wishes of the pious, or from the well-founded fears of a guilty conscience, is, in fact, based on that fatal confusion of the moral and the material world, which is the prolific parent of despicable and often dangerous superstitions.

That which is true of prayer, the purest and most spiritual form

---

[1] Comp. the decided words of Cato (in *Sallust*, Catil. LII), "non votis neque suppliciis muliebribus auxilia deorum parantur; vigilando, agendo, bene consulendo prospera omnia cedunt; ubi secordiae te atque ignaviae tradideris, nequidquam deos implores; irati infestique sunt"; also the maxims *σὺν Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ χεῖρα κίνει*, or *αὐτός τι νῦν δρῶν, εἶτα τοὺς θεοὺς κάλει* (*A. Schott*, Adag. Graec. 1612, pp. 149, 378), or *τὰν χεῖρα ποτιφέροντα τὰν τύχαν καλεῖν* (*Plut.* Inst. Lacon. 28), or "audentes deus ipse juvat" (*Ovid*, Met. X. 586), or "audentes fortuna juvat" (*Macrob.* Saturn. VI. 1; *Virg.* Aen. X. 284), and "sibi quisque profecto Est deus; ignavis precibus Fortuna repugnat" (*Ovid*, Met. VIII. 72, 73); *Babrius*, Fab. XX (Hercules answers the ox-driver, *τῶν τροχῶν ἅπτου καὶ τοὺς βόας κέντριζε, τοῖς θεοῖς δ' εὔχου, ὅταν τι ποιῇς καὐτός, ἢ μάτην εὔξῃ*); "God will not help them that will not help themselves."

[2] Eccl. IX. 10.

[3] Ps. LV. 23; comp. XXXVII. 5.

[4] Ps. CXXVII. 1.

[5] Ver. 2; the English Version renders incorrectly and unintelligibly, "for so He giveth His beloved sleep" (כן יתן לידידו שנא).

[6] Comp. Ps. XIII. 6; XXII. 5; XXV. 2; XXXII. 10; LVI. 12; LXXXVI. 2; etc.

[7] Comp. 2 Ki. II. 23, 24; Gen. IX. 25—27; XXVII. 27—29, 39, 40; XLVIII. 15, 16, 20; Num. VI. 24—27; 1 Sam. II. 10, 21; Num. V. 21, 22; 1 Ki. VIII. 55 *sqq.*; see Comm. on Gen. p. 512.

of devotion, applies with increased force to all other pious exercises, to *sacrifice* or *fasting*. There is no connection between these practices and the ordinary affairs of human life. No degree of self-castigation can avert a calamity which is the inevitable result of a chain of events or of physical conditions. We must repeat once more — to expect an effect without a corresponding cause, is superstition. Yet the Biblical narrative constantly introduces prayer, sacrifice, and the like, and attaches to them a profound and mysterious reality. Who will deny, that any ceremony, however unmeaning in itself, if performed in a spirit of earnestness and humility, may serve the best and holiest ends of religion, by rousing the soul and directing it to its highest duties? But here again, it is not the ceremonies which work so beneficially, but the frame of mind which they happen to call forth; however, this frame of mind, very different in different worshippers, might be produced in many other ways, and is, in fact, more surely engendered by means better consistent with the true nature of man and his place in creation. Even the so-called *good works*, as charity and alms-giving, truly ennobling and beatifying if exercised from a consciousness of the obligations which man owes to man, and from a feeling of single-minded self-denial, are a noxious perversity, if performed in the selfish hope of obtaining the favour of the deity and thereby securing temporal or eternal happiness; not only do the good works thus lose their chief merit and grace, not only do they cease to be the brightest glory and most precious gem of man's life, they contribute to foster both egotism and superstition.[8] We must advance even a step farther and weigh the value and force of *penitence*. If the destruction of a town as Nineveh is all but impending, and is yet averted by the repentance of its inhabitants,[9] we are justified in asking, how such an effect can be wrought by such a cause?[10] We are very far from undervaluing the transcendent merit and wonderful power of repentance, to be prized as the chief means of purification and peace of mind, because it is alone able to counterbalance our inherent weakness, or at least to mitigate its baneful operation: but we cannot attribute to it any other direct or outward influence; for the confession of sinful or wicked acts cannot make them undone; a deed cannot be effaced by a thought, but only by another deed, or by uncontrollable circumstances; on the contrary, experience and reflection teach us alike that no penitence, however sincere and unremitting, can wipe out a transgression; sin must be expiated by suffering; but the sufferer is upheld by the consolation

[8] Comp., for instance, Luke XIV. 12—14; see *Feuerbach*, Ursprung der Götter, pp. 392—399 (on "Self-love").

[9] Jonah III.

[10] Comp. Jer. XXVI. 13, 19 ("the Lord will repent of the evil" etc.).

that, as his vice, his indolence, or his imprudence has plunged him into distress and sorrow, so his virtue, his energy, or his thoughtfulness can restore him to happiness and harmony of mind.

### 4. Revelation.

The principles above laid down enable us to assign its due place to another group of notions affecting the very groundwork of the Scriptures — revelation, inspiration, and prophecy.

The main precepts of the Pentateuch claim to be directly communicated by God to Moses; and both the earlier patriarchs and distinguished men of later times are represented as enjoying God's personal intercourse at decisive epochs of their lives. Let us examine the dogmatic foundations upon which such conceptions were built up. It is true that God's incorporeality is theoretically taught in the Pentateuch;[1] yet He appears in human form,[2] and is seen in the visions of the prophets;[3] He speaks distinctly and intelligibly, and communicates His thoughts and designs to His elected mediators.[4] From these views to the doctrine of incarnation there is but a natural step; and thus theology almost returns, as if by a circular movement, to the very point from which it started — the notion of personal gods with human attributes. But how can a Spirit that pervades the universe, and which is accessible to our intellects by the works exclusively that fill the world, and by the laws that govern it, commune bodily or personally with man, and reveal to him commands or truths for the guidance of his life? The most Divine power of which we have knowledge and consciousness, is human reason, and it suffices to secure man's dignity and his happiness. Wise and good men intended to convey to their fellow-beings what they regarded as irrefutable truth; and they

---

[1] See p. 400. The views with regard to the incorporeality of God evidently fluctuated for a long time; it is only necessary to refer to that remarkable and obscure account in Exodus where Moses desired to see the "glory" of God, and the latter replies, "Behold, there is a place by Me, and thou shalt stand upon the rock; and it shall come to pass, while My glory passes by, that I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with My hand while I pass by; and then I will take away My hand, and thou shalt see My back, but My face cannot be seen" (Exod. XXXIII. 21—23; comp. also Num. XII. 6—8 פה אל־פה אדבר־בו; Deut. XXXIV. 10. (פנים אל־פנים) — a passage which has induced many to suppose that the Pentateuch does not at all teach the incorporeality of God (comp., f.i., *Spinoza*, Tract. theol. polit. I. 17, nec lex Mosi revelata ... unquam praecepit, ut credamus, Deum esse incorporeum etc.; comp. ibid. II. 36, 42, 43; XV. 16).

[2] Gen. XVIII. 2, 17.

[3] Isai. VI. 1 *sqq.* see *infra*.

[4] See also Exod. XXXIII. 18—23; comp. *Hirschfeld*, Halachische Exegese, pp. 76, 77; *De Wette*, Dogmatik, II. § 24 a.

clothed their teaching in the form of a revelation, because this is the most impressive, and was therefore, for such purposes, the most usual and familiar mode of communication. Let us analyse a clear instance of revelation or *theophany*; we choose one distinguished by simplicity and grandeur, composed by Isaiah who is unquestionably to be counted among the noblest and most gifted of the ancient Hebrews. "In the year that king Uzziah died", he writes,[5] "I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lofty, and His train filled the Temple. Above Him stood seraphs; each one had six wings; with two he covered his face, and with two he covered his feet, and with two he did fly. And one cried to another and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory . . . Then said I, Woe to me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for my eyes have seen the king, the Lord of hosts" — after which a seraph lays a live coal upon the prophet's lips, and God charges him with the mission of preaching to the Israelites. Has this narrative literal truth? Can it have reality? Isaiah *sees* God. Can God be seen? Would the prophet in sober earnestness admit the possibility? Can he then fear instantaneous death on that account? He sees God *sitting* on a *throne*. Can a spirit be so conceived, and is it tied to the conditions of space? The *train* of God (שׁוּלָיו) is noticed. How is this to be understood? And has He any form that admits of the contrast between *above* and *below?* The prophet observes that the train filled the Temple. Is God enclosed within the walls of an edifice? And in what manner can the garment of a spiritual being fill a circumscribed space?[6] He sees, moreover, seraphs with six wings. What are seraphs? Are they not, like all angels, demons, and spirits, both good and evil, pure and impure, which are so prominent in all parts of the Bible and most so in the latest, are they not beings of eastern mythology, creatures of fancy, without possible reality?[7] Yet he sees them "standing above God" (עֹמְדִים מִמַּעַל לוֹ).[8] What does it mean "above God"? What can there be above Him who fills the heaven and the heaven of heavens, and the whole universe? Then the seraphs speak, and God

---

[5] Isai. VI. 1—13.

[6] For the scene of the vision is obviously not in heaven, but in the Temple (ver. 2), as is evident from "the foundations of the threshold" (ver. 4) and the altar (ver. 6; comp. Jerem. XXIV. 1; Am. IX. 1; Ezek. VIII. 3; esp. X. 4, 5), the vail which separated the Holy from the Holy of Holies being probably supposed to be opened.

[7] Comp. Comm. on Genes. pp. 399, 400; see *Kohut*, Über die jüdische Angelologie und Dämonologie in ihrer Abhängigkeit vom Parsismus, Leipzig 1866 (Abhandlungen der Deutsch-Morgenl. Gesellschaft, Vol. IV. No. 3).

[8] For לו must be referred to אדני, not to כסא.

speaks, and Isaiah answers, and the angels perform a symbolical act. How is a communion between God and man possible by means of language? Does an incorporeal being utter articulate speech intelligible to man? Can an enlightened person expect a verbal reply in addressing God? — Now in what light are we to look upon this vision of Isaiah? The idea of deception or imposition must be utterly discarded; the loftiness and purity of Isaiah's character at once banish such suspicion. Is it, then, the result of wild self-illusion and religious ecstasy?[1] The usual calmness and clear-sighted penetration of the prophet would fainly make us abandon this alternative. Is it, therefore, purely and simply a poetical invention, a form of composition designed to describe interestingly his vocation as a teacher and his initiation as a prophet? The earnestness and depth of the writer forbid us to suppose frivolous playfulness in relating the holiest and most important event of his life. What view, then, remains? Though the narrative evinces prominently neither the fervour of religious enthusiasm, nor the design of beauty and effectiveness of diction, it appears to be a combination of both. Isaiah, in common with his time and people, believed the possibility of a direct revelation; and he had ardour enough to persuade himself that the powerful impulse which stimulated him to his great career, might be hallowed or confirmed by a solemn theophany.[2] On the other hand, he could scarcely deceive himself so far as to imagine that he had actually received such revelation through the personal appearance and address of God; yet he might well *describe* his initiation under that form, which was familiar to his contemporaries, and which he was able to employ with clearness and impressiveness. The form of visions, generally adopted in eastern theology,[3] and naturally varying according to the disposition and talent of the writers and the taste of their times,[4]

[1] Comp. *Spinoza*, Tract. theol. polit. I. 9, verba vero et etiam figurae vel *verae* fuerunt et extra imaginationem prophetae audientis seu videntis, vel *imaginariae* quia nimirum prophetae imaginatio, etiam vigilando, ita disponebatur, ut sibi clare videretur verba audire aut aliquid videre; and with respect to Isaiah's vision he observes (ibid. § 20), Esaiae etiam repraesentatum est *per figuras*, Dei providentiam populum deserere, nempe *imaginando* Deum ter sanctum in throno altissimo etc.; or (II. 20) Esaias vidit Deum vestitum et in solio regis sedentem, Ezechiel autem instar ignis; *uterque sine dubio Deum vidit, prout ipsum imaginari solebat.*

[2] Comp. vers. 5, 8.

[3] Comp. Jer. I. 4—19; Ezek. II. 1—10.

[4] Comp. Am. VII. 1—9; VIII. 1, 2; Zech. I. 7—17; II. 1—9; III. 1—10; 1 Ki. XXII. 19—23; comp. also *Spinoza*, Tract. theol. polit. I. 46; II. 3; esp. 12—23, 49—58, hinc sequitur signa pro opinionibus et capacitate prophetae data fuisse . . . Sic etiam ipsa revelatio variabat in unoquoque propheta pro dispositione temperamenti, corporis, imaginationis, et pro ratione opinionum quas antea amplexus fuerat . . . Haec facile ostendent, Deum nullum habere

grew more and more in favour among the Hebrews; it is found with increased frequency in the later writings, especially in the Book of Daniel and the Revelation of St. John, till it was overloaded with an exuberant, if not extravagant, admixture of symbolism or allegorical play.[5] Narratives like that under examination, have, therefore, a very high psychological interest, but they can be fully understood and appreciated only, if viewed in relation to the age in which they were written, or to which they point. This applies pre-eminently to the most important of all revelations, those of the Pentateuch. The authors of these tales, living many centuries after the events they narrate, and imbued with the idea that God personally appears to His messengers to charge them with His commands, must needs have believed that Moses was above all other men deemed worthy of receiving Divine revelations; and that as his legation was more momentous than that of all his successors, so the personal manifestations of God were, in his case, more direct, more palpable, and more grandly communicated, than on any previous or later occasion.[6] Eager to exalt this mission, they enlarged and, it may be, exaggerated the notions of their own time with regard to theophanies; and their narratives are, therefore, the combined result of conviction and of logical inference. Hence it is futile in the extreme to reduce all visions of the Bible to suggestions by dreams, as has been attempted by Maimonides and others.[7] Much nearer the truth are those who refer them to the working of the imagination,[8] a faculty which they require even more than superiority of mind.[9]

---

stylum peculiarem dicendi, sed tantum pro eruditione et capacitate prophetae eatenus esse elegantem, compendiosum, severum, rudem, prolixum et obscurum. [5] Comp. Ezek. I; IV; XII; Zech. I; IV; V; Dan. II; VII.

[6] Comp. Num. XII. 6—8; Exod. XIX. 10—25; XX. 18—21. Yet the conception that God spoke to Moses "face to face", seems not to have been generally or consistently entertained; for even Moses was not permitted to see God (Exod. XXXIII. 20), and prophets like him were supposed to appear in later times (Deut. XVIII. 15, 18; comp. *supra* p. 438, note 1).

[7] This opinion is denounced by Spinoza in almost vehement terms, "illi sane garriunt; nam nihil aliud curaverunt quam nugas Aristotelicas et sua propria figmenta ex Scriptura extorquere; quo mihi quidem nihil magis absurdum videtur" (Tract. theol. polit. I. 19).

[8] *Spinoza*, l. c. § 25, asserimus . . . neminem nisi imaginationis ope, videlicet ope verborum aut imaginum, Dei revelata accepisse; § 41, quare aequali jure imaginatio prophetarum, quatenus per eam Dei decreta revelabantur, mens Dei etiam vocari poterat, prophetaeque mentem Dei habuisse dici poterant; § 43, possumus jam igitur sine scrupulo affirmare, prophetas non nisi ope imaginationis Dei revelata percepisse, hoc est, mediantibus verbis vel imaginibus, iisque veris aut imaginariis.

[9] L. c. § 25, adeo ad prophetizandum non esse opus perfectiore mente sed vividiore imaginatione; comp. II. 1.

But this is sufficient to determine the degree of their reliability. "By what laws of nature those visions happened", observes Spinoza,[1] "I confess my inability to decide. I might indeed say, like others, that they happened by the power of God; but this I should consider as idle nonsense; for it would be like attempting to explain the nature of some extraordinary thing by a transcendental term." But we must not stop here; we can, in our age, not rest satisfied with resignedly declaring, "It is not necessary that we should know the cause of the prophetic knowledge; and we have no concern in fathoming the principles of the Biblical documents":[2] by knowing that visions are, in a great measure, the result of an active imagination, we know their cause or principle, and are perfectly enabled to estimate their value. We must therefore question the philosophical truth of the remark, "As the prophets received the revelations of God by the help of the imagination, it cannot be doubted that they were able to conceive many truths beyond the limits of the intellect";[3] imagination, which is by Spinoza himself called vague and inconstant,[4] and declared to be hardly fit to understand the things accurately,[5] cannot really and in itself suggest higher truths than calmly weighing reason; and indeed the same thinker, perhaps even advancing too far on the other side, maintains, "those who desire to learn from the books of the prophets wisdom and knowledge of natural and spiritual things, are entirely in error",[6] because imagination, without the judgment of reason, involves no certainty;[7] and he proves elaborately that "prophecy never made the prophets more learned, but left them in their preconceived opinions, and that we are, therefore, in no way bound to believe them in merely speculative matters";[8] that the prophets were ignorant of the causes of the phenomena of nature; "that they have taught nothing peculiar about the Divine attributes, and had very common notions of God, to which they adapted their revelations":[9] but if imagination is understood as a medium of "Divine revelations", the argument is not advanced a single step, as it would still move within the sphere of the supernatural, especially as it is

[1] L. c. § 44. [2] Ibid.

[3] L. c. § 45. [4] Ibid. § 47.

[5] Qui maxime imaginatione pollent, minus apti ad res pure intelligendum, l. c. II. 1.

[6] Qui igitur sapientiam et rerum naturalium et spiritualium cognitionem ex prophetarum libris investigare student tota errant via, II. 2. [7] II. 4 *sqq.*

[8] II. 24; comp. §§ 25 *sqq.*, mira quadam praecipitantia omnes sibi persuaserunt, prophetas omnia quae humanus intellectus assequi potest scivisse (§ 25); satis superque constat . . . prophetas res quae solam speculationem et quae non caritatem et usum vitae spectant, ignorare potuisse, et revera ignoravisse contrariasque habuisse opiniones; quare longe abest, ut ab iis cognitio rerum naturalium et spiritualium sit petenda (§ 52).

[9] Ibid. § 31; comp. III. 18.

elsewhere contended that "the revelations pass beyond the reach of human capacity";[10] though it is, on the other hand, averred with strange inconsistency, that "the doctrine of the Scriptures does not teach sublime speculations and philosophical truths, but merely the simplest things which can be understood by the very dullest."[11]

The Books that are called revealed have, in fact, disclosed nothing that reason and experience are unable to suggest; they contain manifold truths which reflecting minds of all nations have concurrently discovered; they abound in errors which, in many instances, almost destroy the beneficial effects of their truths, and which the continued exercise of reason and of observation has alone been able to discover and to correct. But even if their human origin were not abundantly disclosed by internal evidence, if they did not, by innumerable features, betray themselves as the compositions of fallible, imperfectly informed, though mostly noble-minded and gifted men, we should not be able to accept them as anything else. The writers indeed considered as reality and fact what they supposed to be possible or what appeared to them desirable, because it was a necessity of their age, and was therefore not likely to be questioned by their contemporaries. But they could not be aware of the incredible mischief which their pretended "revelations" have produced. For they professed to proclaim *final* truths, "to which nothing was to be added, and from which nothing was to be taken off"; and thus they fettered thought and research, and retarded human progress in its most important spheres. Moreover, as their words were considered as the utterances of *Divine wisdom* itself, every opposition or even deviation was looked upon as blasphemy and crime punishable by human authorities; heresy was no more an error, but open rebellion against the authority of heaven; and thus were caused those unspeakable miseries and appalling persecutions, which the mind shudders to recall, which will for ever remain a dark stain in the history of the human race, and which are unparalleled even in the annals of pagan superstition. Instead of directing man to exert his own faculties, the Bible dictates to him what he is to consider as the end of all research and knowledge; it makes him a passive recipient of truth, whereas he feels the unconquerable impulse of searching for it himself; and instead of leaving to him the triumphs of well-employed reason, it claims them entirely for a Being immeasurably above him. Revelation, therefore, in so far as it coincides with reason, might work beneficently, and has fortunately worked so in a considerable degree;

---

10 VII. 10; comp. XI. 4, 7, 14; XII. 22.

11 L. c. XIII. 4, quae vel a quovis tardissimo possunt percipi.

but it derogates materially from the *moral* value of the actions which it prompts; for actions, not performed from spontaneity and choice, but in obedience to an authoritative command from a higher power, not only lose the noblest attribute of virtue, but are liable to thousandfold evasions and perversions; which double danger is effectually avoided by leaving the sovereignty to reason itself, instead of delegating it to revelation, its temporary and imperfect embodiment. Morality does not deserve its name, unless it flows from pure and free motives. Works of charity, benevolence and good-will, performed because they are commanded with the promise of reward and the threat of punishment, cease to be meritorious. In short, revelation, based upon a defective notion of the Deity, enslaving human reason and slighting its strength and nobleness, teaching the dangerous surrender of human enquiry in favour of a supernatural code, unjustifiably converting cosmic or anthropological truths into theological dogmas, and boldly pronouncing, in the name of an invisible spirit, as eternal law what is no more than the emanation of human thought, and what, therefore, is exposed to error and capable of improvement, depending on the intellect of man for all it utters, and then presumptuously demanding the mastery over him, and hence fostering sophistry and casuistic perversion, which are required to harmonise the later advancements of truth with its own immovable dicta — the idea of revelation combines whatever is objectionable and preposterous in positive religion, and manifests at a glance its weakness and its fallacy. The term revelation which, in its essence, precisely coincides with human knowledge and wisdom, can therefore fitly be dispensed with altogether, and ought only to be employed conventionally for describing the traditional view of orthodoxy.

The greatest confusion is, however, created by an indiscriminate use of that word as well in its dogmatic or technical meaning as also in a figurative sense as merely synonymous with enlightenment or the productions of genius. This may often arise from indistinctness of thought, but it is, we are afraid, not unfrequently the result of insincerity and equivocation. Yet it is highly objectionable unfairly to attribute a new notion to an old term which unsuspecting readers can only understand in the vulgar sense. An honest mind will shun a duplicity designed to conciliate opposite views, but really satisfying neither the believer nor the critic, and enveloping the most important questions in misty haziness. How little either religion, philosophy, or history gains by such unmanly and allegorising playfulness, may be best proved from Lessing's treatise on the Education of the Human Race, which, composed in the illusory form of a fictitious logic, in no manner advances

the subject which it endeavours to elucidate. We shall briefly review its leading ideas. "That which education does for individuals, revelation works for the whole human race" (§ 1). Here the term revelation is manifestly employed in its usual or orthodox acceptation. But we pass to the following clause, "Education is revelation which is imparted to individual men; and revelation is education, which has been imparted, and is still being imparted, to the human race" (§ 2). In what manner is it "still being imparted"? Theologians are agreed that revelation, in its dogmatic meaning, has completely ceased many centuries ago; nor is education a supernatural disclosure conveyed from beings of a superior species or order to those whom they educate. Revelation must, then, in that clause, not be taken in its traditional, but in a metaphorical sense, as increase of knowledge or wisdom. In what mazes of perplexity are we thus intricated! In reading the essay, we must be on our guard wherever the word revelation occurs, and try whether the one meaning or the other suits the context; the term is therefore an indistinct hieroglyphic to be modified and interpreted at pleasure. — "Education conveys to man nothing which he might not learn from his own mind; it conveys it to him only more rapidly and more easily. Just so revelation conveys to the human race nothing that human reason, left to its own resources, would not also discover, only it conveyed and conveys to him the most important of these truths earlier" (§ 4).[1] Can the confusion go farther? That "revelation" which teaches nothing except the suggestions of human reason, is not the revelation of orthodoxy which is beyond human reason and often opposed to it; for orthodox faith acknowledges the principle, "I believe it, because it is absurd",[2] and it insists upon the reality of all Biblical miracles, which are absolutely contradicted by human reason. Yet that revelation is asserted to teach certain truths "earlier". Then it is, after all, some supernatural communication which anticipates the operation of human reason.[3] This notion of revelation is entirely novel, and has little in common with the dogmatic definition of the term; for according to the former, it merely accelerates the discoveries of man's intellect, while according to the latter, it unfolds new truths utterly unattainable by unaided reason.[4] So then, to complete the chaos, we have a third definition of revelation more vague than either the tra-

[1] Similarly Kant (l. c. p. 233) remarks that "a religion might be at once natural and revealed"; for though indeed attainable by human reason, it might be taught earlier or more completely by revelation.

[2] Credo quia absurdum est.

[3] Comp. §§ 70—72, 76.

[4] In a later part of the essay (§ 77), the author asserts indeed, with sufficient distinctness, that revelation "leads man to better notions of the attributes

ditional or the figurative acceptation; for we may ask, which are "the more important truths" which "revelation" communicates to men "earlier"? and would nations and tribes, not favoured with these revelations, arrive of themselves at the same truths in the course of time? Orthodoxy attributes to revelation the disclosure of *all* truths necessary to "make wise unto salvation", and "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness";[1] and it contends that these truths can on no account be derived from any source except the revealed or inspired books. Inaccuracy so wavering and so shifting necessarily engenders the grossest fallacies; and indeed Lessing thenceforth mainly develops the vulgar and absolutely unhistorical view of the progress of human civilisation. "God has seen fit to keep a certain order in His revelation, and to remain within certain limits" (§ 5). He furnished the first man with the notion of one universal Creator; but man, then left to his own reason, soon misunderstood that notion, and divided the one Infinite God into many finite things, each with peculiar attributes; and this was the origin of polytheism or idolatry; "and who knows, how many millions of years human reason would have strayed on these false paths, although some individuals everywhere and at all times were aware of their being false paths, if it had not pleased God to give human reason a better direction by a new impulse"? — namely by singling out the Israelites for His immediate care and guidance, in order to effect, through them, the education of mankind (§§ 5—9, 18). The sentences quoted contain all the current elements of error and perversity. They are as unphilosophical as any other system of orthodox theology. God is suddenly introduced as a real *deus ex machina,* whenever the author sees no other means of helping him out of historical difficulties. How has this working of God or the whole process of education attributed to Him been arrived at? Exclusively through the Books which are supposed to contain "revelation." But no proof of the reality or possibility of a revelation has ever succeeded. We move, therefore, in a narrow circle which entirely shuts out the exercise of logical deduction. The first man, it is asserted, was furnished with a correct notion of the indivisible unity of God. This is against all psychological and historical probability.[2] We know that, for many ages, religion consisted in the deification of nature by untutored generations awed by her powers because unable to compre-

---

of the Deity, of our own nature, and of our relation to God, at which human reason would, of itself, never have arrived."

[1] 2 Tim. III. 15, 16.

[2] Comp. *Braun,* Naturgeschichte der Sage, I. 275; see also *Saalschütz,* Archaeol. II. 380—392.

hend her laws; and we are certain that many ages passed by before the abstract idea of one all-comprising God was conceived and maintained. The course of development was, therefore, exactly the reverse of that stated; for how is it possible that the aberrations of polytheism and idolatry should have taken so deep roots all over the globe, if the knowledge of one God had once been known, especially as it is admitted that "some individuals everywhere and at all times were aware of their being false paths"? Surely, if revelation, as was before asserted, imparts nothing but what human reason is by itself able to discover, and if, moreover, the notion of one Deity had once been revealed to man and was thus stamped as a truth consonant with his reason and attainable by its efforts, he could not so utterly have lost it, as to require "millions of years" to return to it anew. — And as Lessing was, by the unwarranted use of the term revelation, misled to absurdities unworthy of his acumen and philosophical genius, and elaborately carried out through a lengthy chain of biassed reasoning, in which Biblical history, allegory, and reflection are fancifully mingled; so the same mistakes were repeated and aggravated by men determined not to pass beyond certain self-imposed boundaries, especially if they were disinclined to attach weight to the lessons of history and to the methods of philosophic thought. — A similar obscurity is caused by Spinoza's terminology, which renders an exact appreciation of his views extremely difficult; he speaks of the "commands of God" (jussa Dei) and the "Divine Law" (lex divina),[3] but is far from attributing to these terms their traditional sense; "the means required by the end of all human actions, that is, by the knowledge and love of God, may, in as much as the idea of Him is in us, be called commands of God, because they have been prescribed to us as it were by God Himself in so far as He exists in our minds; and the mode of living which has that aim in view, can very well be called the Divine Law." We believe, certainly not "very well", but to the serious detriment of clearness in the most important questions; the Divine laws and commands, as the Bible understands them, are not those which flow from our Divine reason, but those which a power above and distinct from our reason has proclaimed.[4] Even

[3] Tract. theol. polit. IV. 13.

[4] Comp. ibid. §§ 9, 17 (leges humanae *ex revelatione* or *lumine prophetico* sancitae); V. 3; XII. 18*sqq.*; and yet he observes, tribus itaque de causis Scriptura verbum Dei appellatur, nempe quia veram docet religionem, cujus Deus aeternus est auctor (l. c. §23). A very striking instance of this questionable ambiguity is in XV. 24, where Spinoza, according to his acceptation of the term *theology*, finds the most perfect agreement between the latter and reason, while he had immediately before enumerated various instances of direct contradiction between *Scripture* and reason (l. c. §§ 15*sqq.*).

**with respect to the notion of God he continues the same ambiguity; he observes, on the one hand, that God "can be called King, Lawgiver, just, merciful and the like only in adaptation to the imperfect capacity of the people and from defective reasoning, since all those attributes appertain to human nature only and must altogether be kept removed from the Divine nature";[1] but he maintains, on the other hand, that "God acts according to the necessity of His nature and perfection, and directs all things, that, in fact, His decrees and volitions are eternal truths and ever involve necessity": the impersonal character of the Deity conveyed with sufficient clearness in the first remark, is almost hidden in the second and will be detected by those only who are thoroughly familiar with the philosopher's system.**

It may be instructive, and will help to elucidate our remarks, if we briefly characterise *Lessing as theologian.* For this purpose we begin with a short outline of the treatise, to which we have above referred.

God announced Himself to the Israelites in Egypt "as the God of their ancestors", whom they had entirely forgotten in bondage; He proved by His miracles that He is mightier than any other god; and He thus accustomed the Hebrews to believe in *one* God (§§ 10—13). But as He found that they were not yet capable of fathoming His true and transcendental nature, He limited His instruction to the reward and punishment of this life, and did not reveal the immortality of the soul or a future existence; He confirmed the "Divine origin" of the Old Testament by miracles and prophecies; and sent Moses as His messenger (§§ 15—33). But when, during the exile, the Israelites came into contact with the wise Persians, they purified and enlarged their revealed notions of God; "revelation had before guided their reason; now reason suddenly illumined their revelation" (§§ 35, 36); they recognised God not as the greatest of all national deities, but as the only and exclusive God; like the Persians, they insisted on His incorporeality; their religion, therefore, "though still far beneath pure Sabaeism", found favour with Cyrus who restored them to their country (§§ 37—40). Thenceforward, they remained faithful to Jehovah, attributed to Him alone, and not, as before, to the other gods also, the power of performing miracles and inspiring prophets; and became more fully acquainted with the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which, however, because not distinctly taught in the Hebrew Scriptures, was never received by the whole people, but only by some sects (§§ 41—46). In fact, the Old Testament, both as regards the teaching and the style, "has all the good characteristics of an elementary text-book both for children and a childish nation" ("alle gute Eigenschaften eines Elementarbuchs sowohl für Kinder als für ein kindisches Volk", §§ 47—50). But this elementary book could not, without great injury to the intelligence and character of the people, be left longer in their hands as the source of their instruction; they had arrived at that stage of maturity when another guide was indispensable; "the child had become a boy", and a "better pedagogue" appeared in the person of Christ (§§ 51—54). He tried especially to give to his followers a nobler motive for their actions, and he, therefore, "became the first trustworthy and practical teacher of the immortality of the

[1] L. c. IV. 30, 37.

soul" (§§ 55—61). The apostles diffused far and wide this doctrine of their master (§ 62); they blended it indeed with other tenets "the truth of which was less self-evident, and the benefit of which less considerable"; but even by these doctrines they gave a new impulse to human reason (§ 63); for the writings of the New Testament proved to be, and still are, the second and better elementary text-book for the human race (§ 64); it was most essential that every nation should, for a certain time, consider this book as the *non plus ultra* of all wisdom (§ 67), and especially that it should not be laid aside too soon (§ 68); it should rather be studied again more closely; for it may possibly contain the revelation of truths hinted at in obscure allusions, and not yet quite intelligible to reason, as, for instance, the trinity, original sin, and other doctrines, about which it is profitable both for the improvement of our intellects and our hearts earnestly to speculate (§§ 69—84). For it is the end of the Divine education of the human race, to lead man to the practice of every virtue, without the expectation of future rewards, and to render him contented with the better recompense of his own mind (§ 85). "The time of *a new and eternal gospel* will certainly arrive", as it has been promised even in the elementary books of the New Testament (§ 86), and as it was proclaimed "by some enthusiasts of the thirteenth and fourteenth century", who spoke of *a threefold age of the world*, and declared that the New Covenant must in due time become antiquated, just as the Old one has already become so (§§ 87, 88); though their impatient hopes were premature, and therefore deserved the name of fancies; for the *third age* requires *men* trained by long preparation and perfect enlightenment (§§ 89, 90). Providence advances by imperceptible steps, which man must appreciate if he is to preserve his faith in the progress of mankind. Every individual has to accomplish the path on which the whole race arrives to its perfection (§§ 91—93); and how is he to perform the task? that is, how is he to combine in himself the wisdom of the *three ages* of the world (*supra* §§ 86—88)? He passes — so teaches Lessing gravely — through a kind of metempsychosis, he exists three times on earth, and resumes during each successive reappearance his work of progress where he had left it at his previous demise (§§ 94—100)! [2]

So then the great man, commencing with indistinctness, finished with idle mysticism. Indeed a powerful warning for all, to shun every vagueness of thought, and every, even the slightest, perversion or disregard of reason! Lessing adds to the confusion by some equivocal remarks in the preface to the treatise, "Why should we not be content to trace in positive religions simply the method, by which human reason everywhere and exclusively was able to develop itself and is destined still further to advance, rather than smile or be angry at any one of those systems?" It would almost appear from this observation as if the author intended to offer no more than a plain historical deduction, whereas the essay itself, though in its main points borrowed from Epiphany, Tertullian and others without any acknowledgment of the sources,[3] endeavours to prove a theological and individual theory and expresses peculiar views not

[2] It is the opinion of J. W. Loebell also that the treatise we have analysed has "a Christian and even an apologetic tendency" (G. E. Lessing, aus Bonner Vorlesungen, 1865, p. 140); likewise *Guhrauer*, Lessing's Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts kritisch und philosophisch erörtert.

[3] Comp. *Ritter*, Lessing's philos. u. theol. Grundsätze, pp. 38, 39.

in harmony with the Bible, characterising, for instance, the writings of the New Testament as "the second and better elementary text-book" adapted to boyhood, and to be superseded as antiquated, in the third age, by another code more suitable to matured manhood. We are justified in considering this last opinion as Lessing's true conviction; for we are told by Fr. H. Jacobi that, when he visited him at Wolfenbüttel in 1780, the same year in which the treatise under discussion was written, and expected to find him a perfect theist, he was, in the very first interview, surprised by Lessing's unreserved confession that "if he were to name himself after any philosopher, he would call himself a Spinozist; that ἓν καὶ πᾶν was his motto, and that he desired no free will" — a confession which Jacobi adds, he repeated in several succeeding conversations.[1] Hence the introductory remarks to his comments on the famous extracts from the "Wolfenbüttel Fragments", are deficient in decision and directness; they are indeed so equivocal and admit so decidedly the possibility of an orthodox interpretation that many of the most distinguished protestant divines expressed their assent and obligation. He proceeded, with regard to these Fragments, so cautiously, or rather so artfully, that although they are known to be the productions of Hermann Samuel Reimarus, with whom he had been personally acquainted at Hamburgh, and from whose daughters (Johanna et Elisa) he had obtained the manuscript or the permission to copy it,[2] he published them as the work of some unknown writer, pretended to have found them in the library of Wolfenbüttel, and declared "they had for a long time covertly circulated in lower Saxony, had passed from one province to another, and made in secret more proselytes than it would win in the face of an opposing world." In order to mystify the public still more completely and to remove every possible trace of discovery, he not only, by a pretended conjecture, attributed the authorship to J. L. Schmidt, the heretical translator of Wertheim's Bible,[3] but he accompanied each fragment with apologetic remarks and refutations "such as could be expected from a good Christian who is no professed theologian";[4] and in thus lending the weight of his authority to support the errors which his whole life was avowedly devoted to oppose, he cannot be said to have acted either with manly candour or with far-sighted wisdom. But he generally avoided a clear expression of his opinions. In the course of his remarks,[5] which he later, one by one, defended against his opponent Goeze with the whole power and vehe-

[1] See *Fr. H. Jacobi*, Werke IV. i. pp. 54 *sqq.*, 79 *sqq.*, 89 *sqq.*; comp. Remarks on Lessing and his writings, in Goeschen's edition, vol. X. p. 358; and the fragment of Lessing's treatise, "Von der Wirklichkeit der Dinge ausser Gott", also "Das Christenthum der Vernunft"; comp. *H. Ritter*, Über Lessing's philosophische und religiöse Grundsätze (aus den Göttinger Studien, 1847), who, however, supposes that Lessing did not understand the teaching of Spinoza (pp. 5 *sqq.*), and attempts to lessen the points of similarity between both thinkers (pp. 8—19; comp. pp. 37—45, 51—53, 55 *sqq.*). Significant also are the words which, in his "Nathan", Lessing puts into the mouth of the judge to whom the dispute of the three brothers and their three rings was referred: "Eure Ringe sind alle drei nicht echt; der echte Ring vermuthlich ging verloren" (act III, scene 7).

[2] See *D. F. Strauss*, H. S. Reimarus und seine Schutzschrift für die vernünftigen Verehrer Gottes, Leipzig 1862, pp. 13—20.

[3] Works, IX. p. 40.

[4] See Works, IX. pp. 393, 394; comp. p. 242.

[5] Works, IX. pp. 48, 49.

mence of his dialectic ingenuity, he employs arguments hardly befitting a Spinozist who takes for his guiding principle ἓν καὶ πᾶν, and who renounces his free will, in the common sense of the word. The sceptical fragments, he says, might be met with many answers; but even if they should perplex the learned theologian, they cannot embarrass the Christian, for whom "Christianity exists, which he *feels* to be true, and in which he *feels* himself happy — in short the letter is not the spirit, and the Bible is not religion." What idea do these words, apparently so enlightened, convey to an unsuspecting reader? They can only mean that, though many doctrines of the Bible cannot be *proved*, they are nevertheless *true*; and hence it would follow that they are so natural and so entirely consonant with human reason and experience, that men will ever acknowledge them, even if the authority of Scripture were set aside or declared to be not final — a fallacy which has recurred in innumerable forms, and is still repeated at the present day.[1] But so ambiguous and indefinite are Lessing's remarks on this point, that it is difficult to discover his exact view. Hence he ventures the following observations. "The Bible obviously contains more than what immediately belongs to religion, and it is a mère conjecture to assert that, in the additional parts, it must be equally infallible . . . Christianity existed before the evangelists and apostles had commenced to write; . . . therefore, though all they wrote might again be lost, the religion they taught would yet remain. The Christian religion is not true because the evangelists and the apostles taught it; but they taught it because it is true; the written traditions must be explained from their internal truth; and religion, if it has no internal truth, cannot derive it from any number of written traditions."[2] We ask, in hopeless bewilderment, are these views orthodox, or are they sceptical? They sound so much like a defence of faith that their rationalism pales away into mere phraseology; and yet they seem so insinuating to rationalism, that faith withdraws in mistrust. Orthodoxy and scepticism might, with equal justice, claim the sentence triumphantly, "even if all that the evangelists and apostles wrote were lost again, the religion they taught would yet remain"; for orthodoxy might interpret it as a confession that the revealed truths can never be lost in all eternity, even if the revealed books should cease to exist or to be acknowledged; while scepticism might discover in it the admission that as human reason acted in conformity with its own dictates before any religious books were diffused, so it does not require them now that they exist, nor would it miss them if they disappeared. — But we shall not pursue any farther the tergiversations, of which Lessing's polemical writings on theology[3] are replete, and which we have noticed at such length only because the high respect which Lessing deservedly enjoys as a critic in matters of art, has misled many to attribute to him the same authority as a critic in matters of theology. Though he is infinitely superior to his opponent Goeze in dexterity of controversial argumentation and force of pointed satire, he is much inferior to him in consistency and simplicity, and we must add, in truthfulness; he appears to stand to him almost in the relation of the wolf and the lamb in that fable on which he has so beautifully and so appositely commented.[4] But would he have been so evasive in his reasoning, if he had lived nearly a century later?

---

[1] See *infra* sub Inspiration.

[2] Works, IX. p. 49.

[3] Works, X. pp. 1—134, 399—425.

[4] Many calm enquirers have, there-

### 5. Inspiration.

It would be needless, after the preceding remarks, to characterise minutely the term inspiration. Those who, in our age, persist in regarding it as a suggestion from some superhuman source, thereby forfeit the right of speaking in matters of historical research.[1] Inspiration is in reality nothing but intellectual or moral elevation of man himself striving to rise to the utmost greatness and purity of his nature; therefore the word, if employed at all, may with equal propriety be applied to the earnest and noble effusion of any gifted mind. The point has indeed been virtually surrendered even by orthodox divines. "A doctrine of inspiration", observes Tholuck, at the conclusion of his exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews,[2] "which assumes uniform correctness of the words of Scripture cannot be accepted in accordance with the results here obtained." "The treatment of the Bible according to the theory of literal inspiration", says Döllinger,[3] "would render every theology impossible"; and Stanley writes, "this doctrine of literal inspiration can henceforth no more be imposed on the English Church."[4] If there is a difference between the so-called "inspired" books of the Bible and "profane" works, it arises from the circumstance that the Scriptural canon includes, on the whole, such writings only as are either directly designed to elucidate religious doctrines, or are at least composed from a spiritual or theocratic point of view, and therefore may be considered in the light of religious text-books. But the Hebrew canon represents very imperfectly the wealth of the literature of the ancient Hebrews;[5] for its compilers, pursuing a special object, narrowed the scope of the collection to one particular class of writings,[6]

---

fore, commenced to question the justice of Lessing's unsparing severity towards Goeze, and could not but point out his inconsistency, if not his duplicity; comp. *Roepe*, Joh. Melch. Goeze, eine Rettung; *Ernst Köpke*, Studien zu Lessing's Nathan, p. 22 ("Goeze war es heiliger Ernst um die Orthodoxie, er vertheidigte dieselbe gegen eine neue Welt- und Lebensanschauung . . . mit ehrlichen Waffen und glaubenstreuem Ernste); *Carl G. W. Schiller*, Lessing im Fragmentenstreit, 1865; comp. however, *Schwarz*, Lessing als Theologe dargestellt; *Aug. Boden*, Lessing und Goeze; *Loebell* l. c. pp. 122—131 (who observes with partiality, that Goeze "became notorious and proverbial as the type of a narrow, haughty and contentious faith according to the letter").

[1] On the received notion of inspiration see *De Wette*, Dogmatik. II. §§ 26a and b. [2] Erste Beilage zum Commentar des Hebräerbriefs, §§ 56, 57.

[3] The Church and the Churches, p. 162.

[4] *Stanley*, The Bible, its Form and its Substance, p. XVII; comp. also *J. Hannah*, The Relation between the Divine and Human Elements in Holy Scripture, in the notes to which work the literature of the subject will be found in sufficient completeness.

[5] On the lost works see Comm. on Genes. p. 85.

[6] Comp. *Spinoza*, Tr. theol. pol. X. 43, Ex quibus facile colligimus ante

though they were not quite consistent in their plan, for they admitted several portions entirely "profane" in tendency, as the erotic "Song of Solomon" and the worldly forty-fifth Psalm.[7] Hence it follows, on the one hand, that Hebrew literature was at once more varied and less severe as would appear from the Hebrew canon; and on the other hand, that the works allowed to form a part of the collection possess, even in doctrinal matters, no higher authority than they deserve on a critical examination of their contents. But in this respect we observe two different stages. Some admit historical errors and internal discrepancies in the Bible, and hence refuse to accept the *facts* and *narratives* which it contains, yet they maintain the immutable and eternal truth of the Biblical *doctrines* and *dogmas*, and look upon them as indispensable and all-sufficient for happiness, wisdom, and salvation; they attribute, therefore, to the Bible still a Divine or supernatural origin, and declare that the doctrines, and not the facts, were the end of revelation. Others again believe that the manifest historical errors of the Bible indeed compel us to ascribe to it an ordinary human authorship; but they nevertheless hold or would seem to hold that the spiritual and religious views laid down in the Scriptures, are the highest and purest at which human reason is able to arrive in its search after truth, and that they must, therefore, be for ever adhered to as the standard of faith. We do not know which of the two views deserves the palm of inconsistency. If one part of a book, however subordinate that part is supposed to be, abounds with errors, the book is not infallible, and cannot, therefore, be considered Divine; but it is an unfounded assumption that the portions of the Bible which contain narratives are unessential; it is a misconception of the spirit of the Scriptures, to regard, for instance, the account of the Creation, of the Flood, or the wanderings of the Israelites in the desert, as collateral or indifferent; the Bible itself makes no distinction between important and unimportant parts; it insists, on the contrary, that no single word ought to be added or taken away;[8] either the whole of the Bible is Divine or the whole is not Divine; any intermediate opinion is a feeble and

---

tempus Machabaeorum nullum canonem sacrorum librorum fuisse, sed hos quos jam habemus, a Pharisaeis secundi templi ... prae multis aliis selectos esse et ex solo eorum decreto receptos.

[7] The typical acceptations of bridegroom and bride as Christ and the Church, are vain and hopeless attempts to bring those productions within the pale of spiritual teaching; on the "Song of Solomon" see, besides many works of continental critics which it is unnecessary here to enumerate, the excellent treatise of *W. Houghton*, An Essay on the Canticles, 1865; comp. also *Ginsburg*, the Song of Songs, Introduction.

[8] Comp. Deut. IV. 2.

unavailing compromise, whether arising from insincerity or from a conviction too timid to follow out its own consequences. On the other hand, if the Scriptures are the work of human reason, it is difficult to understand, why human reason should never be able to pass beyond them, and write something more perfect; it is against all historical evidence to assume that man reached some thousands of years ago the utmost degree of enlightenment of which he is capable, and that ever afterwards his only task consists in preserving and protecting the intellectual treasures then discovered; this we repeat is untrue; for we know that man has, since those times, immeasurably advanced in every valuable acquirement; that he has in particular made marvellous progress in those branches of knowledge which disclose the depths of the human mind and the mechanism of the universe, in *philosophy* and *the natural sciences;* and that even now he feels he has scarcely mastered more than the rudiments of either; as men wrote the books of the Bible, so men can, at subsequent periods, write books that surpass the Bible; and later again, works superior to the books that surpass the Bible; and till the genius of mankind is degenerated or exhausted, every following generation will attempt to outstep the efforts of anterior ages.

### 6. Prophecy.

The gift of prophecy which all ancient nations attributed to elected favourites of the deity,[1] is again nothing else but the gift of human reason and judgment, striving to penetrate through the veil of the future, and hence naturally liable to error. We are far from denying the peculiar importance and the most blissful influence of the Hebrew "prophets"; they were the ever movable element of Israel's religious training; they counteracted, and for a long time successfully, that stagnation which the growth of the Levitical spirit threatened to produce; they fought with undaunted courage against the narrowness of the priesthood, and often against the presumption of kings; they vindicated the rights of the spirit against the rigid lifelessness of formulas, and of morality and virtue against the encroachments of ritualism and the dogma; they appealed with fervour and glowing eloquence to the hearts and consciences, not to the fears and prejudices of their hearers; they loved their country with almost enthusiastic patriotism; uplifted by the feeling of a higher impulse and assistance, they were enlightened

[1] Comp. *Cic.* De Divin. I. 51 (profecto hominibus a diis futura significari necesse est) and 38 (si sunt dii neque ante declarant hominibus quae futura sunt, aut non diligunt homines, aut quid eventurum sit ignorant, aut existimant nihil interesse hominum scire quid futurum sit etc.); on the Biblical notion of prophecy see *De Wette*, Dogmatik, II. § 246.

teachers in religion, and clear-sighted counsellors in politics; these objects — the purification of faith, the improvement of morals, and the advancement of national prosperity — constituted their chief mission; prediction of the future was only their subordinate function; the erroneous translation of the Hebrew word נָבִיא by *prophet*, while it means "overflowing speaker", has frequently caused its innermost import to be misunderstood and distorted; for it raises the accessory activity to almost exclusive importance. The prophets of the Hebrews, high-minded and unselfish, unequalled as a class in singleness of motive and purity of enthusiasm, in intrepidity and perseverance, practical experience and literary ability, deserve indeed the superiority over those of any other nation; they showed, moreover, greater sagacity in the delineation of future occurrences, since they were mostly political characters, moving in the very current of public life; but they were not the less fallible; their activity was absolutely tied to the ordinary limits of the human mind; and therefore, they occasionally predicted events which either were not fulfilled at all, or happened in a different manner and form. Thus Amos[2] foretold, "Jeroboam shall die by the sword and Israel shall surely be led away captive out of their own land"' whereas the historical account relates "that he slept with his fathers and Nadab his son reigned in his stead."[3] Jeremiah[4] prophesied of king Jehoiakim, that "he shall be buried in the burial of an ass, and drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem";[5] but history tells us that "he slept with his fathers."[6] Again, Jeremiah[7] foretold concerning the Edomites, that all their towns would be given up to eternal desolation,[8] that in fact their whole territory would be converted into a dreary, uninhabited desert, the horror and mockery of all strangers, like Sodom and Gomorrah,[9] and that they themselves would be carried away by Nebuchadnezzar like helpless lambs;[10] and gloomy predictions of a similar nature, likewise suggested by deep and implacable hatred,[11] were pronounced by Ezekiel,[12] Obadiah,[13] and other writers.[14] Now the Edomites were indeed subjugated by the Babylonians,[15] and suffered considerable injuries;[16] but they remained in their land; they succeeded even in appropriating to themselves a part of

---

[2] VII. 11. [3] 1 Ki. XIV. 20.
[4] XXII. 18, 19. [5] Comp. XXXVI. 30.
[6] 2 Ki. XXIV. 6; comp. 2 Chron. XXXVI. 6. [7] XLIX. 7—22.
[8] Ver. 13. [9] Vers. 17, 18.
[10] Ver. 20; comp. Lam. IV. 21.
[11] Comp. Ps. CXXXVII. 7; Ezek. XXXV. 5.
[12] XXXV. 3, 4, 6—9, 14, 15; XXV. 12—14. [13] Vers. 5, 9, 10, 18.
[14] Joel IV. 9; Am. I. 11; Isai. XXXIV. 5—15; LXIII. 1—6.
[15] Jer. XXXVII. 3, 6 (comp. the observations of Hitzig in the "Exegetisches Handbuch" *in loc.*).
[16] Mal. I. 3, 4; Ezek. XXXII. 29.

southern Judea including Hebron,[1] which was, therefore, frequently called Idumea; they took an active part in the Maccabean wars,[2] in the course of which they were compelled by John Hyrcanus (about B. C. 130) to adopt the rite of circumcision, and were incorporated in the Jewish commonwealth.[3] Ezekiel promised the political re-union of the empires of Israel and Judah,[4] which has never been realised. The total destruction of Gaza is repeatedly predicted in distinct terms;[5] yet the town exists to the present day. The coincidences are certainly much more numerous than the failures; but the prophecies were commonly pronounced in general, and often in vague terms; the poetical elevation and the rhetorical emphasis with which they were set forth, were even unfavourable to nice accuracy; precise details were avoided, names of persons never mentioned,[6] and dates usually stated in round numbers,[7] or altogether omitted.[8] Moreover, many professed prophecies are in reality nothing but history in the form of prophecies; they were composed after the events to which they relate; for ancient writers, especially if wishing to furnish a comprehensive survey of the past, or to endow national institutions with a higher authority, were accustomed to make pious and renowned men of earlier ages pronounce the *facts* as *prophecies,* which, however, were desired by the authors to be regarded as real predictions of the men to whom they ascribed them — a style of writing which recommends itself by impressive solemnity, and to which Hebrew literature owes some of its finest and choicest compositions.[9] Besides, the Bible teaches that

---

[1] 1 Macc. V. 65; comp. Ezek. XXXVI. 5.

[2] 1 Macc. V. 3, 65; 2 Macc. X. 15—18; XII. 32—36.

[3] Comp. *Joseph.* Antiqq. XIII. ix. 1; XV. vii. 9; etc., comp. *Gesen.* Comm. über den Jesaia, I. pp. 906—909.

[4] Ezek. XXXVII. 22.

[5] Am. I. 6, 7; Jerem. XLVII. 1 *sqq.* Zeph. II. 4; comp. Zech. IX. 5. Other instances of unfulfilled or imperfectly fulfilled prophecies, see *Knobel*, Der Prophetismus der Hebräer, I. 303 *sqq.; Bohlen*, Genesis, Einleit., pp. CXXXII. CXXXIII; though some passages (as Jer. XLIII. 8—13; XLVI. 13—26; XLIV. 30) have often been unjustly quoted (so by *De Wette*, Einleitung in d. A. T. § 204; *Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, pp. 489—492); so also Jer. XXII. 28—30 compared with LII. 31—34, and 2 Ki. XXV. 27—30 (see *Spinoza*, Tr. theol. pol. X. 38).

[6] The mention of Cyrus (כֹּרֶשׁ) by the second Isaiah at once betrays and proves the real time in which this author lived and wrote.

[7] As *seventy* or *forty*; comp. Isai. XXIII. 15, 16; Jer. XXV. 11, 12; XXIX. 10; Dan. IX. 24; Ezek. XXIX. 11—13.

[8] Comp. Jer. XLVI. 26; XLIX. 6, 39; Isai. II. 2; etc.

[9] As Gen. IX. 25—27; XXVII. 27—29, 39, 40; XLVIII. 14—20; XLIX. 1—27; Num. XXIII. 7—10, 18—24; XXIV. 3—9, 15—24; Deut. XXXIII; 1 Sam. II. 30—36; comp. Lev. XXVI; Deut. XXVIII; comp. also *Virg.* Aen. VI. 756—892; Ecl. IV; *Eurip.* Hec. 1259—1281; *Hor.* Od. I. xv; see Comm. on Genes. pp. 720—722.

false prophets may utter predictions which God allows to be realised in order to try the Hebrews whether they love Him with all their hearts;[10] and to crown the confusion, the truthful or fraudulent nature of prophecies given in the name of Jehovah, was according to the Law to be tested by their realisation; predictions proclaimed in the name of Jehovah but not justified by the event, were regarded as criminal deceptions to be punished by the death of the impostor:[11] thus the practical value of prophecies as such was extremely precarious and almost nugatory. In short, the belief in prophecy has the same origin as the doctrines of revelation and inspiration — namely, the impossible supposition that the deity enters into a direct and personal intercourse with some men specially chosen.[12]

But these notions are, moreover, the source of other errors, widely diffused in ancient times, and also shared and recognised by the authors of the Scriptures — the faith in *oracles* and *dreams*. Minds unaccustomed to independence and self-reliance, and untrained in tracing cause and effect, were led to suppose that, in perplexing situations, they might be enlightened and guided by an immediate communication from the deity, whether this were conveyed through the medium of a person, or through the instrumentality of a consecrated object. Who can contemplate, without grief and pity, the fraud and the mischief necessarily caused by so irrational a belief? The most important private and public enterprises were made dependent on the heart or liver of a sacrificial animal, on the smoke or flame of the fire on the altar, on the flight or cry of birds, the movement of serpents, or the neighing of horses, on the figures formed in the water of a goblet, on lightning or an eclipse of the sun or moon, on comets and meteors, on the position of rods or arrows thrown on the ground, the decision of lots, the persons first seen or met in the morning or just after deliberating on some enterprise, and on thousand similar chances which possessed no conceivable connection with the matter at issue, and the interpretation of which was left to the shrewdness or cunning of the official expositors. Soothsaying became a trade, and the soothsayers were used as tools of the powerful, if they did not serve their own avarice or ambition.[13] Auguries often checked the most promising, and encouraged the most pernicious schemes. Oracles were consulted for private and for public purposes; and they not seldom helped to produce the effects

---

[10] Deut. XIII. 4; comp. Ezek. XIV. 9.

[11] Deut. XVIII. 20—22.

[12] What Riehm (Stud. und Krit. 1865, pp. 14 *sqq.*) remarks on the character of Biblical prophecy is as vague and unsatisfactory as the whole "theology of mediation", whose champion he is.

[13] *Soph.* Ant. 1055 (*τὸ μαντικὸν γὰρ πᾶν φιλάργυρον γένος*); comp. Num. XXII. 7; 1 Sam. IX. 7, 8.

**which they predicted. Now, the Bible forbids indeed to consult on the future the *heathen* gods or their ministers,[1] or to indulge in divination, magic, or necromancy,[2] but it unreservedly sanctions oracles requested of the God of the Hebrews[3] through the prophets[4] or by the Urim and Thummim,[5] or granted by dreams[6] or by lot.[7]**

---

**Let us now try to sum up the result of the preceding remarks. It is not sufficient to appeal from the letter of the Bible to its spirit; indeed the one "kills", but even the other is no longer life and truth to us. The spirit of the Bible is not the spirit of our time; it is not the light that illumines our path or points to our goal.**

**Many suppose they have removed all difficulties by urging that religion is to be separated from philosophy; that "there exists between both neither community nor relationship",[8] because, as they contend, one aims at obedience and piety, the other at truth, and the foundations of the former are Scripture and revelation, of the latter nature and general notions; that the Bible is not intended to teach science,[9] and condemns disobedience but not ignorance;[10] that therefore all speculation which does not directly make men obey God, whether it relates to the knowledge of God or the knowledge of natural things, does not concern Scripture and is to be kept apart from revealed religion.[11] But we adjure those who adopt this view of Bacon, Spinoza, and others, to weigh its true scope and tendency. What, in the name of truth, is left for religion to**

---

1 2 Ki. I. 3, 6, 16; 2 Chr. XXV. 20.

2 See *supra* p. 401.

3 דרש את־יהוה or דרש ביהוה, see Comm. on Exod. XXVIII. 30.

4 1 Sam. IX. 9; 1 Ki. XXII. 5 *sqq.*; 2 Ki. III. 11; VIII. 8; XXII. 13, 14; 2 Chr. XVIII. 4 *sqq.*; Ezek. XIV. 7; comp. Judg. XVIII. 5, 6.

5 Num. XXVII. 21; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 6; Ezra II. 63; Neh. VII. 65; comp. Comm. on Exod. pp. 540—545.

6 Num. XII. 6; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 6; Joel III. 1; etc.; comp. Comm. on Genes. pp. 644—646; see also *Feuerbach*, Ursprung der Götter, pp. 264—272; etc.

7 Josh. VII. 14—18; XIV. 2; Josh. XIX. 51; XXI. 4 *sqq.*; 1 Sam. X. 20, 21; XIV. 40—42; comp. Num. XXXI. 30, 46; Jon. I. 7; 1 Chr. XXIV. 6 *sqq.*; Prov. XVI. 33 ("the lot is cast into the lap, but all its decision comes from the Lord"); XVIII. 18; see also Judg. I. 1; 1 Sam. X. 22; XXII. 10, 13, 15; 2 Sam. II. 1; V. 19, 23, 24.

8 *Spinoza*, Tract. theol. pol. XIV. 37, inter fidem sive theologiam et philosophiam nullum esse commercium nullamve affinitatem.

9 *Spinoza*, l. c. XIII. 7, novimus Scripturae intentum non fuisse scientias docere.

10 *Spin.* l. c.

11 *Spinoza*, l. c. XIII. 18; comp. Praef. § 24; II. 58; XI. 22; XIV. 5 (simulque fidem a philosophia separare quod totius operis praecipuum intentum fuit); XV. 21 (nec theologia rationi, nec ratio theologiae ancillari tenetur, sed unaquaeque suum regnum obtinet), 43; comp. also *De Wette*, Das Wesen des christl. Glaubens vom Standpunkt des Glaubens dargestellt, p. 308; Über Religion und Theologie, *passim*; *Hagenbach*, Encyclopädie und Methodologie, § 28.

achieve, if it renounces to teach the knowledge of God and the knowledge of natural things? How can it satisfy man's nature, and be to him all in all, if it disregards and leaves untouched his most essential interests? how can it claim to direct vigorous and intelligent minds, if it excludes *truth* from its sphere, overlooks *nature,* and banishes from its doctrines *general notions?* If it is declared that it is not the business of religion to enquire what is God, "whether Fire, Mind, Light, Thought, or anything else, or to examine in what sense God is the prototype of true life, whether because He has a just and merciful heart, or because all things exist and act through Him, and man therefore also thinks through Him and discerns through Him what is right and good, for it is indifferent what everyone sets forth on these matters"; if, more questionably still, it is asserted, that faith is in no way concerned whether people believe "that God is omnipotent by virtue of His essence or of His power, whether He governs all things by liberty or the necessity of nature, whether He prescribes laws as ruler or teaches them as eternal truths, whether man obeys God from liberty of will or from the compulsion of a Divine decree, and whether the reward of the good and the punishment of the wicked is natural or supernatural in its mode":[12] if, we repeat, religion admits such principles, it works its own destruction; it can have no importance for man, if it eschews his deepest and most sacred problems. Viewed in this manner, religion and philosophy are not sisters, but are forced to become deadly rivals. The separation of both does not involve their conciliation but their hostile opposition. That fatal division bears the guilt of the unhappy confusion which convulsed many centuries. Safety and peace do not lie in the contrast but in the union, or rather in the identity of both.[13] Truth is one and indivisible. It is a paradox to assume a religious truth in contradistinction to a philosophical truth. Faith has no power and no reality, unless it flows from our rational conviction and is at one with it; and our philosophy is imperfect, sterile, and unprofitable, unless it leads to a "religious" life, that is, a life of love and justice, of gladness and active benevolence. Philosophy and religion must henceforth not mark out two different provinces, but two chief divisions of the same province; the joint aim of both is truth and moral excellence; and while philosophy strenuously searches for principles and first

[12] *Spinoza*, l. c. XIV. 30, 31.

[13] Spinoza (l. c. XV. 43) speaks of the "absurda, incommoda et damna" which he maintains have accrued from the connection of both: but when has ever that connection existed? A review of all the horrors that have been perpetrated in the name of religion proves that they were possible only because religion did not concede due weight to reason. Comp. also *Fr. von Raumer*, Schwarz, Strauss, Rénan, pp. 11—15.

causes, religion applies and carries them out in practical life. And in as much as virtuous action is the ultimate aim of all human efforts, it matters little if we call philosophy the "handmaid" of religion, provided we remember that it is also its "torchbearer."

Those who assign distinct spheres to philosophy and religion, however sincerely disposed to acknowledge the rights of reason, unavoidably drift towards views very nearly approaching those traditional opinions which they meant to combat. Thus De Wette arrives at the conclusion, that as "we require a certain external unity and fundamental standard" of faith, it is indispensable "to recognise the authority of the confessions, in which Biblical interpretation finds a safe support" — which result is distinguished from the orthodox creed only by its vagueness; for the author does not desire to have the Bible explained "according to the letter", but "symbolically", that is so that the literal truth and accuracy of the Scriptural narratives may be denied and abandoned, provided the ideas they were intended to convey, are upheld and acknowledged.[1] The separation between form and thought in the Bible is indeed not only justified but imperative; but if the confidence in the correctness of the former is shaken, it is impossible to consider the latter as infallible, and therefore eternally unalterable.

Head and heart, reflection and life, are identical; true philosophy is by its nature and tendency practical; it does not only imply religious elements, but is itself religion.

Again, it is not enough to admit that there is in Scripture "a Divine and a human element", a phrase which recurs a thousand times in recent works of speculative theology;[2] the "human element" is a

---

[1] *De Wette*, Über Religion und Theologie, 2nd edit. p. 275, comp. pp. 162 *sqq.*; Dogmatik, II. §§ 116, 316. These and similarly untenable views are expressed, with increasing minuteness, in the later works of the same theologian, for instance, in his Lectures "Über die Religion", comp. Sect. V—VII; though with characteristic indecision he expresses opinions like these, "revelation and reason are not distinct from each other in essence" (Dogmat. II. § 25). Kant himself (l. c. pp. 145—154, 198, 299) is by supposed practical or political considerations misled to questionable concessions ("der Kirchenglaube wird am besten auf eine heilige Schrift gegründet", etc.).

[2] See, for instance, *Lee*, Inspiration of Holy Scripture, pp. 18 *sqq.*, 369, 505, 507, 510; *Westcott*, Introduction to the Study of the Gospel, pp. 10, 12, 14; *Birks*, The Bible and modern Thought, pp. 339, 475—485; *Arnold*, Sermons, I. 427; *Browne*, Aids to Faith, pp. 287, 290, etc.; *Ellicot*, Aids to Faith, p. 411; *Vaughan*, The Book and the Life, p. 108; *Thirwall*, Letter to Rev. Rowl. Williams, p. 62; *Tait*, The Word of God and the Ground of Faith, p. 31; Inspiration and Justification; *Hagenbach*, l. c. § 36; comp. *J. Hannah*, The relation between the Divine and human elements in Holy Scripture, Bampton Lectures for 1863, p. 4 et *passim;* comp. pp. 257—261; and many other treatises.

concession reluctantly wrung from reflecting minds by the implacable force of facts; but the concession is rendered illusory and worthless by the supposition of a Divine element, the conception and nature of which are above the capacity of man, and which is compatible with assertions like these, "the Holy Scriptures differ from every other book because they alone contain a guaranteed revelation, which lifts the veil, so far as needed, from both the earliest past and the remotest future, to disclose the motive, the sanction, and the law of man's labours, and because the Holy Spirit, which watched over the delivery of that revelation, filled the spirits of the writers with a more complete and pervading presence, than ever presided over the execution of a merely human work."[3] This passage contains as many errors as it does enunciations; the revelation embodied in Scripture is no more "guaranteed" than any other alleged supernatural communication; it is philosophically impossible and historically undemonstrable; it has taught men nothing reliable whether with regard to the history of his race, the origin of the universe, or the development of our planet; it can teach him nothing reliable with regard to his future; for prophecy is subject to error like every other human speculation; it "discloses the motive, the sanction, and the law of man's labours" from points of view which have been essentially modified by later convictions; and there is no "Holy Spirit" distinct from the intellect of man; the books which compose the Bible must, therefore, be measured by the ordinary standard of human faculties; and the result of an impartial survey will be that they possess indeed those peculiar merits which fitted them for religious guides during many generations, but that they are eclipsed by other works in historical value, in comprehensiveness of facts, in depth of philosophy, and accuracy of science. We may, then, well repeat the wish expressed by an earnest enquirer about two hundred years ago, "Jam autem felix profecto nostra esset aetas si ipsam etiam ab omni superstitione liberam videremus."[4]

It is true, in a certain sense, that "opinions taken absolutely without regard to actions involve neither piety nor wickedness, but that a man has a pious or an impious belief, only in so far as his opinions move him to obedience, or afford him a pretext for sin and contumacy";[5] but, in the first place, the great question of our time does not simply relate to the practical results of faith, but at least as deci-

[3] *Hannah*, l. c. p. 228.

[4] *Spinoza*, l. c. XI. 24; though we are neither inclined nor justified to echo his complaint l. c. VIII. 3, at vereor ne nimis sero hoc tentare aggrediar; res enim eo jam ferme pervenit, ut homines circa hoc non patiantur corrigi...nec ullus locus rationi nisi apud paucissimos relictus videtur.

[5] *Spinoza*, l. c. XIII. 29.

dedly to its truth and intrinsic credibility; for else we should arrive at the paradox that in itself the darkest superstition is not objectionable; and in the second place, dearly bought experience teaches, that the only safe guarantee of practical virtue lies in the enlightenment of reason and the clearness of general notions; nay, that a mistaken obedience to a Law ostensibly Divine has led to the most execrable enormities which will for ever remain a stain and disgrace of mankind, to those excesses of horror and frenzy of which even Christianity was capable, such as the criminal burning of witches, the fiendish tortures of the inquisition, the bootless enthusiasm of the crusades, the sanguinary persecution of the Jews, and the insatiable cruelty of religious wars, because Christianity ventured to despise the majesty of reason, and cast it into the ignominious fetters of unintelligible dogmas: *tantum religio potuit suadere malorum.*[1] Hence there is an internal impossibility in the proposition, "whosoever, while believing the truth, becomes disobedient (that is, depraved), has in reality an impious faith, but whosoever, while believing falsehood, becomes obedient (that is, virtuous), has a pious faith";[2] or in the maxim, "not he shows the best faith who shows the best arguments of reason, but he who shows the best works of justice and charity":[3] up to a certain degree and under certain circumstances, simplicity of heart may indeed exercise virtue and self-denial, but it is only the "true faith", that is, enlightened conviction or obedience to reason, which *ensures* the practice of excellence and goodness in all relations of life; and, as a rule, those will show the best works of justice and charity, who can show the best arguments of reason. It is, therefore, not only an erroneous but also a most dangerous opinion, "faith requires pious doctrines rather than true ones, and though there be among them many which have not even a shadow of truth, they are harmless, provided that he who adopts them is not aware that they are false."[4] For without truth genuine piety is impossible.[5] The root of error and falsehood cannot bring forth fruits of righteousness and benevolence. Error, though believed to be truth, necessarily manifests its fatal traces in acts and thoughts. Indeed, our faith will be more perfect, and our life more righteous, more honourable and more useful, the farther we advance in true knowledge.

Religion must become a reality in life; it can become one only if it is *understood;* if it buds forth from our own reflection and feeling;

---

[1] *Lucret.* I. 101.

[2] *Spin.* l. c.; comp. XIV. 16; ex quibus iterum sequitur, nos neminem judicare posse fidelem aut infidelem esse nisi ex operibus.

[3] L. c. XIV. 33.

[4] L. c. XIV. 20 *sqq.*

[5] Actiones quae quasi proles aut fructus intellectus et sanae mentis sunt, l. c. IV. 20.

if it is neither above nor below our nature; if it is neither founded upon mystic speculation, nor stained by the low impulses of selfishness and pride. It must, therefore, on the one hand, repudiate all unintelligible and sterile notions, like revelation, inspiration, and prophecy, and renounce uncertain traditions, imaginary narratives, and lifeless ceremonies; but it must, on the other hand, foster the purest and highest virtues of the human heart, and must lead to an active life of devotion, love, self-control, and cheerful sacrifice; and this blissful feeling of abnegation and useful work must be regarded as the only precious reward to be coveted. The writers of the Bible not unfrequently express this aim with force and beauty; it may suffice to insert a few of these utterances, as it is impossible to adduce all. "God has shown thee, o man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of thee, but to act justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God"?[6] — "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glories glory in this, that he understands and knows Me, that I am the Lord who exercises loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness on the earth; for in these things I delight."[7] — "But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no law."[8] — "All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them; for this is the Law and the prophets."[9] — "All the Law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."[10] — "Love is the fulfilling of the Law."[11] — „Let us love one another; for love is of God, and every one that loves is born of God and knows God; he that loves not knows not God, for God is love . . . If we love one another God dwells in us and His love is perfected in us . . . he that dwells in love dwells in God and God in him."[12] These and similar principles form the eternal and indestructible kernel of the Bible; they are the secret of its intellectual conquests and its civilising power; they contain indeed the germs of the universal faith, and every progress in religion must be marked by their

---

6 Mic. VI. 8. 7 Jer. IX. 22, 23.
8 Gal. V. 22, 23. 9 Matth. VII. 12.
10 Galat. V. 14; comp. Mark XII. 29—34; see Deut. IV. 5; Lev. XIX. 18.
11 Rom. XIII. 8, 10.
12 1 John IV. 7, 8, 12, 16; comp. also Psalm. XV. 1—5; XXIV. 3—6; Isai. LVIII. 6—8; Jer. XXII. 16; Galat. V. 6 ("faith which works by love" alone avails), 13; etc.; see especially Sect. IV; comp. *Spin.* l. c. XIV. 27, cultus Dei ejusque obedientia in sola justitia et caritate sive amore erga proximum consistit; see also IV. 12, 14, 15 (huc itaque nostrum summum bonum nostraque beatitudo redit, in cognitionem scilicet et amorem Dei); Praef. § 26, and various other passages.

zealous realisation in life. If they are taken as guides, the complaint will cease, that "men who boast to profess the Christian religion, that is, love, joy, peacefulness, moderation, and fidelity against all, wrangle with reckless harshness, and daily vent against each other the bitterest hatred, so that from these contentions rather than from those virtues the creed of each is discernible."[1] For "what does it profit, though a man say he has faith, and have not works? can faith save him?... Faith if it has not works, is dead, being alone... You see then, that by works a man is justified and not by faith only."[2] Yet all these beautiful fruits of religion are safe and reliable only, if that faith is derived from the light of man's own mind; to be practically efficient, it must be the result of his own reflection, experience, and individuality; it will help to extend the empire of charity and morals on earth, not if it is handed down to him from the distant past and from different ages, but if it is the creation of his own nature, of his own wants, and his own ideals.

The views here propounded may create, in some minds, a twofold apprehension — first, of a confounding diversity of religious creeds, and secondly, of intellectual intolerance and persecution. But in every essential point, the religious convictions of all will be identical or kindred; for they follow from the essence of human nature, which is virtually the same under all zones and all conditions of existence[3] — everywhere the like aspirations, hopes, and endeavours, the like spiritual needs and efforts;[4] and however varied the speculations, practical morality tends invariably to the same end. And as regards intellectual toleration, nothing is so certain to lead to modesty, humility, and forbearance, than honest research; for every step manifests the limits of

---

[1] *Spin.* l. c. Praef. § 14; comp. XIV. 19 (atque ex his iterum sequitur eos revera antichristos esse qui viros honestos et qui justitiam amant persequuntur propterea quod ab ipsis dissentiunt et cum ipsis eadem fidei dogmata non defendunt: qui enim justitiam et caritatem amant, eos per hoc solum fideles esse scimus; et qui fideles persequitur antichristus est).

[2] James II. 14, 17, 20, 24; comp. Galat. V. 6; see, however, Rom. III. 27, 28; comp. 1 John II. 3—5.

[3] It is well known that the Dahomans and most negro races consider their supreme deity *Man* as too sublime to take notice of humble mankind, and therefore neither love nor fear him, and do not conceive him in an anthropomorphic spirit. "Thus", observes Burtón (Mission to Gelele, II. 136), "so easily do extremes meet, and such is the radical identity of creeds, that the negro's deity, if disassociated from physical objects, would almost represent the idea of the philosopher."

[4] Comp. *Spinoza*, l. c. XIV. 22, cum nemo dubitet commune hominum ingenium varium admodum esse, nec omnes in omnibus aeque acquiescere, sed opiniones diverso modo homines regere... hinc sequitur, ad fidem catholicam sive universalem nulla dogmata pertinere, de quibus inter honestos potest dari controversia; comp. § 23, and similar principles.

our knowledge; and if the wisest has finished his labours, he knows only that he "knows nothing", and — to use a well-known simile of one of England's greatest philosophers — he feels that he resembles the child that gathers pebbles on the seashore, while the ocean of truth lies all unexplored before him.

Henceforth, therefore, we do not desire a religion of fear which is the fruit of delusion, but of love which flows from intelligence, not a religion of rigour which breeds servitude, but of joy which bears witness of the freedom of the mind and heart,[5] not a religion of contention which persecutes others by the haughty presumption of infallibility, but of peace which respects all honest convictions if they can but show works of charity and unselfish devotion. Above all reason, instead of being slighted and denounced as feeble, fallacious, perverse, and corrupted,[6] must be restored to its right and functions as the supreme tribunal; its light alone can dispel the darkness of folly, illusion, and pernicious superstition; without it, religion is barely more than "credulity and wretchedness." Occasionally even the Bible expresses a similar view;[7] yet it insists that the revealed Law alone is true wisdom and understanding.[8] For it avails little to proclaim reason as the highest judge in matters of religion, unless it is consistently treated and respected as such. Yet there is a class of honest thinkers who timidly take back with one hand what they had liberally conceded with the other. Thus it is declared that history is not itself religion, because it employs the purely intellectual and critical, and none of the moral and spiritual faculties, and because thus the Intellect, and not the Soul, would be the first authority in religion.[9] Nobody, we presume, has ever identified history and religion; but if religious influence is attributed to the study of history, it is not on account of the faculties employed in ascertaining the facts, but of those engaged in examining and fathoming the facts so ascertained; not the learned labour of historical criticism, but the philosophical use made of the results of

[5] Comp. Gal. V. 1 *sqq.*; *Spinoz.* l. c. IV. 1 *sqq.*

[6] Comp. *De Wette*, Dogmatik, II. § 31 *a*; *Hagenbach*, l. c. pp. 19 ("Der Verstand muss immer wieder in seine Schranken zurückgewiesen werden." "Der kurzsichtige Verstand reicht nicht hinan an die höchsten Vernunftideen"), 29 ("Die wahre Vernunft kann dem religiösen Gefühl nicht widersprechen, vielmehr gelangt dieses eben durch jene zum Bewusstsein"; which is approximately the true relation between reason and faith).

[7] Comp. Prov. II. 3—5; III. 13 *sqq.*; XVI. 22; 1 Cor. XIV. 20 (*μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε, ταῖς δὲ φρεσὶν τέλειοι γίνεσθε*); etc.

[8] Deut. IV. 5, 6; Prov. IX. 10 (תחלת חכמה יראת יהוה ודעת קדשים בינה); Job XXVIII. 28; etc.

[9] *F. P. Cobbe*, Broken Lights, pp. 141—143.

that criticism, is regarded as enlarging and elevating our views; and in this respect history, or the Intellect working for its pragmatic survey, is indeed not without a strong religious influence. Besides, the severe contradistinction between intellect and soul must be decidedly rejected, a contrast which produces the utmost confusion in the whole sphere of moral philosophy. The two notions do not exclude each other; for the true intellect includes soul; the intellect that does not include soul is defective and unsound; a well-balanced intellect cannot possibly act coldly, selfishly, or cruelly; it is noble, elevated, and gentle; it is conscious of its own boundaries, and, therefore, modest and humble; it knows too well what it owes to others to be otherwise than indulgent and charitable; an intellect which does not possess these attributes, hardly deserves the name, for it lacks its most essential characteristics. The apparent exceptions which are occasionally found, will, on close scrutiny, reveal some radical defect in the organisation of the mind or in the philosophical system it has worked out or adopted.

Not obedience to doctrines imposed by extraneous commands must be the rule of our actions, but freedom of will and choice, or obedience to our reason and our conscience. Not a number of books traditionally handed down, and singled out by fallible judgment from a large multitude of works, is the true source of religion, but the spirit of man which thirsts after truth, and the heart of man which yearns for love; the "word of God" was not heard merely during a limited period of human history; it has not been mute for thousands of years; it was proclaimed at all times when intelligence and moral excellence uttered their thoughts and aspirations; and it will be heard as long as the instinct to great and noble deeds lives in mankind. There is therefore great force and propriety in the following remark: "History is neither *likely* to be the source of our religious knowledge, nor actually *capable* of being satisfactorily established as such. Let us face this truth candidly. Let us renounce the false ground at once and for ever, and build as well as we may on what remains. True that with the claims of history we renounce the hope of obtaining an infallible creed. True that the Consciousness which remains for basis is often obscure and variable . . . Still, still we say, let it be done! It is worse and more dangerous to stand still than to go forward. If an historical Religion be built on the sand, the sooner we learn it, ere the storms beat it down and overwhelm us in its fall, the safer shall we be."[1] When the law is engraven on

[1] *Cobbe*, Broken Lights, p. 149. Comp. also *Arnold*, Sermons, pp. 485—492, "If ever they (discrepancies in the Bible) are brought before us, let us not try to

the tablets of the mind, it cannot be lost, it cannot be destroyed, it is living and working, and streams forth incessantly in deeds of charity and good-will.[2] If the voice of reason is hushed, man is certain to sink into idolatry; it matters little whether the idol is a figure of stone or a Book that petrifies the mind. That Book was sacred and Divine as long as it represented man's innermost emotions, and was honestly acknowledged by him as the chief guide of his life; it ceased to be sacred and Divine when it began to fall upon our minds with a strange accent, and reflected a world which we felt had passed away. We may still study it for understanding a most remarkable phase of human civilisation; we may cull from its pages many a practical and spiritual truth conveyed in language of unsurpassed sublimity; but, as a whole, it cannot edify us; it cannot fully uplift us to the height of our nature. It will always be cherished with gratitude and reverence as the educator of many generations and centuries; but it must yield the precedence to the new light, which the exploration of the forces of nature and the powers of the human mind have thrown upon the general economy of the world. Its blessing is changed into a bane if it presumptuously claims to be the sole legislator for all times; it has, in a great measure, at present fulfilled its mission; it can henceforth only be an individual element among numerous means of human culture. Aptly and truthfully observes Matthew Arnold,[3] "Dissolvents of the old European system of dominant ideas and facts we must all be, all of us who have any power of working; what we have to study is, that we may not be acrid dissolvents of it."

Yet many have argued, that the Bible with all its deficiencies ought to be maintained in authority for ever, because it offers great consolation to the less strong-minded,[4] is useful to the state, and can in no way be injurious to the believer; its truth can indeed not be proved, but this matters little, as most human actions are uncertain and full of fluctuations[5] — an opinion forsooth worthy of no philosopher, and least so of the author of the "Ethics geometrally demonstrated"; an opinion which necessarily involves the most serious errors, and

---

put them down unfairly ... Let us not do evil that evil may be escaped from; and it is an evil, and the fruitful parent of evils innumerable, to do violence to our understanding or to our reason in their own appointed fields, to maintain falsehood in the despite, and reject the truth which they sanction."

[2] Comp. Deut. XXX. 6; Jer. XXXI. 33; 2 Cor. III. 3 (*φανερούμενοι ὅτι ἐστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ᾽ ἡμῶν καὶ ἐγγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι, ἀλλὰ πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶ λιθίναις, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν πλαξὶ καρδίαις σαρκίναις*). [3] Essays in Criticism, p. 155.

[4] *Spinoza*, l. c. XV. 37, qui ratione non ita pollent.

[5] *Spinoza*, l. c. §§ 15, 22, 27, 37.

naturally led its framer to conclusions almost entirely destructive of his philosophical efforts; for he contends that "revelation" was most necessary because no man could, by the natural light of reason, have discovered the fundamental doctrine of theology; that man is saved by obedience alone without an intelligent knowledge of things;[1] and he ventures the most questionable remark, "all can absolutely obey, but there are, in proportion to the whole human race, but very few who can acquire the habit of virtue by the guidance of reason alone; therefore, we should, without the testimony of Scripture, despair of the salvation of most men":[2] not only does he sanction the dangerous opposition between revelation and reason, and attributes to the one powers which he denies to the other, but he adopts the obnoxious distinction between a creed for philosophers and a creed for the vulgar mass, as if that which is illusion and falsehood for the former could be truth and light for the latter. A belief which does not satisfy the most acute enquirer, can by honest men never be deemed sufficient for the simple-minded. Many pretend that the distinction is demanded by policy and expediency; but it is generally prompted by pride and arrogance, and always leads to hollowness and hypocrisy. And these characteristics are almost glaringly manifest in the singular observation, "the Law was given to those only who are devoid of reason and the supports of natural intelligence":[3] the pride lies in the assumed superiority over the great majority of men, and the hypocrisy in the ostensible profession of "revelation"; for if revealed truths were sincerely believed in, they would not, with evident contempt, be described as important for the silly only, but would be held to be valuable even for the most gifted.

Every man is, by his nature, subject to superstition, because he is by his nature subject to fear;[4] but by knowledge he must subdue fear and superstition; he must, on the one hand, rise to the consciousness of his dignity and power, and he must, on the other hand, modestly subordinate himself as a serving link of the universe, convinced that no evil can happen to him whatever happens to him as a member of universal creation.[5] But how does he rise to his dignity? If his mind strives to penetrate into the first causes and the essence of things; if his heart conquers every passion and all base emotions; if his actions, guided by love, aim at promoting the welfare of mankind, or of that part of it with which his destiny is connected. Therefore, TRUTH, VIRTUE,

[1] L. c. §§ 22, 27, 44. [2] L. c. § 45.

[3] Nam ea-lex-iis tantum tradita est qui ratione et naturalis intellectus documentis carent.

[4] Comp. *Feuerbach*, Vorlesungen über das Wesen der Religion, pp. 31—39.

[5] In his magnificent inaugural Address as Rector of St. Andrews University,

and ACTIVE LOVE — these three form the creed of the Future, but the greatest of these is TRUTH;[6] for enlightenment leads to self-control and to self-denying deeds; knowledge alone is able to keep man on the path of moderation and thoughtfulness, and thus to secure, through virtue, his inward peace and happiness.

---

delivered on Febr. 1, 1867, John Stuart Mill describes history as "a chain of causes and effects still unwinding itself before the student's eyes, and full of momentous consequences to himself and his descendants; the unfolding of a great epic or dramatic action, to terminate in the happiness or misery, the elevation or degradation of the human race; an unremitting conflict between good and evil powers, of which every act done by any of us, insignificant as we are, forms one of the incidents; a conflict in which even the smallest of us cannot escape from taking part, in which whoever does not help the right side is helping the wrong, and for our share in which, whether it be greater or smaller, and let its actual consequences be visible, or in the main invisible, no one of us can escape the responsibility" (pp. 68, 69).

[6] Comp. 1 Cor. XIII. 13, *μένει πίστις ἐλπὶς ἀγάπη . . . μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη*. All that has been said against *knowledge* or against *action* in matters of religion, is unsatisfactory(comp. e. g. *Hagenbach*, l. c. pp. 20 and 21—24); comp. John XIII. 17 (*εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοί ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε αὐτά*).

# A. FIRST CODE.

## Chapters I to V.

### 1. THE BURNT-OFFERING (עֹלָה).

## CHAPTER I.

SUMMARY.—God speaks to Moses from the Tabernacle, and communicates to him the laws of the *Burnt-offering* (עֹלָה), which is to consist of male cattle, whether bullocks, sheep, or goats (vers. 1—13), or of fowls, whether turtle-doves or young pigeons (vers. 14—17). If the victim is a quadruped, it is to be burnt entirely on the altar, with the exception of the hide (VII. 8), while the blood is sprinkled on the altar round about; if it is a bird, the head and then the rest of the body are to be burnt, except the crop and its contents, while the blood is pressed out along the side of the altar.

1. And the Lord called to Moses, and spoke to him

1—9. All the Israelites, both men and women, had, with readiness and zeal, co-operated in the completion of the holy Tabernacle; the skilful rejoiced in being permitted to bestow upon it their talents, and the wealthy contributed the costly and multifarious materials (Exod. XXXV. 5—11, 21—29); till at last the offerings were far too abundant even for that magnificent structure, and their discontinuance was enjoined by a public proclamation (XXXVI. 5—7). Every detail was so scrupulously executed in accordance with the Divine command, that Moses felt induced to pronounce a blessing upon the pious people (XXXIX. 43). The time had arrived for arranging the component parts and erecting the edifice. The first day of Nisan, in the year after the Israelites' departure from Egypt, was appointed for the task (XL. 2, 17). In systematic order, and under the direct supervision of Moses, the labour was performed. First the external framework of the Tabernacle was joined together: the boards of acacia wood, twenty on the northern, as many on the southern, and eight on the western side, were fixed in the ground by means of tenons and silver sockets, two for each board; the poles of acacia wood covered with gold were fitted in five golden rings fastened at the outside of the boards, to render the structure conveniently portable during journeys; the four pillars of acacia wood overlaid with gold, at the eastern side of the Holy of Holies, and the five at the entrance of the Holy, were duly fastened by hooks and sockets (XL. 18); and the beautiful hanging of twined byssus, and blue, red, and crimson, with figures of the Cherubim woven upon it, was suspended by small hooks within the Tent, forming the ceiling, and falling down on the sides; while the three other coverings of goats' hair, of rams' skins, and of badgers' skins, were spread over it from without, partially reaching down to the ground to protect the gold-coated acacia boards against the injury of the weather (ver. 19). The exterior having thus

**out of the Tent of Meeting, saying, 2. Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them, If anyone of you bring an offering to the Lord, you shall bring your offering of the cattle, *whether* of the herd or of the flock.**

been reared, Moses put the holy implements in their prescribed places within. Beginning at the western extremity, he furnished the Holy of Holies with *the Ark of the Covenant*, not, however, before he had deposited therein the two tablets of the Law or "the Testimony", had also, for the purpose of transportation, drawn the two gilded staves of acacia wood, never again to be removed, through the four rings at its four feet, and had put the golden mercy-seat with the sacred figures of the Cherubim on its upper side. Then he closed the Holy of Holies by the splendid curtain which was suspended immediately under the loops and hooks of the first covering (vers. 20, 21). He next removed into the Sanctuary or Holy its three chief utensils — to the northern side, *the Shew-bread Table* of acacia wood overlaid with gold, with its enclosure and wreath, its golden rings and staves, and the golden vessels belonging to it, the dishes and bowls, the cans and cups, arranging upon it the shew-bread, twelve cakes in two rows, and probably adding the first frank-incense to be burnt upon them; to the southern side, opposite the Table, the magnificent *Candlestick*, weighing with its appendages one talent of gold, consisting of seven branches and seven lamps, beautifully ornamented with calyxes of almond flowers, apples or pomegranates, and blossoms; and between the Table and the Candlestick, just before the curtain of the Holy of Holies, the *Altar of Incense*, of acacia wood overlaid with gold, with its rings and staves. Then he fastened the vail which formed the entrance of the Sanctuary (vers. 22-28). Lastly he placed in the Court the *Altar of Burnt-offering*, of hollow boards of acacia wood covered with brass, and probably filled with earth, adding its vessels, the pots and shovels, the bowls and forks; and the *Laver* to the left of the altar, nearer the Sanctuary, made of brass, like the base on which it rested (vers. 29—32). And having fixed, by hooks and sockets, the fifty-six columns which marked the area of the Court round the Tabernacle, and fastened the hangings to the columns, and having, at the eastern side, suspended the curtain to serve as the entrance door, he could well consider the noble work as entirely completed and declare it ready for the sacred purposes which it was thenceforth destined to serve (ver. 33). In order to mark these purposes symbolically, he anointed both the whole structure and all principal utensils with the holy oil, and thus consecrated them (vers. 9—11; comp. Num. VII. 1; see p. 116); and as a sign and confirmation that the task had in every respect been accomplished in conformity with the Divine will, a heaven-sent cloud covered the edifice, and the glory of God filled it. Moses, unable to enter, remained before the Tabernacle, while God communicated to him His commands from within (vers. 34, 35; Lev. I. 1; see also notes on VIII. 1—5).

This is the connection intended between the second and third Book of the Pentateuch; it is plain and unforced, and its continuity is only once interrupted, at the conclusion of Exodus, by the insertion of a general notice, in harmony with the pragmatical nature of Biblical history (comp. Comm. on Exod. XL. 34—38). The narrative is indeed perfectly consistent with itself,

**3. If his offering *be* a burnt-sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish: he shall offer it at the door of the Tent of Meeting for his acceptance before**

and the *general* arrangement of the sections is logical and judicious (see Introduction § 1); for as the second Book concludes with the erection of the Tabernacle, the third fitly begins with commands concerning sacrifices and priestly functions, succeeded by civil and moral laws; and whereas previously the ordinances were issued from Mount Sinai (comp. Exod. XIX. 3; XXIV. 16), they were now, since Moses had descended from the mountain, proclaimed from the Tabernacle (Exod. XXXIV. 29; Lev. I. 1; comp. Num. I. 1; XII. 5; comp., however, *infra*); and the "Tent of Meeting", from where God promised to commune with Moses and the priests (Exod. XXV. 22; XXIX. 42—45; XXX. 6; Num. XVII. 19), was indeed appropriately made the scene of the proclamation, as it was to be the scene of the execution, of the sacerdotal precepts (Lev. I. 1). God had visibly manifested His love of Israel by filling the Sanctuary with His glory (Exod. XL. 34), and Israel was thenceforth to receive, from the same place, the injunctions by the observance of which they might preserve that love for ever; and these laws were addressed to all the children of Israel because they immediately concerned every member of the holy community (ver. 2).

But it is needless to point out the legendary character of the whole account. It contains many essential elements of religious fiction: God holds direct and personal intercourse with His servant Moses; He reveals to him orally all the details of a complicated sacrificial and sacerdotal service; He fills the Tabernacle with His glory so visibly that Moses is unable to enter. It is throughout pervaded by anthropomorphic notions utterly incompatible with the spiritual and incorporeal nature of the Deity. Therefore, the manner in which the sacrificial ordinances are set forth, deprives them necessarily of that higher authority, with which the author of Leviticus deemed it desirable to invest them. The stamp of Divine origin, claimed for all the laws and institutions, was considered pre-eminently important for those regulations which concerned the innermost centre of religious life, formed the chief national bond, and were designed to exhibit man in his most essential relations to God and his fellow-men, and to secure peace and purity of mind. Yet these laws, though not possessing the fictitious support of an alleged supernatural suggestion, deserve the most careful investigation; for they are the combined result of tradition and thought; they reflect, on the one hand, the sacrificial practice current among the Israelites in the compiler's time, or deemed by him possible and expedient; and they embody, on the other hand, a complete system of statutes thoughtfully deduced from the leading doctrines of Hebrew theology by earnest and cultivated minds; they have, therefore, at once a positive or historical, and a speculative or dogmatical importance; and though, in the former respect, their value can, of course, but vaguely and approximately be estimated, since our limited information does not permit us to determine the extent to which the author borrowed from the observances of his time, they are, in the latter respect, of singular interest, since they are connected with the very essence of the Hebrew creed, and allow us, by an impartial analysis, to compare the religious views of the Israelites with those of the other nations

the Lord. 4. And he shall put his hand upon the head

of antiquity. We have endeavoured in the preceding treatise, to examine the text under these various aspects.

The burnt-offerings aptly commence the sacrificial laws. First, they were probably the oldest form of sacrifice. In the next place, they had the very widest application, and could be presented by any person without distinction (אדם, ver. 2), a point which is the more significant as the offerer, sharing the sacred functions with the priests, had to perform several important parts of the ceremony himself. And lastly, though originally designed to convey merely the worshipper's awe and his unconditional submission to the Divine supremacy, they were, in the Levitical code, invested with the character of *atonement* (ver. 4), and were not only commanded on specified occasions, but left to the spontaneous impulse of the heart that yearns for peace and for the expiation of sins known to the transgressor alone. They were, therefore, meant to serve the highest ends of an inward religion. Thus modified, they marked a decided progress in the path of spiritual faith; they were, in fact, the fore-runners of the expiatory offerings, which form the very crowning point of the sacrificial system, and beyond which, even at the very next step, the mind leaves the fetters of the ceremonial law and enters the purer regions of freedom and elevation. Hence the Levitical holocausts lead us to a time when the deep-rooted tendencies towards pagan idolatry had been conquered, and the intellectual efforts of the more thoughtful and more gifted among the Hebrews had been rewarded by the establishment of a religious creed, which, however far removed from absolute truth, and however repugnant to the true attributes of the deity and the requirements of philosophy and reason, at least permitted the exercise of noble and exalted humanity, and even facilitated, more than any of the preceding and most of the later systems of theology, an insight into the moral government of the world, and the higher aims of human existence. Thus the very beginning of the Book reveals unmistakeably the time and purposes of its composition, and forms the first link in that great chain of evidence which leads to the most pregnant and most interesting historical results (pp. 43—46).

The nature and the development of the burnt-offering, as well as the occasions and ceremonies of its presentation, have been fully discussed in the previous treatise, to which we must refer on this and on every similar point of detail connected with Hebrew sacrifices (see pp. 234—241).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS.—The first chapter, which forms an integral part of the earliest collection of sacrificial laws (ch. I—III, see the Introduction), is evidently of a comparatively ancient date, at least in its original and fundamental form; the burnt-offering is repeatedly designated as "an offering made by fire of a sweet odour to the Lord" (אשה ריח ניחוח ליהוה, vers. 9, 13, 17), which anthropomorphic phrase suggests a distinct inference as regards the date (comp. pp. 7, 8); therefore, the words ונרצה לו לכפר עליו *it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him* (ver. 4), which point to the most advanced stage in the history of sacrifices, seem to be a later addition of the Jehovistic revisor, meant to form, as it were, a gloss to the preceding words לרצנו לפני יהוה (ver. 3), and to allude to the deeper and more spiritual meaning of holocausts. — The primitive date of this section is apparent from another circumstance. It is here stated, that,

**of the burnt-offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him. 5. And he shall kill the young bullock before the Lord: and the priests, Aaron's**

among various preparations for the holocaust, the priests "shall put fire upon the altar, and lay wood in order upon the fire" (ver. 7), whereas another passage ordains a perpetual fire to be kept on the altar (VI. 1—6), which would render such injunction superfluous. Our section must, therefore, not only have originated at a time when the sacrificial legislation was in its earlier phases, but it must have proceeded from an author who did not insist upon, if he at all entertained, the idea of a permanent fire, which requires a well-established sanctuary, and marks an advance in the organisation of public worship. Thus the manifest discrepancy may be accounted for, if it cannot be reconciled. The corresponding command in the twelfth verse is indeed worded as if a fire had previously burnt on the altar, "and the priest shall lay them in order upon the wood that is on the fire upon the altar"; but this verse is so worded merely in reference to the preceding passage (ver. 7), with which it is closely connected, and no doubt coincides in date and origin. — The opinion that the author here thinks of the *first* burnt-offering (*Knobel*, Comm. p. 358), is excluded by the tenour of the chapter which contains precepts altogether general in their application. — The subject יהוה belonging both to ויקרא and וידבר (in ver. 1) follows only after the second verb (comp. II. 2; VIII. 15; see our Hebrew Grammar, Part II, § LXXVI). The small א which the Masorah marks in ויקרא naturally leads to the conjecture that some old and valued copies of the Pentateuch read וַיִּקָּר, God *met* Moses or *appeared* to him (comp. Num. XXIII. 3, 4, 16). That the latter term was exclusively used with reference to heathen, and ויקרא with regard to Hebrew prophets, is a futile supposition (see *Rashi* on ver. 1; comp. Exod. III. 18).—Although the communications are here (as in Num. I. 1; XII. 5) stated to have been made from the "Tent of Meeting", they are, in other parts of Leviticus, mentioned to have been given "on Mount Sinai" (בהר סיני), in connections which prove that this term means the mountain itself, not the mountainous tract or the wilderness of Sinai (see esp. VII. 38; also XXV. 1; XXVI. 46; XXVII. 34; Num. III. 1), and therefore not the Tabernacle (Num. XXVIII. 6). It is hence evident that the author of the heading of the first code (I. 1), was not the author of the conclusion of the second (VII. 38; see Comm. *in loc.*). — אֲלֵהֶם (ver. 2) *to them*, written defectively for אֲלֵיהֶם; see Gramm. § XXX. 5. *b*; XXXIII. ii. 2. — The second verse, if compared with the fourteenth, contains an irregularity of construction which can only be satisfactorily explained by a supposition allowing us a welcome insight into the *genesis* of the chapter. For the second verse conveys the general remark, "If anyone of you bring an offering (קרבן) to the Lord, you shall bring your offering (קרבנכם) of the cattle, whether of the herd or of the flock", which, understood in the only way permitted by grammar and logic, evidently applies to *all* sacrifices, to which those words form a common introduction. We are, therefore, bound to conclude that quadrupeds alone were at first deemed sufficiently valuable to be admitted as animal sacrifices. But when experience taught that thus, as a rule, the poorer classes were excluded from the chief means of religious worship, from which they ought least of all to be debarred, turtle-doves and pigeons were also accepted, which, from their abundance

**sons, shall bring the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar that *is* by the door of the Tent of Meeting. 6. And one shall flay the burnt-offering,**

and cheapness, were within the reach of the most needy (see p. 80); hence regulations concerning holocausts of these birds were later added to the original code; and the fourteenth verse, beginning, "And if his offering to the Lord be a burnt-sacrifice of fowls", is illogical *in form*, because worded as if it stood in contradistinction to a preceding proposition — an anomaly the more readily to be explained as, in the revisor's time, the antithesis between עוף and בהמה existed *in fact*. All other interpretations do violence to the Hebrew text. For even if we deviate from the Masoretic accentuation, and take מן־הבהמה in verse 2 to be the protasis or first clause (as has been done by the Syriac version and Saadiah, by Geddes, Knobel, Keil, Bertheau, — Gruppen, p. 151 —, at one time by Rosenmüller — Schol. p. 8 —, and others), the difficulty is not much lessened, because the second verse treats of sacrifices in general, the fourteenth of burnt-offerings only; and it is impossible to take קרבן and קרבנכם, in ver. 2, in the latter or more restricted sense (Sept. correctly, δῶρα; Vulg. *hostiam*; Rashi, *freewill-offerings*, קרבנות נדבה; De Wette, *Opfergabe*); for it would be intolerably abrupt to introduce an entirely new subject with the words, "If any one of you bring a *burnt*-offering to the Lord of the cattle" etc. — According to Jewish expositors (as Abarbanel a. o.), the term אדם (ver. 2) includes even women and heathens.—That expressions like אדם כי־יקריב do not prove or imply the optional character of *all* sacrifices, has been pointed out above (pp. 55 *sqq.*). — The insertion of καὶ by the Septuagint, after מן־הבהמה, is entirely unauthorised. — לרצנו (ver. 3) is, obviously, *for his acceptance*, that is, for the worshipper's acceptance before God (comp. לרצון להם לפני יהוה, Exod. XXVIII. 38; see also Lev. XIX. 5; XXII. 29; XXIII. 11; Isa. LVI. 7; Jer. VI. 20), corresponding with ונרצה לו (ver. 4) *it shall be accepted for him* (comp. Lev. XXII. 23; Sept. δεκτόν, Vulg. acceptabilis; Onkel translates לא יֵרָצֶה הַמַּקְרִיב (in VII. 18) by לא יהי לרעוא דמקריב, that is, לא יהיה לרצון למקריב): the meaning of the term is indeed explained and almost paraphrased in a later passage, "you shall offer for your acceptance a male without blemish of the herd, of the sheep, or of the goats; but whatsoever has a blemish, that you shall not offer; for it shall not be acceptable for you" (XXII. 19, 20; comp. ver. 21). The translation *of his own voluntary will* (*Mishn.* Erach. V. 6, שאין מתכפר לו עד שיתרצה, where it is stated how far a person may be compelled to a sacrifice; Ebn Ezra, Abarbanel, Engl. Vers., etc.) illogically interrupts the context; and in XXIII. 11, לרצנכם is used with reference to the obligatory offering of the first-fruits (and here indeed the English Version renders *to be accepted for you;* so also in Exod. XXVIII. 38). — It is of importance exactly to define the meaning of the verb כִּפֶּר (in Piel), which so frequently occurs in the sacrificial legislation, and which indeed implies that notion which forms the chief end of the principal offerings. It signifies originally *to cover, to cover up*, in which sense alone it occurs in Kal (Gen. VI. 14; comp. Arab. غفر; but the noun כֹּפֶר is *redemption*, Exod. XXI. 30; XXX. 12; Isai. XLIII. 3); hence applied to guilt, it means *to cover* or *hide* the sinner's transgression from the

**and cut it into its pieces. 7. And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar, and lay wood**

presence of God, without, however, intimating the mode of that covering or concealing; and it is, in this connection, used synonymously with כָּסָה (Nehem. III. 37; Ps. LXXXV. 3; XXXII. 1), and in parallelism with מָחָה *to efface* (Jer. XVIII. 23; comp. Nehem. III. 37). This is the first and earliest, or more external, stage in the history of that term. But when, in the general progress of religious ideas, the notion of sin was conceived more profoundly and more spiritually, the meaning attributed to כִּפֶּר was modified accordingly; it assumed the sense of *expiating*, that is, of removing the sin not merely from the sight of God, but of banishing its force and effect from the sinner's heart; it became synonymous with restoring, *by atonement*, the peace of mind that had been disturbed by sin (comp כֹּפֶר Exod. XXX. 12, 15; כַּפֹּרֶת, כִּפּוּרִים; see Num. VIII. 19); so that כִּפֵּר became analogous to חִטֵּא, which, originally signifying *to remove sin* (חֵטְא), later took the meaning of *restoring* (Gen. XXXI. 39, אָנֹכִי אֲחַטֶּנָּה), that is, of *expiating* (The objections of Bähr, Symb. II. 280, against this meaning are untenable, prompted as they are by his unavailing opposition to the doctrine of vicarious substitution in the Old Testament, see *supra* p. 294; the suffix in אחטנה proves that חטא in Piel has *transitive* meaning, and cannot, therefore, signify *to suffer for a fault*). From these observations it will be easy to account for the different constructions of כִּפֵּר. It is occasionally joined with בְּעַד (Exod. XXXII. 30; Lev. IX. 7; XVI. 6, 24; 2 Chr. XXX. 18), but usually with עַל, both which prepositions frequently follow after verbs which denote *covering* or *veiling* (comp. Gram. I. p. 320), rarely with לְ (Deut. XXI. 8; Ezek. XVI. 63), or with the simple accusative (Ps. LXV. 4; LXXVIII. 38; hence in the passive לארץ לא יְכֻפַּר Num. XXXV. 33, or חטאתך תְּכֻפָּר Isai. VI. 7; comp. Isai. XXII. 14; XXVII. 9; XXVIII. 18; Deut. XXI. 8). The object of the expiation should, according to the etymology, properly be the sin (עון, חטאת), and it is so in many cases (Exod. XXXII, 30; Isai. VI. 7; Jer. XVIII. 23; Ps. LXXIX. 9; etc.); but as the end of the removal of sin is the justification of the sinner, who, on account of his offence and like it, had reason to hide himself before God, the object of כִּפֵּר is, by a natural metonomy, also and most frequently the sinner (Lev. I. 4; IV. 20, 26, 31, 35; V. 16; Num. XVII. 11, 12; XXV. 13, etc.), so that occasionally כִּפֵּר is followed both by *sin* and *sinner*, one defining or qualifying the other, and therefore both construed with עַל (Lev. IV. 35, וכפר עליו על־חטאתו; V. 13, 18; XIX, 22); or the sin of which the sinner is purified, is introduced by מן (Lev. IV. 26; V. 6, 10; XIV. 19; XVI. 34; Num. VI. 11); or it is followed by *his soul*, that is, the principle of his life and existence (Lev. XVII. 11; Exod. XXX. 15); it is, therefore, unnecessary to suppose (with Rosenmüller, Excurs. II ad Levit. p. 201) that כִּפֶּר עליו is an ellipsis for כִּפֶּר על־נפשו, and this again for כִּפֶּר על־חטאת נפשו; as the verb כִּפֵּר, though originally meaning *to cover*, gradually adopted the figurative sense of *expiating*; the period which elapsed between the first and second stage of its history was sufficiently protracted for the change. Hence even lifeless things could be the object of expiation, as the altar, or its horns, the Sanctuary, or a house (Exod. XXIX. 36, 37; XXX. 10; Lev. VIII. 15; XIV. 53; XVI. 16, 18, 33; Ezek. XLIII. 20, 26; XLV. 20), in reference to which it would be impossible to adhere to the primitive meaning

**in order upon the fire: 8. And the priests, Aaron's sons, shall lay the parts, *and* the head, and the fat in order upon the wood that *is* on the fire upon the altar.**

of *covering* or *concealing* or *removing*; and so again כִּפֶּר becomes synonymous with חִטֵּא (Lev. XIV. 49 and 53, where חטא את־הבית and כפר על־הבית occur indifferently; comp. Exod. XXIX. 36, 37; Lev. VIII. 15; Num. VIII. 21; 2 Chr. XXIX. 24; Ps. LI. 9). But it is obvious from this analysis that the object of כִּפֶּר can never be God, who is sinless; the combination כִּפֶּר על־יהוה could only signify *to cover* or *to deny* God (as in the later phrase כֹּפֵר בָּעִקָּר *he who denies the foundations of faith, an infidel*); and the word עליו so often occurring in connection with כִּפֶּר never refers to God; or if it could be applied to Him, it would not signify *to appease Him* (comp. אכפרה פניו במנחה, Gen. XXXII. 21; also 2 Sam. XXI. 3; Prov. XVI. 14; Isai. XLVII. 11); since it is a characteristic principle of Hebrew sacrifices, that they are not meant to calm the *Deity*, but to give peace to the offerer, which involves a significant contrast to pagan conceptions (see pp. 316—318). The power of atonement, of course, rests with God, who is occasionally introduced as accomplishing it (Deut. XXI. 8; Ps. LXV. 4; LXXVIII. 38; Jer. XVIII. 23); but it is usually represented as being delegated to the priests, His ministers (Lev. IV. 26, 31, 35; V. 6, 10; XIV. 20, 29; etc.). It is objectionable to render וְכִפֶּר עֲלֵהֶם הכהן (IV. 20) "the priest shall cover them, that is, he shall protect them against the Divine wrath by interceding for them with God" (*Knobel*, Lev. p. 388); for this meaning of כפר, erroneous even with regard to sin-offerings, would not at all apply to holocausts, much less to thank-offerings. — On the form כִּפֶּר see Gram. § XLIV. 1. 6. — The offerer, as a rule, killed the victim (p. 184); hence the singular of the verb (ושחט, ver. 5) is, no doubt, the correct reading, not the plural (as the Septuagint has, καὶ σφάζουσι, vers. 5, 11). — Whether we prefer (in ver. 7) בני אהרן הַכֹּהֵן or הַכֹּהֲנִים (as in vers. 5, 8, 11, Samar., Sept., Syr., etc.), is immaterial. — The blood was to be sprinkled על־המזבח סביב, that is, round the sides of the altar, not on its upper surface (see p. 191). — The subject to והפשיט and ונתח (ver. 6) is either one of the priests or a Levite; hence the Septuagint translates these verbs in plural (ἐκδείραντες and μελιοῦσι), corresponding with בני אהרן in the preceding and the subsequent verse; and והפשיטו and ונתחו are indeed found in the Samaritan codex; but these are most probably not the original readings, just because the singular of the verb is less easy, though entirely in harmony with Hebrew usage (comp. Grammar § LXXVI); see pp. 196, 197. — The priests shall place upon the wood the various parts or members (נְתָחִים) of the animal, together with the head and the fat (ver. 8); for the נתחים (Onkel. איבריא), the head, and the fat are considered to make up the victim; hence the words את־הראש ואת־הפדר do not stand in apposition to את־הנתחים, after which, therefore, the Septuagint correctly inserts καὶ (comp. ver. 12; VIII. 20; IX. 13). From the term וערכו *and they shall lay in order*, Talmudists deduced the precept that the members and parts of the animal should as much as possible be arranged in the order which they possess in the living animal — the head foremost, then the shoulders, and then the other limbs in due sequence, while the fat (פדר) was put either beneath the pieces for the better feeding of the flame, or above them for covering the unsightly and

9. And its bowels and its legs shall he wash with water:

bleeding parts (comp. *Maim.* Maase Hakkorb. c. 6); an artificial rule in no manner harmonising with the simplicity of our chapter. The conjectures of the same school concerning three or more-different fires (מערכות; orders or sets), one for the sacrifices, one for the fumigations, and the third as the prescribed or perpetual fire (*Mishn.* Yom. IV. 6; *Talm.* Yom. 45*a*), are later speculations intended to reconcile the various Biblical allusions on the subject (Lev. I. 7; VI. 5, 6; XVI. 13), and to connect them with the tradition of the first fire said to have fallen from heaven upon the altar (comp. also *Outram*, De Sacrif. I. xvi. 13). — The word פֶּדֶר, which occurs only here and in a few other passages (vers. 8, 12; VIII. 20), is probably derived from פדר in the sense of *feeding* or *fattening* (comp. Arab. بدن or فدن), and means, therefore, simply *fat* (so Sept. στέαρ; Syr. and Onk., and Jonath. in Lev. VIII. 20 תרבא; Arabs Erpen. شحمه; Jerome in Lev. VIII. 20 adeps; Pagninus, Castelli, and others), and more particularly that fat which is on the intestines, and which was naturally taken off when the entrails were to be cleansed, previously to being burnt as a part of the holocaust (I. 8, 9, 12, 13; VIII. 20, 21). It is not to be traced to פדר in the conjectural sense of *separating*, as if synonymous with פרד, and signifying the fat "that is apart from the flesh" (so Jonath. in our passage פריסותא דתרבא, *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. ii. 45, and others). But it can on no account be rendered by *intestines* (Junius), *diaphragm* or *midriff* (Schindler, Zunz — Zwerchfell —), *the net of the liver* (Münster), the *trunk* or *the body* (Jonath. in I. 12 ית גופיה; comp. Ebn Ezra *in loc.)*, or *the parts near the liver* (Jerome in I. 8, 12 cuncta quae adhaerent jecori)—unsupported translations opposed to the context in which the word occurs.— קֶרֶב (ver. 9) belongs to the parts which require to be washed before being placed on the altar (vers. 9, 13, etc.); it is *the inwards* or *lower intestines*, as the stomach and the guts, which, properly cleansed, were extensively eaten by the ancients (comp. *Athen.* III. 47, 48; IX. 67), and could, therefore, not fitly be omitted in a *holocaust;* we have indeed express testimony that they were frequently sacrificed to the gods, under the names of *hirae*, *fendicae*, and *lactes* (comp. *Plaut.* Curc. II. i. 23, Radices cordis pereunt, hirae omnes dolent; *Macrob.* Somn. Scip. I. 6 *fin.*, habetur praecipuum intestinorum omnium; *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 24, p. 230; *Pers.* Sat. II. 30; *Virg.* Aen. VI. 253, 254); so the ancient translations, Sept. τὰ ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ or ἐνδόσθια; Josephus (Antiq. III. ix. 1) τὰ κατὰ νηδὺν; Vulg. intestina; but more generally Targ. Jonath. כריסא and Targ. Onkel. גוא, Vulg. vitalia; but the word does not comprise the upper intestines as the lung, the heart, or the liver. On קֶרֶב in reference to man, see *Delitzsch*, Bibl. Psychol. pp. 220 —222. — The meaning of כְּרָעַיִם (from כרע *to bend;* comp. the German *Bug* or shoulder from *biegen;* see Grimm, Deutsch. Wörterb. II. p. 494) cannot be uncertain. The term, besides being used of cattle (I. 9, 13; IV. 11; VIII. 21; etc.), is also employed in connection with the locust, of which it is said (XI. 21) that it has כרעים ממעל לרגליו to leap with them, and this evidently points to the upper part of the hind-legs, which were to be washed properly before being burnt on the altar, because they are generally unclean after the slaughtering of the animal; כרעים is, therefore, neither

and the priest shall burn all on the altar, *as* a burnt-
sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to
the Lord.
10. And if his offering *be* of the flocks, *whether* of
the sheep or of the goats, for a burnt-sacrifice, he shall
bring it a male without blemish. 11. And he shall kill
it on the side of the altar northward before the Lord:
and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall sprinkle its blood
round about upon the altar. 12. And he shall cut it
into its pieces, and its head, and its fat; and the priest
shall lay them in order on the wood that *is* on the fire
upon the altar: 13. And he shall wash the bowels and
the legs with water; and the priest shall bring *it* all,
and burn *it* upon the altar: it *is* a burnt-sacrifice, an
offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to the Lord.

leg in general, nor "the leg from the knee to the foot" (Unterschenkel, Gesenius, Knobel, Fürst, Bunsen, a. o.), nor simply foot (Sept. and Joseph. *πούς*, although the former have also *σκέλος* and *ἀκροθήριον*). Wessely explains "that part upon which the animal rests when it lies down" (כרע), which is too indistinct. — The parts just described were to be washed by the priest (ירחץ) mentioned in the succeeding half of the verse, or perhaps by a Levite under the priest's supervision (comp. also ver. 13); the plural of the verb ירחצו and *πλυνοῦσιν* employed by the Samarit. and Sept. is, therefore, an unnecessary deviation from the Hebrew text. — In הַמִּזְבֵּחָה *on the altar* (vers. 9, 13, 15) for עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ (IX. 13, 17), the ה *locale* implies rest, not motion; it so occurs very frequently in the sacrificial laws (II. 2; III. 5; IV. 9; V. 12; VII. 5, 31; VIII. 16; IX. 10; XVI. 25; comp. 2 Chr. XXIX. 22—24); and it seems to betray a comparatively early time in the history of language, when the ה had simply the meaning of locality, without being strictly confined to one particular relation of place; thus we find the same peculiarity in old particles, as שָׁמָּה *there*, אָנָה *where?* הֵנָּה *here*, חוּצָה *without*, and in a few words occurring chiefly in earlier writings (see Gramm. § XXV. 4). — Luzzatto, in order to avoid the anthromorphism of אשה ריח ניחוח ליהוה (ver. 9), translates ריח ניחוח *odore propiziatorio*, and urging the distinctive accent under נִיחוֹחַ, he refers לַיהוָה to עֹלָה — *è un olocausto al Signore*; but this acceptation, questionable in itself, is of no avail in passages like וירח יהוה את־ריח הניחוח (Gen. VIII. 28), which Luzzatto is compelled to render freely and arbitrarily, *Il Signore, gradito l'odore propiziatorio, disse tra se.*

**10—13.** PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — The Septuagint adds, between verse 10 and 11, the precept of the imposition of the hand (*καὶ ἐπιθήσει τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ*), correctly as regards the spirit of the section, though not in accordance with the Masoretic text. — The words "and its head and its fat", following after "its parts" (ver. 12), are to be understood as in ver. 8 — the sheep or the goats are to be cut into their natural parts, special care being taken to secure the head and the fat. — The construction in ver. 12 is a

**14. And if his offering to the Lord *be* a burnt-sacrifice of fowls, then he shall bring his offering of the turtle-doves or of the young pigeons. 15. And the priest shall bring it to the altar, and wring off its head, and burn *it* on the altar; and its blood shall be pressed out on the side of the altar: 16. And he shall remove its crop with the excrements thereof and cast it beside**

*zeugma*, "and he shall cut it into its pieces, and shall *cut off* its head and its fat" (see Gramm. § 104. 2).

**14—17.** Possibly in order to enhance the value of offerings of birds, very small in itself, the whole ceremonial was performed by the priest; the worshipper renounced even his prerogative of killing the animal, and this was the more desirable as the sprinkling of the scanty blood of those birds could be well performed by him only who killed them, and the sprinkling was exclusively a priestly act (comp. pp. 185, 241).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — On the probability of these verses being a later addition see *supra* on vers. 1—9. — The head of the turtle-doves was to be *wrung off* or *pinched off* (מלק, ver. 15; Sept. ἀποκνίσει τὴν κεφαλήν; Targ. Jon. יחזום, Targ. Jerus. נעום, comp. حذم unguibus discerpere; Vulg. freely retorto ad collum capite ac rupto vulneris loco), and burnt separately; whereas if the bird was a sin-offering, the head was merely broken in at the neck, without being separated from it (V. 8 ולא יבדיל; see p. 188). — After the *head* was burnt, the blood of the *body* was pressed out, drop by drop (נמצה, Sept. aptly σταγγιεῖ τὸ αἷμα; comp. Judg. VI. 38; Syr. מצא, Arab. مصّ), on the side of the altar; the words והקטיר ··· ונמצה imply no *hysteron proteron;* nor needs ונמצה to be taken as a *pluperfect*, "after its blood had been pressed out" (Wessely, Arnheim, a. o.) — נֹצָה (in ver. 16) is evidently *excrement*, *filth* (from צָאָה, for נֹצָא, that which is thrown out; comp. צוֹאָה and צֵאָה, Isai. IV. 4; Prov. XXX. 12; hardly from the conjectural root צאה *foetuit*, the fem. of partic. Niph. נִצְאָה or נְצָאָה contracted into נָצָה, so that בְּנָצָתָהּ would be the required reading, not בְּנֹצָתָהּ — a view propounded by Knobel without probability); so the Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan, and Arab. versions (בְּאוּכְלֵיהּ, בְּנִטְשָׁא, בִּלְקְטֵיהּ), most of the Jewish interpreters (Rashi עם בני מעיה), Schreder, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, De Wette, and others; for though נֹצָה occurs also in the meaning of *feather* (Ezek. XVII. 3, 7; Job. XXXIX. 13, from the root נָצָה *to fly)*, it is impossible to take it here in this sense (as has been done by the Sept., Sym., Theod., the Talmud, Vulg., Kimchi, Nachman., Luther, Engl. Vers., and many modern translators), as this would require בְּנֹצָתוֹ (with the *masculine* of the suffix, as the Samaritan text indeed reads), in accordance with the preceding noun מֻרְאָתוֹ, instead of בנצתה, the suffix of which word can only refer to the noun מראה; the crop was to be removed *with* its excrements, that is, as regards the sense, on *account* of its excrements (Maurer, ingluviem ejus sordidam); comp. also *Hom.* Il. XIX. 266—268 (Talthybios threw the stomach of the boar into the sea, βόσιν ἰχθύσιν). It is indeed probable that, as the quadrupeds were flayed, so the birds were divested of their feathers, before being burnt on the altar, to prevent an intolerable smell; but though this may be supposed, it is certainly, from the

**the altar eastward, to the place of the ashes: 17. And he shall cleave it at its wings, *but* shall not take *them* off, and the priest shall burn it upon the altar, upon the wood that *is* upon the fire: it *is* a burnt-sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to the Lord.**

reasons stated, not expressed in בנצתה (comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. VI. 5). It is not probable that the term מראה (whether referable to the Arabic مرا *to digest food*, or derived from ראה for רעה *to pasture*, as *viscera* from *vesci*, or *Eingeweide* from *weiden* — Knobel) includes, besides the crop (Sept. πρόλοβος, Onk. זָפְקֵיהּ, Jerus. קוּרְקְבָנֵיהּ, etc.), the intestines of the birds (*Mishn.* l. c., Schreder, Rosenm., Knobel), which being scarcely worth washing and cleaning, like those of the quadrupeds (vers. 9, 13), were no doubt altogether thrown away; the Vulgate renders conjecturally vesicula gutturis. — לא יַבְדִּיל (ver. 17) is added by way of asyndeton (comp. V. 8, וְלֹא), and the character of abruptness which this construction involves, is enhanced by the omission of the accusative of the personal pronoun — *but he shall not take* (them) *off* (comp. Gram. §§ 78. 7; 104. 8). — Ewald (Alterth. p. 47) supposes that these verses contain "several mistakes of copyists", which he proposes to correct from V. 8, 9; he objects especially to the words הקטיר המזבחה (ver. 15), which he supposes to have originally been קיר המזבח (V. 9). But the ritual of holocausts and of sin-offerings of birds is designedly distinct from each other, in accordance with the special character of each; our passage cannot, therefore, be altered from the later one regarding sin-offerings; and the separate burning of the head has a parallel in vers. 8, 9 (see p. 240).

## 2. The Bloodless Offering (מִנְחָה).

## CHAPTER II.

Summary. — God reveals to Moses precepts concerning the *Bloodless offerings* (מִנְחָה), whether they consist simply of fine flour (vers. 1—3), or are baked in the oven (ver. 4), prepared in a pan (ver. 5), or boiled in a cauldron; in all which cases a handful is to be burnt as "a memorial" on the altar, while the rest belongs, as most holy, to the priests. Salt is never to be omitted in any sacrifice, while honey and leaven are to be rigidly avoided, though they may be employed for firstfruit-oblations (vers. 11—13), regarding which an ordinance is appended (vers. 14—16).

**1. And if anyone will offer a bloodless offering to**

1—13. Animal and bloodless sacrifices were probably co-eval in origin (see pp. 10—14). The code of law which treated of the one, necessarily included the other. Hence both are here introduced in close connection (וְנֶפֶשׁ, ver. 1). But since the former were regarded as more valuable and more meritorious, they fitly occupy the first place in these ordinances. Bloodless oblations were doubtless presented alone and independently of animal

**the Lord, his offering shall be *of* fine flour; and he shall pour oil upon it, and put frank-incense thereon. 2. And he shall bring it to Aaron's sons, the priests; and the priest shall take thereof a handful of its flour and of its oil with all its frank-incense; and he shall burn *this as* a memorial upon the altar, *as* an offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to the Lord: 3. And the remainder of the bloodless offering *shall belong* to Aaron and his sons; *it is* a most holy *part* of the offerings of the Lord made by fire.**

offerings. This is manifest from a rational survey of the nature and history of sacrifices; and it is confirmed by the tenour of this chapter: the קָרְבַּן מִנְחָה is placed in juxtaposition to the קָרְבַּן עֹלָה (vers. 1, 3, 4, etc), and forms, therefore, like the latter, a distinct class; and the ceremonials are so complete in themselves that it would be difficult to make them a subservient appendage to another ritual. Moreover, it can scarcely be questioned that the מִנְחָה was primitively burnt to the Deity entire, like the עֹלָה; not only is this implied in the notion of *sacrifice*, but it is expressed in the very name which means *gift* (comp. p. 216). But when the right of performing sacrifices was transferred from the whole people to one family or tribe, it was deemed sufficient to burn to the Deity a small portion of the oblation, as a symbol of the whole, while the rest was left for the maintenance of the members of that tribe, who acted as mediators between God and the nation, and were in many respects regarded as the representatives of the former. In this altered and indirect and — it must be added — artificial sense, the bloodless offering might even then have been called a *gift* (מנחה, see ch. III). However, in one incidental point, the ordinances of Leviticus manifest a certain fluctuation. For it appears that, at first, all the bloodless offerings alike, with the exception of the "memorial", were given over to the priests as a common stock to be divided among them (vers. 3, 10); but later, when the organisation of the Levitical order advanced, it became law that those bloodless oblations only which consisted merely of flour unprepared, should thenceforth be distributed among all the Aaronites indifferently, while those prepared in an oven, a pan, or cauldron, should belong to the individual priests who performed the sacrifice (Lev. VII. 9, 10). For when the sacerdotal functions were, as much as was feasible, equally divided among the body of the priests (whether this object was really ever carried out, or remained a legislative idea), each of them could, as a rule, be supposed to subsist upon the income attached to his own functions; while a comparatively small amount of dues sufficed as a provision for those who, for any reason, did not or could not officiate (comp. p. 210, and notes on VII. 8—10). — Of the more carefully prepared cereal offerings three classes are specified — those baked in the oven (תַּנּוּר), or in the pan (מַחֲבַת), or cooked in a pot or cauldron (מַרְחֶשֶׁת; comp. pp. 223—225). The term oven (תַּנּוּר) denotes not only the baker's oven or stove, heated for a considerable time, but also a large or portable pot, generally of earthenware, liable

4. And if thou bring an oblation of a bloodless offering baked in the oven, *it shall be* unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil.

5. And if thy oblation *be* a bloodless offering *prepared* in a pan, it shall be *of* fine flour, mingled with oil, unleavened: 6. Thou shalt divide it in pieces, and pour oil thereon: it *is* a bloodless offering.

to be broken (Lev. XI. 35), such as is still extensively used in the East for making bread and cakes readily. The different forms of ovens and the contrivances to replace them have been described elsewhere (see Comm. on Exod. pp. 128, 129, 197, 214; comp. *Mishn.* Menach. V. 9; *Golius*, Lex. Arab. p. 398 sub تنور; *Niebuhr*, Reisebeschreibung, I. p. 234, and in *Michaelis* Orientalische Bibl. VII. 176, 177; *Harmer*, Observ. I. 414—420, edit. 1808; *Robinson*, Biblic. Researches, I. 485; II. 117, 118, 162, 2nd edit.; *Kitto* on ver. 4). — The pan (מַחֲבַת), a flat metal vessel, generally of iron (Ezek. IV. 3), was employed for baking hard and crisp cakes, which were generally mixed with oil, after which they were not unfrequently broken into small pieces, and then again thoroughly kneaded into a thick paste with butter, honey or milk, to be finally divided into larger portions; the same utensil is still so used among the Arabs and other Asiatic tribes, especially of Syria and Armenia, and among the Kabyles in Africa (comp. *Harmer*, Observ. I. 412—414; *Kitto* on ver. 6; etc.; see also *supra* p. 198. In 1 Chr. IX. 31 such preparations are called מַעֲשֵׂה הַחֲבִתִּים, and among the Arabs *chubs* خبز or *mafruka*). — The "pot" or "cauldron" (מַרְחֶשֶׁת) is a deep vessel suitable for boiling flour and other substances thoroughly. — Now in all these cases, the sacred character of the offering was conveyed not only by the admixture of oil, the type of holiness and sanctification (p. 115), the addition of frank-incense, the emblem of devotion (p. 118), and the use of salt, the agent of preservation, and therefore called "the salt of the covenant" (p. 110); but more decidedly still by the rigid prohibition of honey and leaven, representing fermentation and corruption (pp. 133 *sqq.*), by the portion devoted to God and burnt in His honour as a "memorial" (אַזְכָּרָה), to bring the worshipper to His gracious remembrance, and lastly by the injunction to leave to the priests the remainder as most holy (קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים; see p. 76). Honey might, indeed, as a product of nature, be dedicated, in its natural state, as a firstfruit-gift and as a part of the offerer's income (comp. Deut. XXVI. 2, 9, 10), and it could be employed for the leavened firstfruit loaves presented on Pentecost (Lev. XXIII. 16, 17); however, in both cases, the oblation was not placed *on* the altar, but *before* it (לִפְנֵי מזבח, Deut. XXVI. 4), and it belonged to the priests who consumed it (Lev. XXIII. 20); but honey and leaven could never form parts of offerings destined to be burnt on the altar; they could never be a sweet odour to the Lord (ריח ניחוח ליהוה).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS.—As נֶפֶשׁ (ver. 1) expresses the indefinite pronoun *somebody* (corresponding with אָדָם in I. 2), קָרְבָּנוֹ has the masculine suffix, though the nearer verb (תַּקְרִיב) is in the feminine (comp. IV. 2, 27; V. 1, 2; Gramm. § 82. 4; see § 77. 5;

7. And if thy oblation *be* a bloodless offering *boiled* in a cauldron, it shall be made *of* fine flour with oil. 8. And thou shalt bring the bloodless offering that is made of these things to the Lord; and when it is presented to the priest, he shall bring it to the altar. 9. And the priest shall take from the bloodless offering its memorial, and shall burn *it* upon the altar; *it is* an offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to the Lord. 10. And the remainder of the bloodless offering *shall*

and אֶחָד נֶפֶשׁ in Num. XXXI. 28). — On סֹלֶת see p. 103 note 26. — The Samaritan text concludes the first verse with the words מנחה הוא, and so the Septuagint adds *θυσία ἐστί*. — The subject to וְיָצַק and וְנָתַן (ver. 1) is naturally the offerer, not the priest, but the subject to וְקָמַץ (ver. 2) *and he shall take off* is הַכֹּהֵן, expressed only in the following part of the period (see on I. 1). The Vulgate refers וקמץ to the preceding words, and renders *quorum unus tollet* (see Gramm. § 101. 2). — On the meaning of קמץ (correctly explained by Kimchi s. v. ענין קבוץ ואסיפה, comp. Arab. قمز), see p. 224 note 3. — מִשָּׁם *from there*, i. e. *of it* (the flour), the adverbium loci taking the force of a personal pronoun (comp. Gen. III. 23; XLIX. 24; etc.); not "from the vessel containing the flour." — On אַזְכָּרָה (ver. 2, for הַזְכָּרָה, Gramm. § I. 4) *memorial* (Sept. *μνημόσυνον*, or *ἀνάμνησις* in XXIV. 7; Vulg. *memoriale* or *monimentum*; Luther *zum Gedächtniss;* so also Rashi, Ebn Ezra, and others; Johlson *Gedächtnissopfer;* comp. Num. V. 15 מַזְכֶּרֶת עָוֹן see p. 206. Michaelis (Uebersetz. ver. 9 and Supplem. II. p. 616) and De Wette render indistinctly *Opfertheil* (as if זכר signified to sacrifice), and Knobel *Abgabe* (from the Kal זכר in the questionable meaning of presenting with something), Bunsen freely *Feuertheil*, Ewald *Duft* (inconclusively referring to Lev. XXIV.

7, since the sin-offering has an אזכרה though not accompanied by frank-incense, Lev. V. 11, 12), like Schultens, Clericus, Saadiah, Rashbam, Mendelssohn and some other Jewish interpreters (comp. Ebn Ezra, כריח וקטרת, taking as supports Isai. LXVI. 3; Hos. XIV. 8), Lud. de Dieu followed by Rosenmüller *celebratio* sc. nominis divini, Bähr (I. 411; II. 428) *Lobpreis*, Hofmann *Preis* (from הזכיר in the sense of praising which is inapplicable to Lev. V. 12 and Num. V. 26), i. e. the portion offered for the glorification of God, and Kliefoth (Liturg. Abhandl. IV. pp. 87, 112) *Danksagung* (a meaning foreign to הזכיר; comp. *Kurtz*, Opfercultus, pp. 255, 256) — all which translations are either erroneous or inaccurate. On אַזְכָּרָתָהּ for אַזְכָּרָתָהּ, see Gramm. § XXXI. 6. *b*. — The feminine הַנּוֹתֶרֶת (ver. 3) is used to express the neuter, *that which is left* (Gramm. § 84. b); it is hardly employed by way of attraction with the following מן־המנחה (so *Parchon* Lexic. sub החל, p. 17 *a* ed. Stern; and similarly *Wessely*, Biur *in loc.*). — תַּקְרִיב (ver. 4) is the second person masc. (comp. ver. 14), not the third pers. fem. with נפש as subject, in spite of Bertheau's subtle objections (Die sieben Gruppen etc. p. 149), prompted by a desire to defend his untenable theories of "groups" of laws. — בְּלוּלֹת בַּשֶּׁמֶן is not *poured over with oil* (Vulg. *conspersa*, Targ. Onk. פִּילָא, De Wette *begossen)*, but *mingled with oil* (Sept.

*belong* to Aaron and his sons; *it is* a most holy *part* of the offerings of the Lord made by fire.

11. No bloodless offering which you shall bring to the Lord, shall be made fermented; for you shall burn no leaven nor any honey in any offering of the Lord made by fire. 12. For a firstfruit oblation you may offer them to the Lord; but they shall not come upon

*πεφυραμένη*, like מֻרְבֶּכֶת in VI. 14; VII. 12; Luther *gemenget*, Bunsen *angemacht); for* בלל is distinct from יצק (vers. 1, 6), comp. p. 105, to which we refer also on חַלּוֹת and רְקִיקִים. — מַחֲבַת (ver. 5) is probably a flat and shallow vessel (therefore עַל־הַמַּחֲבַת, comp. VII. 9), most likely a *pan* called *tadshen* (طاجن) by the present Arabs, and so it is here rendered by the Septuagint (*τήγανον*) and the Syriac version (טגניא); it is hardly the "fire-plate" (Boothroyd), a convex plate of iron, supported by stones, with a slow fire underneath, and frequently used to bake the common large thin cakes (comp. *Kitto*, on ver. 5); for the oil could not be mingled upon it. — On the absolute infinitive פָּתוֹת (ver. 6) *to break, to divide* (comp. פַּת piece, Arab. فتّ, Sept. *διαθρύψεις αὐτὰ κλάσματα*) with the force of the imperative, defined by the following וְיָצַקְתָּ, see Gramm. § 97. 4. — מַרְחֶשֶׁת (ver. 7) from רָחַשׁ *to boil up* or *bubble up* (comp. Ps. XLV. 2) is a deep vessel, a *pot* or *cauldron* (in *Mishn.* Menach. V. 8, the difference between מרחשת and מחבת is stated by Rabbi Chaninah to be this, that the former is "deep" עמוקה and what is prepared in it is fluid, while the latter is "flat" צפה and what is prepared in it is hard; comp. *Talm.* Menach. 63*a*; and so Rashi, Rashbam, a. o.); not *gridiron* (Vulg. *craticula*, Sept. *ἐσχάρα*, Luther, De Wette *Rost)* or *frying-pan* (Engl. Vers., Bunsen); Targ. Onk. בְּרָתָא, evidently a corruption of רְדָתָא, whether this is frying-pan or cooking-pot; Syr. טרטקל which is supposed to be identical with קרטקל, that is, craticula; Ebn Ezra מעשה מטוגן (comp. *Buxt.* Lex. Talm. p. 855). — The masculine יֵעָשֶׂה (ver. 8) referring to מִנְחָה stands for תֵּעָשֶׂה, by way of impersonal construction (see Gramm. § 77. 15). — מֵאֵלֶּה *of these* includes the two preceding modes of bloodless offering also, those baked in an oven (ver. 4) and fried in the pan (ver. 5). Targ. Jonath. understands, without probability, "the oblation that is made of flour and oil." — The verbs of the 8th verse are partly unsymmetrical, the second person (וְהֵבֵאתָ) being followed by the third (וְהִקְרִיבָהּ, see Gramm. § LXXVII. 21. 1), and partly irregular in construction, the subject of וְהִקְרִיבָהּ being the offering Israelite, while that of וְהִגִּישָׁהּ is the priest (see Gramm. § LXXVII. 21. 6). — וְהֵרִים (ver. 9) corresponds with וְקָמַץ (ver. 2); it means therefore simply *and he shall take off*, and does not involve a solemn and peculiar mode of heaving (תְּרוּמָה, p. 203), as is evident from an examination of parallel passages (comp. III. 3 with IV. 8; VII. 3; and IV. 10 with IV. 31, 35). — The reading of בֹּרִית (comp. Jer. II. 22; Mal. III. 2), instead of בְּרִית (ver. 13), *salt of purity* (of ברר), *pure salt* or *nitre*, proposed by Michaelis (Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr. No. 288, 298, 1407), and adopted as far as we know by Dathe alone, is not only gratuitous, but objectionable, as it would be difficult to find a simple construction for the following אלהיך; no more plausible is the reading בְּרִית

the altar for a sweet odour. 13. And every oblation of thy bloodless offering shalt thou season with salt; nor shalt thou allow the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy bloodless offering: with all thy offerings thou shalt offer salt.

14. And when thou offerest the oblation of firstfruits to the Lord, thou shalt offer for the oblation of thy firstfruits green ears of corn roasted by the fire, *namely, the grains* rubbed out of the early corn. 15. And thou shalt put

*the food* of thy God (comp. 2 Sam. XIII. 5, 7, 10), suggested by Geddes, since the *salt* is never described as the *food* of God; but as a means of *covenant* (בְּרִית) it is both common and intelligible. "When the Athenians complained of violated hospitality, they were wont to say, *Ποῦ ἅλες*" (*Popham*, Extracts from the Pentateuch etc. p. 141). The concluding words of the command, "with all thy offerings (על כל־קרבנך) thou shalt offer salt", are too distinct to allow us to doubt that salt was meant to be an ingredient not of bloodless only but of animal sacrifices also, so that the application of salt with the latter class of offering (Ezek. XLIII. 24; Mark IX. 49) was no deviation from the ancient law (comp. *Joseph.* Ant. III. ix. 1, *πάσαντες ἁλσὶν κτλ.*); the animal offerings were certainly no less meant to produce "a covenant of God" (ברית אלהיך) than the bloodless oblations. — According to a Jewish rite, based on our passage, the first morsel of bread (מוציא) that is eaten is always dipped in salt, since the table represents the altar (see p. 62).

**14—16.** Roasted grains of corn (אָבִיב קָלוּי), whether simply prepared by the fire, or baked in a pan or on a plate of iron, were, as they still are, a favourite food in many parts of the East (comp. XXIII. 14; Josh. V. 11; 1 Sam. XVII. 17; XXV. 18; 2 Sam. XVII. 28; Ruth II. 14; *Virg.* Georg. I. 267; *Ovid*, Fast. II. 521; *Plin.* H. N. XVIII. 2, 7 or 14; *Celsius*, Hierobot. II. 231—234). They were, therefore, naturally and habitually presented on the altar, from a spontaneous impulse, by an agricultural people; and the legislator had no other task but to prescribe their presentation accompanied with rites calculated clearly to stamp them as a *minchah*, that is, to ordain the addition of oil and frank-incense, and the burning of "the memorial." Hence it cannot be doubted that the precept, "When thou offerest the oblation of firstfruits (בִּכּוּרִים) to the Lord", refers to private, and not to public offerings; this is clearly implied by the tenour of the law which makes no allusion whatever to the people; the public firstfruit *minchah*, consisting of ears of barley, was according to a distinct ordinance, to be offered on the second day of Passover with a prescribed ritual (p. 227); whereas our passage fixes no time, mentions none beyond the ordinary ceremonies of the *minchah*, and limits the offering to no particular class of grain, which, if such restriction were designed, would be wheat rather than the less valuable barley.— On the bloodless offerings in general see pp. 216—228.

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS.—The offering of the firstfruits was to consist of *ears of corn*, that is, their grains, *roasted by the fire* (אָבִיב קָלוּי בָּאֵשׁ). The ears should be of the best or

oil upon it, and lay frank-incense thereon: it *is* a bloodless offering. 16. And the priest shall burn its memorial, *some* of its rubbed out *grains* and *some* of its oil, with all its frank-incense; *it is* an offering made by fire to the Lord.

earliest sort (כַּרְמֶל), and the grains carefully cleared of the husks by *rubbing* (גֶּרֶשׂ) and skinning; hence גֶּרֶשׂ כַּרְמֶל, literally *the rubbing of the ears* (i. e. the grains obtained by this process), is a qualifying apposition to the preceding words אביב קלוי באש. The noun אָבִיב, from אֵב *verdure*, *bloom* (Job VIII. 12; Cant. VI. 11; Ebn Ezra strangely from אָב the first, earliest), denotes the young ears of corn, still green and soft (hence Sept. νέα χίδρα, Vulg. *spicae virentes*, Aquil. and Symm. ἁπαλά). Though כַּרְמֶל is generally *garden* or *vineyard*, it is sometimes used, by way of metonomy, for the *produce* or *fruit* of the garden (comp. XXIII. 14; 2 Ki. IV. 42); and if employed in reference to corn, which is not generally grown in gardens, it seems to denote a superior quality, which, owing to careful cultivation, ripens earlier than the corn of the fields (comp. *Gesen.* Thes. p. 713). As the firstfruits were most properly presented as much as possible in their natural state, like the first sheaf on Passover, it is hardly probable that the grains were *crushed* or *pounded* (Sept. χίδρα ἐρικτά; Vulg. *confringes* in morem farris; Theodot. πίονα ἄλφιτα; Cleric. *contusionem;* Arnheim a. o. *Grütze*); for though גרשׂ, a root vague in import, may mean to pound or crush (comp. Hebr. and Syr. גרם, Arab. جرش), it denotes also *to rub* or *to rub out* (Onk. פֵּירוּכָן, from פרך *fricare;* Syr. פריכתא מרכיתא, i. e. perfricata pura; Ar. Erp. مهشم فريك; Samar. קליף peeled off, etc.; although Onkelos strangely renders in XXIII. 14, כרמל also with פירוכן; comp. *Rosenm.* Schol. on ver. 14; etc.). Aquil. and Symmach. translate כרמל λάχανα ὀσπριώδη, *tender pulse-like vegetables*, against the context (comp. Vulg. in XXIII. 14, pultes); Luther omits it altogether; and Jewish interpreters take it to mean the ears of corn still tender and juicy (comp. *Rosenm.* l. c.; Cleric. arista viridis; Arnh. volle Aehren), so that it would, in fact, be synonymous with אביב, which opinion is devoid of all etymological support; while Michaelis (Suppl. VI. p. 2253, No. 2363) unwarrantably proposes to read כְּרֶמֶל *like coarse sand*, analogous to the Arabic رمل (גרשׂ כְּרֶמֶל *contusum in arenae grossioris morem* granum frumenti, et elliptice כְּרֶמֶל *ut arena grossior*, eadem manente sententia).—The precepts concerning the offering of firstfruits (vers. 14—16) ought properly to have followed immediately after those concerning other bloodless offerings to which they are entirely analogous in ritual, whereas they are separated from them by some general commands applying not only to all bloodless but to all animal sacrifices alike (vers. 11—13); they are probably a supplementary addition appended by a reviser anxious to introduce a class of bloodless oblations of great practical importance for the tribe of Levi.

## 3. THE THANK-OFFERING (שְׁלָמִים).

# CHAPTER III.

SUMMARY.—Now follow the precepts concerning the *Thank-offering* (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים), which may be presented, male or female, either from the herd (vers. 1—5) or from the flock, whether a lamb (vers. 6—11) or a goat (vers. 12—16): the fat and the fat parts are to be burnt on the altar; the breast and the right shoulder belong to the priest, and the remainder of the victim to the offerer. Appended is a prohibition, enjoined for all time, against eating blood and fat.

1. And if his oblation *be* a thank-offering, if he offer *it* of the herd, whether *it be* a male or female, he shall offer it without blemish before the Lord. 2. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, and kill it at the door of the Tent of Meeting, and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about. 3. And he shall offer of the thank-offering, *as* an offering made by fire to the Lord, the fat

**1—17.** As the feeling of awe precedes that of joyful gratitude in man's relation to God, so undoubtedly the holocausts preceded the thank-offerings. And as the latter sentiment implies a religious progress, so does the latter class of sacrifices. This is especially evident from the degree of participation permitted to the offerer in either case. The holocaust was totally burnt to God, and even the hide was claimed by His ministers (VII. 8); the thank-offering was but very partially delivered up to the flames, indeed no more than was necessary to mark the animal as a sacrifice; the fat and the fat parts dedicated to God were hardly more than emblems to point to the sacredness of the act; the rest was retained mainly by the offerer himself. This indicates an important advance in religious development; it involves, in some sense, a more spiritual conception of the sacrificial practice; it aptly expresses the conviction that God, the bestower of every blessing, though all-powerful, does not disdain graciously to commune with man; and that man, the recipient of unceasing bounties, though dependent and ever needful, may in joyous confidence rely upon God's paternal protection (comp. pp. 1, 2). But the Levitical organisation, as devised in the Pentateuch, demanded slight modifications from the original ordinances regarding thank-offerings. Some portions — the breast and the right shoulder — were set apart for the priests, if the eucharistic sacrifice was private; while the ministers received all that remained after the burning of the fat and fat parts, if the offering was public; in the former case, the deviation had a practical, in the latter a theocratic or hierarchical reason; for in the one, it was devised as a provision for clerical functionaries; in the other, as an acknowledgment of God's sovereignty through His representatives; and, in neither case, the measure materially affected the fundamental idea of the thank-offering. It is also noteworthy that the rigour in the precepts of the

**that covers the bowels, and all the fat that *is* upon the bowels, 4. And the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is* by the flanks, and the great lobe of the liver, which he shall take off by the kidneys. 5. And Aaron's sons shall burn it on the altar upon the burnt-sacrifice, which *is* upon the wood on the fire; *it is* an offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to the Lord.**

burnt-offering is markedly relaxed compared with those of the eucharistic sacrifice; for while male animals exclusively were commanded for the former, male and female victims were indifferently permitted for the latter — a change arguing a more liberal spirit and a greater freedom of religious feeling.

The bloodless oblations might, of course, also be either holocausts or thank-offerings; but it appears that they were holocausts only in the early stages of sacrificial usage (see p. 482); in the Pentateuch they share with the thank-offerings this important characteristic, that a comparatively small portion only was burnt on the altar; but they differ from the thank-offerings in this remarkable point, that the remainder belonged entirely to the priests, whether they were offered for private individuals or for the whole nation; so that no part of them was, in any case, left to the worshippers themselves. The reason is obvious; they were probably, as a rule, presented by poorer people, and were of such small value, that they could hardly have been regarded as sacrifices unless they were entirely dedicated to sacred purposes; whereas, in animal thank-offerings, the surrender of "the fat that covers the bowels, and all the fat that is on the bowels, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, which is by the flanks, and the great lobe of the liver", and in certain classes of sheep the valuable tail also, together with the breast and right shoulder, was an act of sufficient self-denial on the part of the offerers, who were, moreover, bidden to invite the poor and helpless to share the sacrificial repast that followed the offering. Thus the three first classes of sacrifice — the holocaust, the bloodless, and the eucharistic — are allied by various and natural analogies; their very distinctions reveal their affinity; and they were, therefore, justly connected in an early attempt at sacrificial legislation (comp. II. 1; III. 1).

The tail (אַלְיָה) of the sheep above referred to is "extremely broad and large terminating in a small appendix that turns back upon it. It is of a substance between fat and marrow, is not eaten separately but mixed with the lean meat, and is also often used instead of butter." (*Harmer,* Observat. III. 329). It is "not less than three cubits in length, so that if it were allowed to trail on the ground, it would be bruised and fall into sores; but every shepherd . . . makes little carts and fastens them on the tails, binding the tail of each separate sheep to a separate cart." (*Herod.* III. 113; comp. *Aelian.* Nat. Anim. X. 4; *Mishn.* Shabb. V. 4; *Leo African.* Africae Descr. IX. p. 754 edit. Lugd. Batav. 1632). It weighs usually about fifteen pounds, but sometimes much more, up to fifty, while Leo Africanus contends to have seen one in Egypt weighing eighty pounds. That species of sheep (ovis laticaudata) is found extensively in Syria and Palestine, in southern Arabia and Egypt, northern Africa and other parts of the

**6. And if his offering for a thank-offering to the Lord *be* of the flock, he shall offer it, male or female, without blemish. 7. If he offers a lamb for his offering, then shall he offer it before the Lord. 8. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, and kill it before the Tent of Meeting; and Aaron's sons shall sprinkle its blood round about upon the altar. 9. And**

East; it is in Africa called "sheep of Barbery"; it is kindred to that now known under the name of Cape sheep because found especially at the Cape of Good Hope, "having a kind of apron tail, entirely of rich marrowy fat, extending to the width of their hind quarters, and frequently trailing on the ground; the weight of the tail is often more than six or eight pounds" (*Fellows*, Asia Minor, p. 10, quoted in Rawlinson's Edit. of Herod. II. p. 500); and Robinson observes, "The sheep of Palestine are all of the broad-tailed species; the broad part being a mere excrescence of fat, with the proper tail hanging out of it" (Biblical Researches, I. 477; comp. also *Aristot.* Hist. Anim. VIII. 27, *ἔν τε τῇ Συρίᾳ τὰ πρόβατα τὰς οὐρὰς ἔχει τὸ πλάτος πήχεως*; *Aelian*, Nat. Anim. III. 3; IV. 32; *Diod. Sic.* IV. 54; *Plin.* H. N. VIII. 48 or 75; see also *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. ii. 45, p. 496; *Rosenmüll.* Alterth. IV. 74—77; *Sonnini*, Voyage, III. 286, 287; Comm. on Exod. p. 555; *Kitto* on ver. 9).

Now this first sketch embodies, besides, the most important of the general principles of Hebrew sacrifices — that every fermenting substance, such as leaven and honey, ought to be avoided, while, on the other hand, salt was never to be omitted, in any offering (II. 11, 13); that the blood was to be sprinkled round the altar, and the fat to be burnt upon it; and that, therefore, neither blood nor fat was to be eaten in any age or in any clime (III. 17). For this latter injunction, the compiler found no more appropriate place than at the end of this first code, where it is introduced with some abruptness. But he mentions it as a simple and absolute command, without assigning to it a deeper reason (comp. also VII. 22—27). Now, primitively, both fat and blood were evidently shunned because they were supposed to involve the principle of animal life which it was deemed godless to consume. On this ground chiefly, and as forming the most sacred parts of the animal, they were ordered to be devoted to God upon the altar. As regards the fat, no more distinct statement occurs throughout the Pentateuch (see pp. 129—131). But a very peculiar significance was gradually attached to the blood. After the first and ruder notions of sacrifice had been conquered, the victim was currently regarded as a substitute for the offerer, and to suffer, as his representative, the death which he himself was held to have deserved for his transgressions. And since the blood was viewed as the element of life, it was the victim's blood which ensured the worshipper's atonement, and, in fact, wrought one of the chief ends of all sacrifice. These ideas were naturally developed in the course of time only; they are not alluded to in our text, but they are distinctly, and even emphatically set forth in a subsequent collection of sacrificial laws, "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that makes an atonement for the

**he shall offer of the thank-offering, *as* an offering made by fire to the Lord, its fat — the whole fat tail which he shall take off close by the backbone, and the fat that covers the bowels, and all the fat that *is* upon the bowels, 10. And the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is* by the flanks, and the great lobe of the liver, which he shall take off by the kidneys.**

soul" (XVII. 11; see p. 125). And if we read the injunction in its strict and categorical decision, "It shall be a perpetual statute for your generations (לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם), throughout all your dwellings" (בְּכֹל מוֹשְׁבֹתֵיכֶם), it is difficult to see how those who acknowledge the Divine origin of the Pentateuch, can ever deem themselves justified in eating the fat or blood of animals (comp. Exod. XII. 14, 20, 24; see, however, p. 131).

On the Thank-offering in general see pp. 241—249.

Philological remarks.—The second person in which the instructions were enjoined in nearly the whole of the preceding chapter (קרבנך, תקריב, etc., vers. 4, 5, 12, 14, etc; comp., however vers. 1, 2), passes now into the third person (וְסָמַךְ, קָרְבָּנוֹ, etc.), a common anallage in Hebrew (see Gramm. § LXXVII. 21. 1, 2). — פֶּתַח (ver. 2), the simple or adverbial accusative, stands for לִפְנֵי פֶּתַח (vers. 8, 13) *before the door* (see Gramm. § 86. 4.*e*). — The subject to וְהִקְרִיב (ver. 3) is "one of the priests" who were mentioned in the preceding verse. — "The fat that covers the bowels" is the large net of fat, which, beginning from the stomach with which it is joined, spreads over the intestines and covers them, serving especially to secure to these parts a proper degree of warmth; while "all the fat that is upon the bowels" is evidently the lumps of fat which form themselves between the guts or intestines and are easily detached from them. — The kidneys (כְּלָיוֹת, probably traceable simply to כְּלִי *vessel*, and not to כלה in the sense of desiring, Ps. LXXXIV. 3, though the כליות were considered as a seat of desires, comp. the Talmudical adage הלב מבין כליות יועצות) belong, as is well known, to the fattest parts of quadrupeds (comp. Deut. XXXII. 14), especially of rams (comp. Isai. XXXIV. 6); they are entirely *covered* with fat (*Hom*. Il. XXI. 204, δημὸν ἐπινεφρίδιον; comp. טֻחוֹת *reins*, Job XXXVIII. 36; Ps. LI. 8; derived by many from טוח *to cover*; see *Ebn Ezra* on Ps. l. c., שהם מכוסות חלב; *Bochart* Hieroz. I. ii. 45, p. 503, renes adipe illiti sunt atque obducti) to such a degree that it frequently degenerates into a disease, and causes the death of the animals (comp. *Aristot.* De Part. Anim. III. 9; etc.). — The כְּסָלִים of oxen, sheep, and goats are, according to Biblical statements (vers. 4, 10, 15; IV. 9; VII. 4), parts near the כליות or kidneys, and peculiarly fat and rich (comp. Job XV. 27); they are, therefore, undoubtedly *the flanks*, as many ancient translators render (Sept. μηροί; Aquila λαγόνες; Symm. ψόαι or ψύαι; Vulg. ilia; Targum Onkel. גִּיסְסַיָּא, that is sides; and so Syr. סטרא; Targ. Jonath. כַּפְלֵי, that is, the *doubled* or folded muscles of the flanks; Rashi flancs, explaining, "the fat that is on the kidneys when the animal is alive, is on the upper part of the flanks downward; and this is the fat which is under the thighs which are called *lombes*; it appears white in the upper part of the flanks, and in

11. And the priest shall burn it upon the altar; *it is* the food of the offering made by fire to the Lord.

12. And if his offering *be* a goat, then he shall offer it before the Lord. 13. And he shall lay his hand upon its head, and kill it before the Tent of Meeting; and the sons of Aaron shall sprinkle its blood upon the altar

the lower part it is covered by the flesh"), and most of the modern interpreters (Luther Lenden, Engl. Vers. flanks, etc.). The word כסל is scarcely identical with ἰξύς, that is, the waist or the small of the back (comp. *Hom.* Od. V. 231; X. 544, περὶ δὲ ζώνην βάλετ' ἰξυῖ); so *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. p. 507, who moreover observes, Utrumque (כסל and ἰξύς) puto primum *lumbum* significare, deinde per κατάχρησιν vicinas partes, puta *ilia* et ossa *ilii*, adeoque *os femoris huic suppositum*, atque inde esse quod כסל a Graecis μηρός redditur et μηρίον i. e. femur. The words את־החלב אשר עלהן וכ' can only be rendered "the fat that is on them (the kidneys), (namely) the fat that is by the flanks"; Bochart correctly "adipem qui est super ipsos, qui, inquam, est ad lumbos" (Hieroz. I. p. 506); Kimchi, and after him Drusius, supply unnecessarily and inappropriately *and* before the second אשר. — The term הַיֹּתֶרֶת על־הכבד which is not without difficulty, is most probably the one separate upper lobe of the liver, more distinct from the four other lobes, which, in some measure, forms a whole in itself, almost like the stomach with which it is united, and could therefore be called an *additional* or *abounding* part (יֹתֶרֶת or زيادة, as the Arabic translators render, though this term is by Avicenna described as an addition to the liver which contains the gall); for the furrows or *fossae* at the back of the liver, resembling in form the Greek letter *H*, divide that organ into four or five very unequal parts or lobes; that upper lobe is generally thicker and fatter than the rest of the lobes, and was therefore simply comprised under the denomination of fat (חלב, III. 16; VII. 30, 31); it was hence both easily distinguishable and removable, and particularly fit for the sacrifice; it could thus obviously be called not only יתרת הכבד (Exod. XXIX. 22; Lev. VIII. 16), but also על־הכבד (Exod. XXIX. 13; Lev. III. 4, 10, 15; IV. 9), and מִן־הכבד (Lev. IX. 10). That was probably the lobe κατ' ἐξοχήν, wherefore many ancient translators and expositors render the word in this sense; Sept., Philo (De Vict. 7), Josephus λοβὸς τοῦ ἥπατος or ἐπὶ τοῦ ἥπατος; and modern translators "the greater lobe of the liver", as Gesenius, Bähr, Ewald, Keil, and others. The same import has the rendering of some Jewish interpreters who express יתרת by טרפס or טרפשא; so Rashi on Exod. XXIX. 13, תרפשא דכבדא שקורין איברי״ש, that is, *hebras* in Spanish, *fibres* in French; Kimchi (Lib. Rad. s. v.) טרפש ובלע״ז אבר״ש, i. e. *hebras* (though he explains על־הכבד as if the יתרת were distinct from the liver, ופירשו עם הכבד כי מעט מן הכבד היה נוטל עם היותרת; similarly also Rashi); for טרפשא is evidently τράπεζα, by which term the Greeks designated the largest and thickest of the lobes of the liver, which was therefore called simply ὁ λοβός being broad like a *table* (comp. *Reland*, Ant. p. 551; *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. p. 501; *Pape*, Griech. Wörterb. s. v.; comp. also *fibrae* in Latin, distinguished by fatness; *Pers.* Sat. III. 32). Michaelis

round about. 14. And he shall offer thereof *as* his oblation, *as* an offering made by fire to the Lord, the fat that covers the bowels, and all the fat that *is* upon the bowels, 15. And the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is* by the flanks, and the great lobe of the liver, which he shall take off by the kidneys.

(on our passage) renders "the smaller lobe of the liver", which he explains as an appendage of the liver considerably smaller than the liver itself, and adjoining the kidneys (see also *Gerlach* in loc.); but not all ruminants have such appendage to their liver. Many have understood יתרת as the *net* which covers the liver — Vulg., Fuller, Coccejus, a. o. reticulum jecoris, and therefore later writers *omentum* minus hepatico-gastricum; Luther "das Netz um die Leber", Engl. Vers. "the caul above the liver", De Wette a. o., "das Netz an der Leber", Fürst "die netzartige Decke der Leber", Kurtz (Opferc. p. 182) "das kleine Netz oder Lebernetz", etc.; while Josephus (Ant. III. ix. 2), with a carelessness not uncommon in his descriptions of Levitical rites, renders both *λοβὸς τοῦ ἥπατος* and *ἐπίπλοος*: but this is not probable, first because the net is so firmly attached to the liver that it can hardly be separated from it, and then because being thin and comparatively meagre, it was not worthy to be burnt as an offering and could not be classed among the fat parts; for the fat that is contained between its folds is never considerable (comp. *Aristot.* De Part. An. IV. 3). The Chaldee and Syriac translators, evidently understanding עַל־הכבד strictly *above* the liver, render חַצְרָא or חָצֵר, that is *midriff* (so also Engl. Vers. marg. read.), Gr. *διάφραγμα*, that is, the muscle which is instrumental in the movement of the chest in breathing, and divides the thorax from the abdomen (Hom. *φρένες*, comp. Od. IX. 301, *οὐτάμεναι πρὸς στῆθος ὅθι φρένες ἧπαρ ἔχουσιν*). — אתו (ver. 5) refers either to אִשֶּׁה or to the various parts which compose the אשה taken collectively (comp. ver. 11 וְהִקְטִירוֹ, and ver. 16 וְהִקְטִירָם). The אִשֶּׁה shall be burnt עַל־הָעֹלָה, which is, simply, *upon the burnt-offering;* for the regular morning-holocaust was supposed to burn the whole day (see notes on VI. 1—6), and as it commenced the religious day, the thank-offering could properly be said to be consumed "upon the burnt-offering" (comp. also VI. 5, והקטיר עליה חלבי השלמים, see notes *in loc.*; and on על־העלה in IX. 14, see p. 240). It is scarcely appropriate to render *in the manner of the burnt-sacrifice* (Knobel and others), although the preposition עַל bears this translation (comp. V. 22; Isai. LX. 7; Jer. VI. 14; Ps. LVI. 1; CX. 4; Esth. IX. 26; see Gramm. § CVI. 5); for the thank-offering was *not* burnt in the manner of the holocaust; the former was divided into the fat parts and the other portions, the latter into the natural limbs of the animal (I. 6). But quite objectionable is the translation *in addition to the burnt sacrifice* (*Theodor.* Quaest. I. in Lev.; *Baumgarten,* p. 133; etc., etc.), as this would imply that thank-offerings were, in all cases, mere accompaniments of holocausts, which is entirely erroneous. — It is undoubted that אַלְיָה (ver. 9) is *tail* (Arab. أَلْيَة, Sept. Ex. XXIX. 22 *κέρκος*; Joseph. *οὐρά*, etc.), and not *hip* (Sept. in our passage *ὀσφύς*), nor *rump* (Engl. Vers.); and the tail of victims was by Greeks and Romans also devoted to the deity (comp. *Knobel,*

**16. And the priest shall burn them upon the altar *as* the food of the offering made by fire for a sweet odour: all the fat *belongs* to the Lord. 17. *It shall be* an eternal statute for your generations throughout all your dwellings, You shall eat neither any fat nor blood.**

Levit. p. 377). The tail was to be taken off "close by הֶעָצֶה"; the latter word must therefore mean *back-bone*; Onkel. שִׁדְרְתָא, Jonath. רְקִיתָא, that is, ῥάχις, Kimchi, s. v., קצה השדרה; "the spine resembles a tree עץ with its branches", Bechai, Wessely, a. o.), or more accurately still the *os coccygis* (Arab. عصعص, so Saad.; see *Boch.* Hieroz. I. ii. 49, p. 497); it is certainly not the flesh or the muscles of the *flanks* (Sept. ψόαι), a rendering caused by the erroneous conception of אליה as hip (τὴν ὀσφὺν ἄμωμον σὺν ταῖς ψόαις), which is incorrect in various respects, nor *kidneys* (Vulg. cum renibus, Rashbam, Rashi, playfully explaining למעלה מן הכליות היועצות, comp. *Talm.* Chull. 11*a*, and others). The tail of sheep only, but not of other quadrupeds, is enumerated among the fat parts (comp. especially Levit. IX. 19, where החלבים of the שור is contrasted with the אליה and other fat or fat parts of the איל, so that the athnach under שור is not only correct but indispensable; so the Sept. and essentially the Syriac); therefore, it was not absolutely considered as "fat", and was, according to Jewish tradition, not comprised in the prohibition concerning the eating of fat (Lev. III. 17; VII. 23, 25), for it was believed that that only which of all the clean sacrificial animals alike was burnt upon the altar, was most holy, and therefore interdicted as human food (comp. *Yoreh Deah* § 64. 5, חלב האליה לא נקרא חלב אלא לענין קרבן). Yet the Karaites were of a different opinion and declared the tail of the sheep also to be unlawful for food, like all other fat parts (comp. *Talm.* Chull. 117*a*); nay traces of this divergence between the Rabbanites and the Karaites are found even in the old translators of the Pentateuch. For while the majority of them, like our received text, was on the side of the former, the Samaritan codex exhibits the view of the latter; thus our text, like the old translations, has in Exod. XXIX. 22 and Lev. VIII. 25, "and thou shalt take (and he took) the fat AND the fat tail (החלב והאליה)", whereas the Samaritan codex reads, "the fat, namely the fat tail" etc. (החלב האליה), so that אליה is one specified part of the fat comprised in the general term חלב; which alone seems to be the logical reading in those passages; and such subdivision is, indeed, maintained in other passages, as Levit. VII. 3 (כל חלבו ··· האליה; but the Sept. adds again *and* before אליה; the Vulgate, to effect the same purpose omits כל חלבו entirely, so that the אליה would not belong to חלב at all); III. 9 (חלבו האליה, though the Sept., the Syr., and Targ. Jerus. render חלב והאליה, and Saad. and Bechai חלבו והאליה, thus again excluding the tail from the category of fat; comp. *Geiger*, Urschrift, pp. 467—469, and Ozar Nechmad 1863, pp. 101, 102). It is, therefore, as unnecessary as it would be inadmissible, to render חלבו in our passage (ver. 9) "the choicest parts of it" (כל המיטב והמובחר, Wessely, Herxheimer, Arnheim, Wogue, a. o.; comp. also Targ. Jonath. טוב שומניה).

## 4. Expiatory Offerings.

### α. Sin-offering (חַטָּאת), IV. 1—V. 13.

## CHAPTER IV.

**Summary.**—The laws regarding expiatory sacrifices, whether sin-offerings (חַטָּאת, IV. 1—V. 13) or trespass-offerings (אָשָׁם, V. 14—26). The sin-offering presented by the High-priest (IV. 3—12) or in the name of the whole people (IV. 13—21) was more solemn than that presented for a "ruler" (נָשִׂיא, IV. 22—26), and this again more solemn than that of a common Israelite (V. 27—35): the difference lay both in the choice of the victim and the significance of the ritual, especially the modes of sprinkling the blood (comp. vers. 6, 7, 17, 18, 25, 30, 34). In all four cases, the fat and fat parts were to be burnt on the altar; but in the two former, the remainder of the victim was to be burnt without the camp, in the two latter, it was to be consumed by the priests in a clean place. Then follow some special instances of sin-offerings (V. 1—13), namely, for neglecting to give information as witness, for all kinds of impurity, and for heedless oaths or vows (vers. 1—4); in all which cases the offender was required to present a female lamb or goat as a sin-offering (vers. 5, 6), or if he was poor, two turtle-doves or pigeons, one to be sacrificed as a sin-offering, the other as a holocaust (vers. 7, 10), or even merely the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour, unaccompanied by oil and incense (vers. 11—13). Then only are stated the precepts concerning the trespass-offering, which was prescribed for unlawful appropriation of property, whether unintentional (vers. 14—19) or designed (vers. 20—26), and whether the property was sacred (vers. 14—16) or secular (vers. 17—19): the trespass-offering consisted of a superior and faultless ram, together with full restitution of the unjustly acquired property increased by one fifth of its value.

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Speak

**1, 2.** Submission and gratitude are indeed the emanations of a religious frame of mind; but their source is mainly in a feeling of *dependence*; they bespeak, therefore, only an outward or material relation of man to God; and even gratitude for benefits received is, from this point of view, not essentially distinct from submission on account of dangers to be averted. Hence burnt-offerings and thank-offerings are among the earliest manifestations of religious feeling; and they are found even among nations rude and untutored. They are based on the conception of the deity as the lord of nature and the dispenser of human destinies. They require, as their foundation, merely the general and elementary cosmic notions. But the Hebrews were among the few races that passed beyond this narrow circle of ideas. They conceived God as the Holy one, distinct from the world and elevated above it. Thus they were enabled to create and to adopt a Divine Law, or a moral code, reflecting the sacredness of God, and designed to form the very centre of human existence. Thus again they were enabled truly to define sin as the opposition to the holy will of God, and to trace the

**to the children of Israel saying, If a soul sins unawares**

evil not merely in its outward effects, but to follow it to its source, the wanton deviation from the goodness and perfection of the Deity. These views were steadily developed among the Hebrews; they were understood and expressed with growing distinctness by the profounder minds; and they ultimately gave rise to a new kind of sacrifices — the *expiatory offerings* — designed to keep alive the desire and the hope of godlike purity, whenever the heart is pained and oppressed by a conviction of guilt and a saddening consciousness of its estrangement from the Divine holiness. A class of sacrifices resulting from ideas so refined and spiritual, was most probably adopted at a late period in the history of the nation; it was, perhaps, at the time when the ordinances regarding it were compiled (ch. IV, V), little known and unterstood in its full import. While the two previous kinds of offering are mentioned as a recognized and ordinary usage and treated as such, the third is introduced, with a certain circumstantial minuteness, as a matter little familiar to the people, and, in fact, detailed for their information. On the one hand we read, "If any one of you bring an offering to the Lord, you shall bring your offering of the cattle . . . If his offering be a burnt-sacrifice of the herd, etc." (I. 2, 3); or, "And if his oblation be a thank-offering, if he offer it of the herd, whether it be a male or female, etc." (III. 1). But on the other hand, our text states, "If a soul shall sin unawares against any of the prohibitions of the Lord which ought not to be done, and shall act against anything of any of them . . . then let him bring for his sin which he has committed . . . a young bullock for a sin-offering." The stress which is here laid on some words, permits another inference. There is evidence to prove that a certain sort of expiatory sacrifice — the trespass-offering (אָשָׁם) — was indeed known and practised among the Israelites from a comparatively early time. But it was limited to a few offences mostly connected with the rights of property or the laws of purification, and to those offences only if intentionally committed (see pp. 267, 272). As religious education advanced, and the notion of a "holy people", the children of a "holy God" was unfolded and took root, the expiatory sacrifice was, on the one hand, indeed extended to *all* the Divine commandments (כָּל מִצְוֺת יְהוָה), but was, on the other hand, restricted to those that were inadvertently transgressed (בִּשְׁגָגָה), while those designedly contravened could not be expiated at all by a sacrifice, but were amenable to the rigour of legal punishments. For the holy community was defiled by the guilt of one of its members; that guilt, if unintentional, could, consistently with the character of the theocracy, be expiated by an offering; but it could not, without danger to the state, be remitted, if intentional; "The soul that does ought presumptuously . . . blasphemes the Lord, and that soul shall be cut off from among his people; because he has despised the word of the Lord, and has broken His commandment; that soul shall utterly be cut off; his iniquity shall be upon him" (Num. XV. 30, 31). These conceptions which underlie the expiatory offerings of the Pentateuch, are pure and eternal; they lose nothing if divested of their accidental or Levitical form, or the peculiarities of the monotheistic system; the ideal of moral excellence and of the happiness that arises from the fear of sin, lives in the human race; and the

**against any of the prohibitions of the Lord, which ought**

depth of contrition and the blessed feeling of restored harmony after offences remain realities, whether they are shadowed forth in some ceremonial, or brought into connection with a personal and perfect Being whom man invests with every attribute of greatness and perfection.

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — The fourth and fifth chapters form a second and later code of sacrificial laws; comprising the expiatory offerings, they are naturally divided into two parts, one treating of the *sin-offering* (חטאת, IV. 1—V. 13), and one of the trespass-offering (אשם, V. 14—26), each division being introduced by a separate heading (IV. 1 and V. 14); see the Introduction. — Nothing can be more decidedly against the spirit of these laws than to suppose that unintentional offences required expiation, *as a fine*, in order to warn and guard the people more effectually against intentional transgressions (Clericus); the expiatory sacrifices had no such practical object; they were, in themselves, so important that they could well be designed to serve no other purpose but their own; their sole aim was the purity of the theocratic community and of each of its members. — בִּשְׁגָגָה (vers. 2, 22, 27, comp. ver. 13; Num. XXXV. 11, 15) is undoubtedly *with inadvertence*, *inadvertently*, or *unawares* (Sept. *ἀκουσίως*; comp. ולא ידע, V. 17; בבלי דעת, Deut. IV. 42 and Num. XXXV. 11; ונעלם ממנו, Lev. V. 2—4; IV. 13), or *by error* (Onk. בְּשָׁלוּ), or in the words of the Mishnah (Horay. II. 3), אין חייבין אלא על העלם דבר עם שגגת המעשה (ignorantia rei cum errore facti); the term is employed in opposition to "audaciously" (ביד רמה) or "intentionally" (Num. XV. 30; comp. בִּצְדִיָּה, Num. XXXV. 20) or heedlessly (as the offence of the people, during Saul's reign, when after a fatiguing pursuit of the enemy, they ate meat with its blood, 1 Sam. XIV. 32—34); it does not mean *from ignorance* (Vulg., Aq. *ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ*, Clericus, Rosenmüller on V. 17; comp. *ἀγνοήματα*, Hebr. IX. 7), so that the offender, though aware of his deed, was unconscious of its criminal character; the text speaks of "the commandments of the Lord", of which nobody could plead to be ignorant because believed to have been publicly promulgated; for instance, a man may have married a woman, whom he did not know to be his aunt (XX. 19, 20); but a man is not presumed to be ignorant of the unlawfulness of a marriage with his aunt: in the former case, he might expiate his guilt by a sin-offering, when he is informed of the real facts; the latter case is not at all provided for in the Law; it involves indeed also a transgression of a Divine command, and was no doubt dealt with by the priests or leaders, if it came to their knowledge, but it was certainly not met by an expiatory offering. Attempts have been made to set apart the חטאת for the one class of offences, the אשם for the other; but they are ineffectual, because not borne out by Scriptural statements (see p. 265). However, it is indisputably against the meaning of these ordinances to limit their application strictly and exclusively to sins of *commission*, so that, for instance, those who had unawares *omitted* to celebrate the Passover in its due time, were not bound or not allowed to offer a חטאת as an expiation (comp. *Mishn.* Kerith. I. 1, and Barten. in loc. ואין קרבן על שגגתן): the word מִצְוָה denotes not only *precept*, but also *prohibition* (comp. Gen. II. 16, 17), that is, *law* in its widest sense, whether positive or negative, as is evident from the wording

not to be done, and acts against anything of any one of them: *3.* If the anointed *High*-priest sins to the guilt of the people; then let him bring for his sin which he has committed, a young bullock without blemish to the

of the second verse, "If a soul shall sin unawares against any of the prohibitions of the Lord which ought not to be done" (מצות יהוה אשר לא תעשינה; comp. Num. XV. 22), which phrase implies no such ellipsis as "*concerning things* which ought not to be done" (Engl. Vers.; as the verb תעשינה refers strictly to מצות). Therefore, insisting upon the literal expression of the injunction, we might be justified in understanding sins of omission rather than sins of commission; but the distinction between these two classes is altogether artificial and barren; it is not organically derived from the nature of sin itself, which is equally to be avoided or to be atoned for whether a positive or a negative command has been neglected; positive and negative command are, in fact, convertible terms; "remember the sabbath day to keep it holy" (Exod. XX. 8) is identical with "thou shalt not desecrate the sabbath" (comp. Ezek. XX. 16; XXII. 8; etc.). But it is probable that from the time of their introduction, expiatory sacrifices were only offered for real and evident contraventions of legal precepts, but not if a general feeling of sinfulness and moral frailty was to be confessed (comp. *Maim.* Pref. to Mishn. Zevach.); for the latter objects the older burnt-offerings were undoubtedly retained, which had gradually assumed an expiatory character, and had extensively been presented in this sense (see p. 473): hence חטאת and אשם were offered only as an obligation, but never as a vow (נדר) or free-will gift (נדבה.) — On נפש construed both with the feminine (תחטא) and the masculine (ועשה), see note on II. 1. — The particle מִן in מִכֹּל and מֵאַחַת has partitive sense, "with regard to any of all", and "with regard to anything of any one of them" (comp. V. 13), as in אביון מֵאחד אחיך (in Deut. XV. 7, a poor man, any one of thy brethren), although it is so difficult to render in our language that it almost seems to be pleonastically employed (comp. Gramm. § CV. 4; *Gesen.* Thesaur. p. 801; Lehrgeb. § 228. 2; *Ewald*, Krit. Gram. § 322.*b*); we have here, therefore, no *constructio praegnans*, "and acts *by deviating* from any one of them" (Wessely, Wogue). The Talmud (Shabb. 103*a*, *b*) gravely remarks, "מאחת מהנה means in a part of a sin, for instance, if a person writes on Sabbath שם of שמעון or of שמואל, or נח of נחור, or דן of דניאל"; and this futility is approvingly quoted by Rabbinical interpreters (as Rashi and Rashbam).

**3—12.** A gradation established with regard to no other class of sacrifices was appointed in reference to the sin-offering (חַטָּאת). The solemnity of the latter varied in accordance with the position or importance occupied by the offerer in the theocratic state. The individual and the community were, by this peculiar organisation, inseparably joined in a bond of mutual relationship. The righteousness of the one enhanced the holiness of the other; and the impiety of the former endangered the very existence of the latter. The Hebrew theocracy resembled the Spartan and Roman polity in so far, as, in either, the man was merged in the citizen; but the Spartan or Roman citizen was exclusively a political being; the Hebrew citizen — as ideally conceived in the Pentateuch — was

Lord for a sin-offering. 4. And he shall bring the bullock to the door of the Tent of Meeting before the Lord, and shall lay his hand upon the bullock's head, and kill the bullock before the Lord. 5. And the anointed *High*-priest shall take *some* of the bullock's blood, and bring it to the Tent of Meeting: 6. And the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord against the vail

stunted in none of his human faculties, but, raised into a sphere of holiness, he retained full scope for all domestic and social virtues, which he was indeed expected to bring into harmony with a system that acknowledged God, the holy and the perfect, as king and as ruler. Now, from these points of view, the supreme requirement was the sanctity of the nation in its totality. If the whole people had been defiled by some involuntary transgression, the theocracy was most directly profaned, and the sacred relation between God and Israel disturbed or interrupted. Therefore, the expiatory offering presented on such occasions was surrounded by a ceremonial of the utmost impressiveness: the blood of a bullock dedicated to God by the imposition of hands on the part of the elders of the people, was by the High-priest sprinkled seven times against the vail before the Holy of Holies and put upon the horns of the golden altar in the Holy. But the people was, theocratically, represented by the High-priest; the sin of the latter was, therefore, a breach of the holy covenant as flagrant as the sin of the former; and hence, "if the High-priest sinned to the guilt of the people" (לְאַשְׁמַת הָעָם), his sin-offering was exactly identical with that presented for a transgression of the whole people, except that, naturally, he himself performed the imposition of hand. Nay, Jewish tradition teaches, "If the bullock of the High-priest and the bullock of the congregation stand together ready for sin-offerings, the former has the precedence in every way" (*Mishn.* Horay. III. 6). This law was not suggested merely by the supreme honour in which the High-priest was held as the chief spiritual instructor; nor by the consideration that the influence of his example was all-powerful for good or for evil, and especially in those matters which formed the life and centre of the commonwealth; it was not even dictated by such maxims as, "A sin is small or great according to the dignity of the sinner" (החטא הוא קטן או גדול בערך החוטא) or, "The imprudence of a leader is equivalent to recklessness" (שגגת תלמוד עולה זדון); but it was required by the very nature of the organisation which demanded a holy mediator between a holy God and an erring people. This train of ideas almost spontaneously led to the notion and the desire of a sinless intercessor or High-priest; therefore, Philo already speaks of a "true High-priest who has no participation in sin", in contradistinction to a High-priest "who is falsely so called" (*ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἀρχιερεὺς, καὶ μὴ ψευδόμενος, ἀμέτοχος ἁμαρτημάτων ἐστίν*, De Victim. c. 10); and this idea is, in the New Testament, found in full development (Hebr. VII. 26—28, see p. 158). Therefore, the High-priest had to present the sin-offering here described not only for a neglect of the official obligations devolving upon him as the spiritual head of the people, but for any offence whatever (comp. Lev. X. 6; XXI. 10, 11); he could, on

of the Sanctuary. 7. And the priest shall put *some* of
the blood upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense
before the Lord, which *is* in the Tent of Meeting;
and shall pour all the *other* blood of the bullock
at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering, which
*is* at the door of the Tent of Meeting. 8. And he
shall take off from the bullock of the sin-offering
all the fat — the fat that covers the bowels, and all
the fat that *is* upon the bowels, 9. And the two kidneys,

no account, be separated from his sacred office; his every action was to reflect the peculiar system which he embodied. Yet it is the opinion of Jewish expositors that a kid of the goats, one year old, was sacrificed for an unconscious act of idolatry, whether it had been practiced by a king, a High-priest, a priest, or a private Israelite, because with regard to the worship of God all Hebrews were supposed to have been informed alike; and that for a sin of impurity committed with respect to the Sanctuary or the holy food, a female kid or a female lamb was offered by the High-priest in common with all Israelites; but that if any other law was transgressed, the distinctions between the offering of a High-priest, a chief, and a common Israelite were maintained (so *Maimonides*, De Noxiis, c. X.; *Abarbanel*, Introd. to Levit. c. 4, p. 324 ed. Veil). Nothing can be more opposed to the spirit of the ordinances under discussion; the very letter militates against that view; for the general introduction, equally applying to all subsequent cases, speaks of "any of the commandments of the Lord" (כָּל מִצְוֹת יְהוָה) and of "anything of any one of them" (אַחַת מֵהֵנָּה). But the following analogy, which indeed obviously offers itself, is more objectionable still, if urged too closely. It is true that, according to Hebrew and to Eastern notions generally, a misdeed of the head of the house is visited upon the whole family (Josh. VII. 24, 25), and an offence of the chief of the state upon all the members of the community (2 Sam. XXIV. 10—25): but the High-priest is not only the head and chief, but the representative of the people; the sin of the one is *eo ipso* the sin of the other (comp. p. 296 note 4). The Eastern custom of making all the connections of the offender responsible for his guilt is barbarous; whereas the spiritual relation between High-priest and people, as sketched in the Pentateuch, is the result of a long and careful religious education; and it may be considered artificially refined and subtle rather than barbarous (comp. Comm. on Exod: pp. 348—350). — According to Talmudical teaching, the offences of the later sanhedrim were estimated and expiated like those of the High-priest; this is in so far in harmony with the spirit of the Pentateuch, as the sanhedrim was the highest authority in matters of faith; but it possessed also worldly powers that had before been vested in the elders of the people; it had not the character of a mediating body between God and Israel; and as it could not expiate the nation, so it could not directly defile it.

Philological Remarks.—The third verse begins the first subdivision of the general and comprehensive case put in the second verse, "If any one sin"; the next subdivision follows in ver. 13; hence the Sept. has correctly in ver. 2 ψυχὴ ἐὰν ἁμάρτῃ, in ver. 3

and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is* by the flanks, and the great lobe of the liver, which he shall take off by the kidneys, 10. As it is taken off from the bullock of the thank-offering; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar of the burnt-offering. 11. And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head, and with

*ἐὰν μὲν ὁ ἀρχιερεύς*, and in ver. 13 *ἐὰν δὲ πᾶσα συναγωγή*; it is uncalled for to supply at the end of the second verse, *sacrificio expiet delictum suum* (as Dathe, Rosenmüller, and others do). — הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ (vers. 3, 5, 16) is evidently the High-priest (Sept. *ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ κεχρισμένος*, or *ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστὸς ὁ τετελειωμένος*; Onk. כהנא רבא; Ebn Ezra הכהן הגדול; Vulg. merely sacerdos qui unctus est; the Samar. adds אשר מלא את־ידו, comp. VIII. 33; the Mishnah, Horayoth III. 4, understands exclusively the כהן המשוח בשמן המשחה, not the כהן המרובה בבגדים, see the Treatise on Priesthood); it is equivalent to הכהן הגדול (XXI. 10), because the High-priest alone was consecrated by a more complete anointment (VIII. 12, 30; XXI. 12; comp. Exod. XXIX. 7). And if there were any doubt concerning the meaning of הכהן המשיח, it would be unequivocally removed by the words "to the sin of the people" (לְאַשְׁמַת הָעָם), which can apply to none but the religious chief of the nation, for they mean, "so that his sin falls upon the nation" (in culpam populi, comp. X. 6); not, "according to the sin of the people" (Engl. Vers.), much less "delinquere faciens populum" (Vulg.), *τοῦ τὸν λαὸν ἁμαρτεῖν* (Sept.; *ὥστε τὸν λαὸν ἁμαρτεῖν*, Philo), or "per errorem, quod populus sequutus similiter peccaverit" (Rosenm.; comp. Ebn Ezra, a. o.; comp. Mal. II. 8). Though the Law makes no mention of the sin-offering of a common priest, it was probably like that of the High-priest, not like that of the chief (נשיא); because the common priest was more immediately connected with the theocracy than the chief, whose position was political and social rather than religious. Those, therefore, are certainly mistaken who (like Ebn Ezra on ver. 26) place the priest and Levite, with regard to sin-offerings, on the same footing as the common Israelite. The explanation of Philo (De Victim. c. 10), to which we have alluded above, is partly inaccurate, partly mystical and opposed to the spirit of the O. T.; for he observes that the High-priest receives such honour not so much for his own sake, but on account of being a servant of the nation; and he adds, "and if ever he stumble, this will happen to him, not for his own sake, but for the common errors of the nation." — On the term הִזָּה (ver. 6), used in connection with חטאת only, and its distinction from זָרַק, employed with regard to שלמים, עולה, and אשם, see p. 190 note 7. — The priest "shall sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord against the vail of the Sanctuary" (לפני יהוה את־פני פרכת הקדש); the latter words, rather obscure in import, cannot mean "*before* the vail" (Targum Onk., Luther, Engl. Vers., Hofmann, Knobel), that is, on the ground of the Holy, because then the sacred blood would have been trod upon by the priests who were habitually occupied in the Sanctuary, or by the High-priest who, on the day of Atonement, entered the Holy of Holies. It is true, that in sprinkling the blood of expiation, the *direction* towards the vail, on account

his legs, and his bowels, and his dung, 12. Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp to a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire; where the ashes are poured out shall he be burnt.

13. And if the whole congregation of Israel sins unawares, and the thing is hidden from the eyes of the community, and they have done anyone of the prohibitions of the Lord which ought not to be done, and are guilty; 14. And if the sin, which they have com-

of the Mercy-seat (כפרת) behind it, was pre-eminently important (כנגד מקום קדושתה, see Rashi and Rashb. *in loco*; comp. Num. XIX. 4 אל־נכח); but for this very reason it is probable that the vail itself was sprinkled upon (Sept. *κατὰ τὸ καταπέτασμα*, Vulg. contra velum). "Before the vail" is usually לפני הפרכת (Exod. XXX. 6; XL. 26), which expression would most probably have been preferred here also, were it even for the sake of symmetry with לפני יהוה, if that meaning had been intended. The words "before the Lord" (לפני יהוה), have, in this connection, a more emphatic, we might almost say, a more literal, meaning than in other passages (as in vers. 4, 15, 24 etc.); they really denote the place from which God was believed to commune with Israel (Exod. XXV. 22), not merely the holy Tabernacle in general, or even the Holy, where the shew-bread, the frank-incense, and the lights of the candlestick were prepared "before the Lord" (Exod. XXVIII. 35; XXX. 8; XL. 23, 25).—The words על־הכליות יסירנה (ver. 9) mean "he shall take it off (viz. the lobe of the liver) by the kidneys" (comp. on III. 4), not "with the kidneys" (Engl. Vers., Sept. *σὺν τοῖς νεφροῖς*).—A peculiar meaning has been attributed to the express statement that the same parts shall be burnt of the sin-offering as of the thank-offering (ver. 10); for, observes Philo (De Victim. c. 11), "in a certain sense the man who repents has also restored his safety, since he is cured of a disease of the soul, which is worse than the evils of the body"; a view which illustrates, not so much the words of Scripture, but Philo's fine though allegorising spiritualism. — If the whole animal was not burnt, the fat and fat parts were delivered to the flames to represent the whole.—כָּל־הַדָּם (in vers. 7, 18, 30, 34, and Sept. and some Mss. in ver. 25) means, of course, "all the *other* or *remaining* blood" (comp. ver. 9 הנשאר בדם); comp. Exod. XXIX. 12 and Lev. VIII. 15; Vulg. omnem reliquum sanguinem; Rashi שירי הדם; Knobel "sein Blut im ganzen, die grosse Masse desselben."—On the construction of vers. 11, 12 (ואת־עור הפר··· והוציא את־כל־הפר) see Gram. §§ 74. 5; 75. 3.

**13—21.** If any unintentional sin of the whole community was to be atoned for (comp. ver. 2.), our text prescribes the sacrifice of a bullock, as in the case of the High-priest's sin-offering; but on many occasions, and especially on the Day of Atonement, the animal slaughtered for the general expiation of the people was not a bull, but a goat inferior in value (XVI. 8, 15), for which discrepancy we have tried to account in another place (pp. 40, 41). It may here suffice to remark that "the whole congregation of Israel" treated of in

mitted concerning it, becomes known; then the community
shall offer a young bullock for a sin-offering and bring
him before the Tent of Meeting, 15. And the elders
of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head
of the bullock before the Lord, and *one of them* shall
kill the bullock before the Lord. 16. And the anointed
*High*-priest shall bring *some* of the bullock's blood to the
Tent of Meeting; 17. And the *High*-priest shall dip his
finger in the blood, and sprinkle *it* seven times before
the Lord, against the vail. 18. And he shall put *some*
of the blood upon the horns of the altar which *is* before
the Lord, that *is* in the Tent of Meeting, and shall pour
out all the *other* blood at the bottom of the altar of
burnt-offering which *is* at the door of the Tent of Meeting.
19. And he shall take all his fat from him, and burn

our text, is indeed the people itself, whose very elders (זִקְנֵי הָעֵדָה, ver. 15) are named, and not, as Rabbinical interpreters, anxious to account for the difference just pointed out, have contended, the great sanhedrim, which might, from error, proclaim a decree calculated to mislead the whole nation (comp. *Mishn.* Horay. I. 1 *sqq.*; *Rashi* on ver. 13; *Maimon.* Shegig. c. 14).

Philological Remarks.—For reasons pointed out in the notes on vers. 3—12, the regulations on the sin-offering of the people ought consistently to precede those on the sin-offering of the High-priest; but the order is here reversed; and this illogical arrangement manifests the late origin and hierarchical character of this part of the Levitical legislation (see *infra.* notes on vers. 22—35).—The plain precepts contained in these verses have by Jewish tradition been even more strangely misunderstood than has above been mentioned. They were interpreted to mean that *twelve* (or thirteen) bulls were to be sacrificed, one for each tribe (and one for the sanhedrim); whereas this law centres in the notion of the *unity* of Israel as the nation of God (comp. הַקָּהָל, vers. 14, 21; the term קהל יהודה in 2 Chr. XX. 5 does not prove that each tribe was like the congregation); and they have been supposed to imply a distinction between the crime of idolatry and other offences punishable with excision (כָּרֵת), so that in the former case twelve (or thirteen) kids of the goats were to be presented in addition to as many bulls (in reference to Num. XV. 24), whereas the sanctity of the people which was measured by the perfection of God, was disturbed by even the least infringement of His commands (see ver. 13, אחת מכל־מצות יהוה; comp. *Mishn.* Horay. I. 5; see also *Lightfoot*, Oper. I. 706, 707). — וְנוֹדְעָה (ver. 14) belongs to the first clause, like וְאָשֵׁמוּ (ver. 13), "and if the sin becomes known", analogous to או־הודע in vers. 23, 28. The translation, "Si totus Israelis coetus aliquid deliquerit ... culpam contraxerunt; si peccatum ab iis commissum innotuerit, offerat coetus" etc. (Maurer) is partly languid (see *infra* on או ver. 23), and partly abrupt.— עליה (ver. 14) refers to אחת (ver. 13) — the sin which they (the community) have committed with regard to it; Jewish interpreters explain

*it* upon the altar. 20. And he shall do with the bullock as he did with the *first* bullock for a sin-offering, so shall he do with this: and the *High*-priest shall make an atonement for them, that they may be forgiven. 21. And he shall carry forth the bullock without the camp, and burn him as he burnt the first bullock: it *is* the sin-offering for the community.

22. A ruler who sins and does unawares anyone of all the prohibitions of the Lord his God which ought not to be done, and *is* guilty; 23. If his sin, wherein he has sinned, is brought to his knowledge, he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a male without blemish; 24. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the goat, and kill him in the place where they kill the burnt-offering before the Lord: it *is* a sin-offering. 25. And the priest shall take *some* of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put *it* upon the horns

"the sin of the spiritual leaders (or sanhedrim), on account of which they (the individual Israelites) have sinned" (see Wessely *in loc.*); a conception forbidden by sound rules of exegesis.— The subject to וְשָׁחַט (ver. 15) is undoubtedly one or the first of the elders (Sept. σφάξουσι), in harmony with the general laws of slaughtering the victim (see p. 184). — טָבַל is, in ver. 17, joined with מִן (as in XIV. 16), although the construction with בְּ is more usual (ver. 6; IX. 9; 1 Sam. XIV. 27; Ruth II. 14; etc.), and טבל מן־הדם may be rendered "to dip in some of the blood" (Sept. βάψει ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος). — לפר החטאת (ver. 20) means, of course, "with the *first* bullock", or that presented for the High-priest; or לפר החטאת הראשון, comp. ver. 21. — The words וכפר עלהם הכהן (ver. 20, comp. ver. 26; V. 13, 18), though not decisively proving in favour of the principle of substitution, are at least not against it. Rosenmüller (Excursus I ad Levit. p. 199) translates erroneously, "hoc modo sacerdos aboleat peccatum ejus et poena ei remittatur", misguided by his incorrect conception of the nature of the sin-offering as *mulcta* or *abolitio criminis* in the same sense. — Some editions write נֶעְלַּם (ver. 13, and V. 2, 4), with dagesh in ל, on which see Gramm. § II. 2. *b*. — On the relation later established between king, High-priest, people, and sanhedrim, see *Mishn.* Horay. I. 1 *sqq.*; II. 1 *sqq.*

**22—35.** The "chief" or "ruler" (נָשִׂיא), which term includes kings, Judges, military leaders, and the heads of the tribes or principal families (בֵּית אָב, Num. III. 24, 30, 35; 1 Ki. VIII. 1), and perhaps also the elders (comp. Exod. XXIV. 1, 9, 11), was less directly concerned with the religious doctrines or the Divine sovereignty; his unintentional offence against the Law was, therefore, atoned for by a sin-offering inferior in solemnity to that of the nation, the High-priest, or the priest; the victim was not a bull, but a kid of the goats; the principal ceremony was not performed by the High-priest but by a common priest; and the blood was neither sprinkled before the vail of the Holy of Holies nor on the altar

of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out his *other* blood at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering.
26. And he shall burn all his fat upon the altar, like the fat of the thank-offering: and the priest shall make an atonement for him on account of his sin, that he may be forgiven.

27. And if any one of the common people sins unawares, because he does anyone of the prohibitions of the Lord which ought not to be done, and is guilty;
28. If his sin, which he has committed, is brought to his knowledge, then he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a female kid without blemish, for his sin which he has committed. 29. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering, and slay the sin-offering in the place of the burnt-offering. 30. And the

of frank-incense in the Holy, but on the horns of the brazen altar in the Court. Yet the "chief" was, in some degree, identified with the unity of Israel; he either represented an important fraction of the people, or the entire nation in a political or social respect; and as, in the theocracy, the worldly and the spiritual elements were inseparably allied, since every worldly institution was the embodiment of some spiritual truth or principle, and every spiritual truth was made the groundwork or support of some political arrangement; the sin-offering of the chief was higher in dignity than that of a private Israelite, which consisted, not of a male goat, but of a female victim, whether a goat or a lamb; yet both coincided in the ceremonies; no part of them was permitted in the Holy of Holies, which was reserved for acts directly theocratic; but all were performed in the Court, or near the altar of burnt-offering, which represented the ordinary religious life of the Hebrews.

Those who are accustomed to an historical analysis of ideas and institutions, will at once admit that the Hebrews could not arrive at the pure and spiritual notions of atonement sketched here and elsewhere by a sudden bound or at an early epoch of their national existence. They had indeed to pass through almost all the stages by which untutored nations advance from rude materialism to intellectual elevation. What immeasurable distance separates the Israelite who sacrificed his only daughter in obedience to a blind and barbarous vow, from the Israelite who conceived the noble law which includes the native and the stranger in one bond of mercy, and assures both alike of Divine forgiveness for sins of human frailty! (Num. XV. 22—29; comp. XIX. 10; 1 Ki. VIII. 41—43). But the movement did not end there. The holy community, if it did not exclude, gradually ignored the stranger, unless he had, by conformity with the distinctive precepts of Mosaism, altogether amalgamated with the Hebrew nation (comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 431); in our section, which systematically treats of expiatory offerings, the stranger is not mentioned; the idea of the *chosen people* had become the foundation of all Hebrew institutions. This was indeed by no means a progress or a

priest shall take *some* of her blood with his finger, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out all her *other* blood at the bottom of the altar. 31. And he shall remove all the fat, as the fat is removed from the thank-offering; and the priest shall burn *it* upon the altar as a sweet odour to the Lord; and the priest shall make an atonement for him that he may be forgiven.

32. And if he bring a lamb as his oblation for a sin-offering, he shall bring it a female without blemish. 33. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering, and slay her for a sin-offering, in the place

gain; it destroyed, on the contrary, the prospects, perhaps for some time entertained by enlightened men, of Mosaism becoming a universal faith; it contracted the circle which they fondly hoped to see one day become wide enough to embrace all mankind; but it was the natural and almost necessary consequence of the leading principles of "Mosaism"; and a *theocracy* was created which placed the people and every individual in an immediate and exclusive relation with God.

The details of the laws of expiatory sacrifice, and the difficulties in the Scriptural text with regard to them, have been discussed in a preceding part of this volume (pp. 249—282).

Philological Remarks.—Although the relative particle אֲשֶׁר sometimes precedes the noun to which it refers, and we might therefore translate אשר נשיא יחטא "the ruler who sins" (ver. 22; comp. Gramm. § LXXX. 1. *b)*, the rather complicated construction of the 22nd and 23rd verses allows an easier analysis, if we take אשר in the sense of *if*, in which it occasionally occurs (f. i. distinctly in V. 2; Deut. XI. 27 compared with ver. 28; XVIII. 22; see 1 Ki. VIII. 31, analogous to ὅτε in Greek), so that it would be equivalent to אִם in vers. 3, 13, 27, "If a ruler sin" (Ebn Ezra paraphrases ואם אשר יחטא הוא נשיא); then a subordinate clause is introduced by אוֹ (ver. 23), which has there the meaning *if* (comp. ver. 28; Exod. XXI. 36; 2 Sam. XVIII. 13), "If his sin is brought to his knowledge" (או־הודע אליו חטאתו; comp. Gramm. § LXXI. 2. 2); and the apodosis begins with והביא, entirely analogous to והקריב in ver. 3, or והקריבו in ver. 14; so also the Sept. (ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ἄρχων ἁμάρτῃ ... καὶ γνωσθῇ αὐτῷ ἡ ἁμαρτία), Vulg. (si peccaverit princeps . . . et postea intellexerit), and others. The Hophal form הוֹדַע (comp. נוֹדְעָה ver. 14) is used for הוֹדַע (see Gramm. § LXIV. 3.*a*), and the construction is impersonal, which accounts for the masculine of the verb (see Gramm. § 77. 15; comp. also Ebn Ezra *in loc.)*. Others (as Rashbam) render, "or if the sin has been brought to his knowledge"; but this would render it necessary to take וְאָשֵׁם in the sense "and he felt his guilt", as indeed Michaelis proposes to translate: but both in our context and in the other passages in which the same meaning has often been attributed to the verb (Hos. V. 15; Zech. XI. 5), the usual signification is preferable. It is inadmissible to conclude a sentence with וְאָשֵׁם, "if a ruler sins, . . . he has made himself guilty" (so *Gesen.* Thes. p. 160, "ubi princeps peccavit per errorem . . . culpam is contraxit"):

where they kill the burnt-offering. 34. And the priest shall take *some* of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out all her *other* blood at the bottom of the altar. 35. And he shall remove all her fat, as the fat of the lamb is removed from the thank-offering; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar, for offerings made by fire to the Lord, and the priest shall make an atonement for him for his sin which he has committed, that he may be forgiven.

which would be a feeble tautology. The sense of the words או הודע אליו is not materially different from that of והוא ידע (V. 3, 4), as has been denied by Ewald (Alterth. p. 62), who therefore proposes to alter ולא ידע in V. 17 into והוא ידע. — Saalschütz (Mos. R. I. 331) takes או in the sense of *or*, and believes that the two cases which that disjunctive particle distinguishes are sins committed from *error* or from momentary *indifference* to the law; but on the one hand it is difficult to see how the words או הודע אליו imply the notion of indifference, and on the other hand, this would properly fall within the class of *intentional* offences, and would thus be entirely excluded from the operation of the sin-offerings.— It requires no proof that "the priest" (הַכֹּהֵן) who officiated at the sin-offering of the ruler or of the common Israelite (vers. 25, 30, 34), was not the High-priest but an ordinary priest; this is rendered certain by the term itself and by the tenour and spirit of the precepts (comp. VI. 19, 22). — נפש מעם הארץ (ver. 27) is any one of the people of the land (Gen. XXIII. 7) indifferently or a common Israelite (comp. 2 Ki. XI. 18, 19; XVI. 15; XXI. 24; Jer. I. 18; Ezek. VII. 27), a term in later periods employed to denote an illiterate and boorish person or class of persons neglecting, from ignorance or obtuseness, certain social and religious duties. — In our text, a female "kid of the goats" (שעירת עזים, ver. 28) is prescribed for the sin-offering of the individual, in another passage "a goat one year old" (עז בת שנתה, Num. XV. 27): whatever the difference or the mode of conciliation may be (see pp. 40, 41), it cannot be found in the fictitious distinction between sins of commission and sins of omission, for the former of which a kid of the goats, for the latter a goat one year old is supposed to have been required (so Knobel); the text in no manner countenances such a view (comp. *supra* on vers. 1, 2). — The term "for a sweet odour" (לריח ניחוח), pointing to an anthropomorphic origin of sacrifices (see p. 7), is used in this passage only (ver. 31) in connection with expiatory offerings. It may indeed partly have been avoided because sin-offerings were not designed as "food for God", but it probably did not occur so familiarly to the authors of these sections, because they, with their much more refined notions, no longer regarded the sacrifices as "food" at all; they had left the natural, and entered the spiritual sphere. It has, therefore, been plausibly supposed that the phrase in question "escaped the writer by mistake" (Knobel) because he had just mentioned the thank-offerings, in connection with which it is frequently employed (comp. on the other hand, *Öhler* in Herz. Real-Encycl. XVI. p. 648). Jewish and

other interpreters find in the use of these words in connection with the least valuable sin-offering the idea implied that the most modest gift of the humblest individual, if presented with feelings of sincere repentance, is as acceptable to God as the most costly sacrifice of persons in the highest stations. — The plural suffix in אֹתָם (ver. 35) refers to חֵלֶב which implies the fat and all the fat parts enumerated before (vers. 8, 9). — On the relative age and chronological arrangement of the different statutes of which the fourth and fifth chapter are composed, we refer to the Introduction.

## CHAPTER V.

1. And if a person sins, because he hears the voice of adjuration, and *might be* a witness, whether he has seen *the offence* or learnt *of it otherwise*, and if he does not tell *it*, and bears his guilt; 2. Or if a soul touches any unclean thing, whether *it be* a carcass of an unclean beast, or a carcass of unclean cattle, or the carcass of unclean reptiles, and if it is hidden from him, and he

**1—13.** When first the scope of expiatory sacrifices was widened and their nature refined, that is, when an advance was made from the trespass-offering (אָשָׁם), to the sin-offering (חַטָּאת), the leading idea towards which the expiatory sacrifices in general struggled — atonement for *unintentional* offences — had not yet prevailed entirely; tardiness and fluctuations were natural in the attainment of an aim so high that it might almost appear to lie beyond the stage of all sacrificial worship; and we cannot, therefore, be surprised that, in the earliest sketch of regulations concerning *sin*-offerings, these sacrifices were prescribed for intentional and undesigned transgressions indifferently. The section under discussion forms that earliest sketch (see the Introduction), and it was by the last revisers of Leviticus placed after the preceding ordinances (ch. IV), because they preferred beginning with that portion which displays the complete organisation of the theocratic community, and discloses, at a glance, the principles which they desired to enforce and to see recognised. Now the first case in which a sin-offering was to be presented, still bore some affinity to the elementary class of expiatory sacrifices, the trespass-offerings; for it had a political rather than a religious character; and its object was as much the maintenance of temporal justice as the moral purity of the citizens. An imperfect machinery for the protection of society imposed the obligation upon every individual to aid the authorities to the utmost of his powers; when, therefore, some offence against the law had been committed, and the constituted tribunals were unable, from want of conclusive evidence, either to discover the offender or to convict him of the crime, it was justly regarded a dereliction of public duty if, on a solemn appeal or "adjuration" (אָלָה) of the judges, anyone who had seen the perpetration of the outrage, or had later, by any chance, become cognisant of it, failed to come forward as witness, and so helped to baffle the ends of justice. It is evident, that such neglect must be classed among the *intentional*

is unclean and guilty; 3. Or if he touches the uncleanness of man, whatever his uncleanness *may be* wherewith *a man* defiles himself, and it is hidden from him, and he *then* learns *it*, and is guilty; 4. Or if a soul swears, rashly protesting with *his* lips to do evil or to do good, whatever *it may be* that a man rashly protests with an

sins; it belongs to this category from its very nature; it was necessarily considered as a graver offence in polities depending for security upon the co-operation of all; we have proofs to show that the expedient of public adjuration was very frequently resorted to (comp. Judg. XVII. 2; 1 Ki. VIII. 31; Prov. XXIX. 24; Matth. XVI. 63); and he who refused to respond to it, was regarded as having brought upon himself a guilt requiring a sacrifice of expiation. How such a precept can be reconciled with the general principle which permits no expiatory offerings for designed offences (Num. XV. 30,31), we have examined in another place (pp. 272, 273).

The aim of creating a "holy" community was pursued by the more spiritual minds of the nation from a comparatively early time; it suggested laws and institutions designed to familiarise the mass of the people with the ideas both of physical and internal purity, and to train them to a religious conception of all earthly affairs. Therefore, when sin-offerings were introduced, they were not only made subservient to social and political ends, but employed to impress upon the Hebrews the necessity of the most perfect purity, if they desired to become indeed the people of Jehovah. Therefore, every contact, were it even accidental and unconscious, with unclean things, as the carcass of unclean quadrupeds or reptiles, or any one of the numerous conditions and ailments of man that cause uncleanness, was to be atoned for by a sin-offering (חַטָּאת). This ordinance suggested itself the more readily, as the older class of expiatory sacrifices, the trespass-offerings (אָשָׁם), had already, for some time, been used in several chief cases of impurity, as after the leper's restoration to health, and a Nazarite's defilement by the proximity of a corpse (XIV. 12, 21, Num. VI, 12). It is not improbable that, for a considerable period, trespass-offerings were presented for a variety of similar contingencies; but that, as the Levitical rigour increased, the more solemn sin-offerings were substituted, which however, except in the choice of the victim, generally differed little from the trespass-offerings, and not even in the mode of disposing of the blood (p. 42). This is no doubt the reason, why sometimes a sin-offering was superadded to the trespass-offering (XIV. 12, 19, 21, 31; Num. VI. 11, 12), because a custom long established and therefore difficult to suppress, was to be rendered more significant in accordance with the progress made in religious worship (see p. 275). However, the general and almost universal injunction contained in this section (vers. 2, 3) regarding sin-offerings in any case of Levitical impurity whatever, was later abandoned and very considerably restricted; it was retained in a few prominent instances only, while, as a rule, impurities were removed merely by ablutions (see pp. 41, 42; comp. Lev. XXII. 5, 6).

As the idea of expiatory sacrifices was mainly derived from the notion of the holiness of God, it was natural that they should have been demanded

**oath, and it is hidden from him, and he *then* learns *it*, and is guilty in any one of these *things:* 5. If he is guilty in any one of these *things*, then he shall confess *the sin* which he has committed in that *thing;* 6. And he shall bring as his forfeited debt to the Lord for the sin which he has committed, a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats, for a sin-offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for him on account**

whenever that holiness had been desecrated by pronouncing or implying the name of God in connection with some heedless oath or affirmation (comp. Comm. on Exod. pp. 352, 353). If perjury was deemed a cardinal crime, because involving defiance of the supremacy of the invisible King, and was, therefore, included in the fundamental code of the Decalogue, a reckless oath or vow, the purport of which was not clearly intended or understood when uttered, was, on theocratic principles, a reprehensible offence, and a sin-offering was required not so much to rebuke the levity of the act, but to restore the bond of sanctity which should unite God and every Israelite. — It is interesting to pursue the gradual growth of that singular and wonderful system which is sketched rather than propounded in the Pentateuch; and though we seldom find more than fragmentary and isolated precepts or statements, it is, in most cases, feasible to trace them to leading principles, and thus to combine them into a connected system. But this highly important task remains necessarily fruitless unless it is approached with that historical sense which discerns chronological periods and acknowledges development of ideas.

In the three cases of guilt just described, the ritual of the sacrifice was identical. The sin-offerings were themselves a new class, and gradations within this class were not yet contemplated. As the *ceremonial* of the sin-offering entirely coincided with that of the older trespass-offering (VII. 7), it needed no detailed description; if perchance it had here originally been mentioned, it could well be omitted, when this section was placed immediately after the elaborate precepts contained in the preceding chapter. Confession, probably made to God during the imposition of the hand, is the only point peculiar to this portion (ver. 5, וְהִתְוַדָּה), whether it was later retained and deemed essential, or not (comp. Num. V. 7). But it was important that the *victim* of the sin-offering should be specified. For all the clean domestic quadrupeds had been appropriated to the earlier classes of sacrifice, and lastly the male sheep and goat to the trespass-offering (see on vers. 14—26); there remained, therefore, for the sin-offering no other characteristic victims but the female sheep and goat (see pp. 83, 84). It was not regarded inappropriate to fix the least valuable beasts for the most solemn sacrifices; on the contrary, such arrangement appeared desirable for various reasons; it recommended itself especially because it enabled persons of humbler means to participate in what was considered the highest exercise of religion. The same consideration suggested still more striking facilities — the substitution of two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, if a sheep or goat could not be afforded, and even of the tenth part of an ephah of flour, if the turtle-

of his sin. 7. And if his fortune does not suffice for a lamb, then he shall bring as his debt which he has forfeited by sin, two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, to the Lord, one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering. 8. And he shall bring them to the priest, who shall offer *that* which *is* for a sin-offering first, and wring its head behind its neck, but shall not separate

doves or the pigeons were above the offerer's means. If the idea, "You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy", was to become a reality, the sin-offering could not be made too general. It is not quite easy to explain the reason why *two* birds, one as a sin-offering and one as a burnt-offering, were to be presented. We know that one bird was not deemed too insignificant for a sacrifice (I. 14—17; comp. *Talm.* Chull. 65 *a*); nay, a small quantity of flour was accepted as a lawful sin-offering. Another explanation must, therefore, be attempted. In all ordinary sacrifices of expiation, the fat and the fat parts were burnt to God on the altar, while the rest of the victim belonged to the priests. These two acts, the burning and the priestly meal, were, in addition to the sprinkling of the blood, supposed to constitute the ritual. Now one pigeon or turtle-dove was not sufficient for these purposes. It was scarcely possible to burn less than one complete bird, and another one was, therefore, required as the portion of the priests. But the nature of the sin-offering suggested a *peculiar* proceeding with regard to the two fowls. Both could not be presented as sin-offerings; each bird, however trifling in value, is an independent sacrifice, because it possesses an independent life; if both had been killed as sin-offerings, not *one*, but two such sacrifices would have been offered for one sin; the same significant ceremonies would have been twice repeated for the same occasion; and the individual offence, for which expiation was sought, would have received an undue weight. Therefore, it was deemed appropriate, to employ the second bird for that sacrifice which, in meaning and import, approaches nearest the sin-offering, namely for a holocaust which implied a confession of the *general* sinfulness of the offender, and which, at the same time, could represent the fat and fat parts of quadrupeds. The bird intended for the sin-offering was presented first (ver. 8), because the procedure with the blood performed in connection with it, was the principal ceremonial and the chief means of atonement; that procedure differed markedly from the mode of disposing of the blood of birds offered as holocausts (I. 15); it was in some way analogous to the treatment of the blood of quadruped sin-offerings; for a part of it was *sprinkled* on the side of the altar, while the rest was pressed out at its base (see p. 192). From the view which we have taken of the two birds, another ordinance with regard to these sacrifices may be intelligibly explained. It was commanded that the head of the pigeon or turtle-dove employed for a sin-offering should be wrung or broken at the neck, but not entirely separated. For the head was not to be burnt; it was partially severed from the body merely for the sake of obtaining the blood which alone was destined for the altar; while the bird mainly belonged to the priest. This was different if the pigeon or turtle-dove was a holocaust; in that case, the

*it*. 9. And he [the priest] shall sprinkle of the blood of the sin-offering upon the side of the altar; and the rest of the blood shall be wrung out at the bottom of the altar; it *is* a sin-offering. 10. And he shall offer the second *for* a burnt-offering, according to the ordinance: and the priest shall make an atonement for him on account of his sin which he has committed, that he may be forgiven.

11. But if his fortune does not suffice for two turtle-

head was entirely wrung off because it was burnt upon the altar, to represent, as if it were, the fat of the sacrifice; while the rest of the little bird was to rise upon the altar, as much as possible in its entirety, whence the wings were merely to be cloven, but not separated from the body (l. 14—17). No analogous regulations with regard to the wings of birds presented as sin-offerings were required, for the reason just alluded to, namely, because such birds, with the exception of their blood, were not disposed of upon the altar.

If the sin-offering was a cereal oblation, the ceremonial was, on the whole, identical with that adopted for ordinary bloodless offerings; the significant deviation — the absence of oil and frank-incense, the emblems of joyful elevation — is self-evident from the severe and solemn character of the expiatory sacrifices. — Offerings of birds were general among many other nations besides the Hebrews (see pp. 87 *sqq.*); and among some of them, provision was made for the sacrifices of the poor kindred in spirit to the laws under discussion. Among the Romans, several poor people might buy and offer one victim; or they presented baked images instead of real animals; or they put upon the altar milk, flour, and salt, or whatever they were able to afford. Among the Greeks, the poor often contented themselves with conciliating the gods by a kiss of the right hand (*Lucian*, De Sacrif. c. 12; comp. *supra* pp. 90, 91).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS.— The difficulties in the exact definition of the difference between the *sin-offering* (חטאת) and *trespass-offering* (אשם) have been aggravated almost to confusion by erroneously referring the first part of this chapter (vers. 1—13) to the latter, instead of the former class. But a close examination leaves no doubt on the subject. 1. These verses are the immediate continuation of the preceding chapter (ונפש), and must, therefore, like it, treat of the חטאת; whereas the אשם, which is a distinct kind of expiatory offering, is introduced by a separate heading (ver. 14), exactly like the חטאת (IV. 1). 2. The sacrifice is repeatedly, and wherever it is to be characteristically described, it is always designated as חטאת (vers. 9, 11, 12, also 6, 7, 8). 3. The victim is, at least in one instance, prescribed to be a female sheep or a female goat (ver. 6; comp. IV. 28, 32), whereas that of the trespass-offering is always a ram (see *infra*); and 4. The law allows, in cases of poverty, substitution of another and less valuable offering (vers. 7—13), which is peculiar to sin-offerings only (comp. XII. 8; XIV. 21, 22), whereas in trespass-offerings the value of the victim and the material restitution are essential and indispensable. Against these decisive arguments the use of the word אָשָׁם (in vers. 6, 7) can have no force; for it signifies, in

doves, or two young pigeons, then he shall bring *for* his offering which he has forfeited by his sin, the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin-offering; he shall put no oil on it, nor shall he put thereon

these verses, not *guilt-offering*, but simply *guilt*, or more precisely, *debt* contracted by some illegal act (comp. Num. V. 7, 8), in harmony with the nature of this class of sacrifice; it occurs in both meanings together — as guilt and trespass-offering — in the same phrase, as . . . והביא את־אשמו לאשם (vers. 15, 25; comp. XIX. 21), where it is just the addition of לאשם which renders the reference of the precept to *trespass-offerings* indubitable, whereas in vers. 6 and 7 the addition of לחטאת points as unmistakeably to the *sin-offering*; and the words אֲשָׁמוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָטָא (ver. 7) signify, therefore, "the guilt or debt which he has brought upon himself by sin" (comprising both חטאת and עלה), and are almost identical with קרבנו אשר חטא (in ver. 11); for חטא is used in a transitive sense also, as חוטא נפשך "thou makest thy soul guilty" (Habak. II. 10; comp. Prov. XX. 2). The import of the first 13 verses has, indeed, been correctly understood by earlier and later interpreters, as Abarbanel (Introd. to Lev. c. IV, p. 320 ed. Veil), Reland, Kurtz (Opferc. §§ 103, 104), Müller (Von der Sünde I. p. 229, note), Munk (Réflexions sur le culte des anciens Hébreux, p. 35, in vol. IV. of Cahen's Bible), Winer (Real-Wört. II. 431), Riehm (Stud. und Krit. 1854, pp. 93 *sqq.*), Keil (Archäol. I. 226, and Comm.), Knobel (Comm.), Öhler (in Herz. Real-Encycl. X. p. 643), Bunsen (Bibelwerk in loc.), a. o.; though it has for a long time been mistaken, and has by many been referred to the אשם, as by Michaelis, Bauer (Gottesd. Verf. I. 142), Gramberg (Rel. Id. I. 124, who boldly corrects לחטאת in ver. 7 into לאשם), Bähr (Symb. II. 404, 412), Saalschütz (Mos. R. I. 327), Hofmann (Schriftbeweis, II.1. p.263; comp. *Kurtz*, Opferc. §§ 103, 104), a. o. Some (and among them Abarbanel, Introd. to Lev. c. IV, p. 322) contend that this portion applies to private Israelites exclusively, since, with regard to the High-priest, the whole people, and the chiefs, it would be impossible to suppose that they were unable to afford a lamb or even two pigeons or turtle-doves (vers. 7, 11). But at the date when this portion was written, the theocratic gradation embodied in the fourth chapter did not yet exist; in the earlier ordinances on expiatory sacrifices, the Law speaks simply of "any individual" (נפש vers. 1, 2, 4, 15, 17, 21), which includes every member of the community, even the priests, though these were, of course, already singled out as the sacred functionaries. — The text in no manner justifies the conjecture that the neglect of a witness who was able to testify to a crime, and failed to do so (ver. 1), refers to cases when it "did not arise from evil intentions, but only from weakness, as for instance, from fear of the criminal, or from unmanly regard of his own interests" (Knobel; comp. Rosenm.); such selfish considerations are, in phases of society such as we have described above, as culpable as evil intentions; and we must be prepared to find, in this section, reference made to designed offences likewise to be expiated by sin-offerings. — The guilt here alluded to is the silence of an eye-witness or of any well-informed person after he has heard the public proclamation. Therefore, וְ in וְשָׁמְעָה strictly implies causative meaning; the person sins *because* he has heard etc. (comp. Gen. XVII. 13; XX. 3;

*any* frank-incense; for it *is* a sin-offering. 12. Then shall he bring it to the priest, and the priest shall take

XXVI. 12; Exod. VI. 13; Deut. XVII. 16; see Gramm. § 107. 1.*k*). — The אלה or *adjuration*, which was probably proclaimed by the judges, consisted evidently of a solemn appeal coupled with an imprecation in case of neglect (comp. the שְׁבֻעַת הָאָלָה, Num. V. 21, pronounced at the "offering of jealousy", pp. 285, 286; hence Ebn Ezra, הוא החרם; yet the rendering "the voice of cursing" is incorrect, because incomplete); it was no doubt addressed to the whole people or to that section of it which was likely to be best acquainted with the matter (comp. Prov. XXIX. 24, אלה שמע ולא יגיד; Judg. XVII. 2, ואתי אליח; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 352, 353). This is what our text expresses; it does not allow us to suppose that the *witness* was to be "sworn in" (as Michaelis and others believe); it is, on the contrary, certain that the law of the Pentateuch neither permits the witness to swear (comp. Exod. XX. 7 and 16), nor to be sworn upon the veracity of his declarations, which latter practice was made optional in the later Rabbinical law only, while then the custom of adjuration was greatly extended. This first verse has, therefore, no close affinity with the fourth, and a transposition of the verses is unnecessary (comp. *Choshen Mishp.* § XXVIII. 2; see *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. § LXXXVIII. 2, p. 605). The renderings of ושמעה קול אלה by "if he heard the voice of some one swearing or cursing" or "reviling the name of God" (comp. *Corn. a Lapid.* on V. 1), are not only against the usage of the language, but are refuted by the following words "and he is a witness whether he has seen or learnt of it", which would be superfluous additions, if he had himself *heard* the criminal utterances. — או ... או (vers. 1, 2) is *whether* ... *or* (sive ... sive; Gramm. §. 71. 4). — The exact meaning of וְהוּא עֵד is, according to the context, "and he might be a witness", that is, might be useful as such. If a person who in this way withholds the truth וְנָשָׂא עֲוֺנוֹ *and bears his guilt*— this is manifestly the sense of these words; they are probably synonymous with וְאָשֵׁם (vers. 2, 4, 23), with which they are indeed coupled (ver. 17); they can hardly mean, "then he shall experience the power and effect of his sin, or suffer his punishment" (Knobel, Keil); for this "punishment" consisted merely in the sacrifice by which the offence was to be expiated; while the phrase נשא עון or נשא חטא, if really applied to punishments, is used only in connection with grave inflictions, trials, and misfortunes (comp. Gen. IV. 13; Exod. XXVIII. 43; Lev. VII. 18; XVII. 16; XIX. 8; XX. 17, 20; XXII. 9; XXIV. 15; Num. V. 31; IX. 13; XIV. 34; XVIII. 22, 32; etc.). The words ונשא עונו belong, therefore, to the first clause, as also vers. 2 to 4, and so and the first part of ver. 5 (והיה כי־יאשם לאחת מאלה) which once more comprehensively states the protasis; and we have translated accordingly (comp. IV. 2—4; so also Rosenm., De Wette, a. o.). The sense is — if a man sins, in the manner described, by culpable silence where his candour would promote the welfare of society, then if he later repents of this omission, he shall, as in the case of the other three offences, make a confession and secure atonement by a sin-offering (ver. 5). — On the division of animals into clean and unclean, and of the quadrupeds into בהמה and חיה (Gen. I. 24, 25; II. 19; VII. 21), see p. 78 note 4. The Vulgate renders נבלת חיה וכו' (ver. 2) as if the text

his handful of it, *as* a memorial thereof, and burn *it* on the altar for an offering made by fire to the Lord; it *is* a sin-offering. 13. And the priest shall make an

were נְבֵלָה וּטְרֵפָה (VII. 24, sive quod occisum a bestia est aut per se mortuum), and ונעלם ממנו inaccurately (et oblita fuerit immunditiae suae), and it is, in general, rather free and summary in the translation of these sections (so is the whole of the 23rd verse rendered by the two words "convicta delicti", whereas, in VI. 4, is added: "et in loco mundissimo usque ad favillam consumi faciet"). — אֲשֶׁר (ver. 2) is identical with כִּי *if* (in vers. 1, 3, 4; comp. on IV. 22). — לְ in לְכֹל (ver. 3) is *concerning* or *with regard to* (so also vers. 4, 5 לכל and לאחת; see Gramm. § 105. 3). — It is questionable to assert that our verses (2, 3) treat of cases "when a person has defiled himself, but has omitted to perform the prescribed purification" (Rosenm., Knobel); our text plainly speaks of uncleanness to be removed by sin-offerings exclusively, which are here represented as the only possible means of purification. The difficulty which has prompted this untenable interpretation can only be removed in the manner indicated above. Nor does the passage refer to persons who, while in a state of uncleanness, have eaten holy food, or have entered the Sanctuary (see Rashi), but to persons affected by uncleanness alone which required the sin-offering. — בַּטֵּא (ver. 4) is *to pronounce heedlessly* or *thoughtlessly*, with the *lips*, not with the *heart*; therefore, an oath or vow so pronounced is termed מבטא שפתים (Num. XXX. 7, 9). In the words כי תשבע לבטא בשפתים, the infinitive לבטא qualifies more precisely the preceding general term תשבע, and has the force of the latin gerund, namely, *if a person swears, speaking heedlessly with his lips*, that is, swears a heedless oath; analogous is בָּרָא לַעֲשׂוֹת (Gen. II. 3) *he created producing* (see Gramm. § 98. 5). — להרע או להטיב *to do evil or good*, that is, to do anything; for the categories of good and evil were believed to exhaust all possibilities (comp. Gen. XXIV. 5; XXXI. 24; Num. XXIV. 13; Isai. XLI. 23); it is hardly correct to understand two distinct cases, viz. that a person thoughtlessly either declared to do a good or a bad thing (Clericus; comp. Ps. XV. 4), because the two terms in question gradually came to express the one simple notion of *anything*, exactly as the two words "right and left" merely conveyed the idea of *anywhere* (Num. XX. 17; XXII. 16; Deut. II. 27; Jon. IV. 11; etc.); but the phrase is certainly not restricted to things which he who swears means to do with regard to himself (Rashi, להרע לעצמו או להיטיב לעצמו; Saad. להתענות to castigate himself or to fast; Fagius, se afflicturum se ipsum, aut alteri benefacturum), or with regard to any class or section of men (Ebn Ezra להרע למי שהוא חייב, Grotius). — לאחת מאלה, in ver. 4, refers to the heedless oaths or vows; in ver. 5, to the cases of guilt enumerated in the preceding verses (1 to 4). — ואם־לא תגיע ידו די שה (ver. 7) is literally, "if his hand does not reach the sufficiency of a lamb", that is, if his power or fortune does not suffice for a lamb; but instead of הגיע the verb הִשִּׂיג is more frequently used in this connection (ver. 11; XIV. 21, 22, 30—32; XXV. 26, 47, 49; XXVII. 8; Num. VI. 21), and sometimes מָצָא (XII. 8, XXV. 28). — Various are the reasons which have by others been assigned for the *two* birds prescribed in cases of insufficient means; for instance, the one bird was intended to expiate a past guilt,

**atonement for him for his sin which he has committed in anyone of these *things*, that he may be forgiven: and it shall belong to the priest like the bloodless offering.**

the other to testify present piety or pious intention for the future; for after the sin is atoned for by the former, the soul proves its unity with God by the latter (so Abarbanel, Introd. to Lev. c. IV. p. 322); but *one* victim symbolised in quadruped sin-offerings both conditions, which are indeed implied in the very nature of the offering. Or, the one bird was designed to secure pardon and remission of punishment, the other to regain Divine grace (Knobel) — an artificial distinction without a tangible difference, for if pardon is secured, the offender returns to his original relation to God, that is, to Divine grace. — Not more satisfactory are the explanations proposed to account for the peculiar precept regarding the head of the bird which was to be wrung at the neck but not separated. It has been supposed that the small and fleshless members of the pigeon could not well be placed before God as a distinct offering; but the head of birds presented as holocausts was always burnt. — As the whole of the ceremonial in connection with the sin-offerings of birds was performed by the priest (see on I. 14—17), the subject to והקריב (ver. 8) is הכהן. — He shall wring its head מִמּוּל עָרְפּוֹ, liter., "from before its neck", that is, as Rashi explains, "opposite the person who looks at the neck, or the whole length of the back of the neck"; which means, according to tradition, that the priest shall, with the nail of his thumb, break open the great blood-vessel at the neck of the bird. — הַנִּשְׁאָר בַּדָּם (ver. 9) the remaining part of the blood, בְּ being employed as in נִשְׁאָר בַּשָּׁנִים (XXV. 52) or הַנּוֹתָר בַּבָּשָׂר (VIII. 32).— קרבנו אשר חטא (ver. 11) means, "his offering which he has forfeited to bring" (comp. *supra*); not "he that sinned shall bring for his offering" (Engl. Vers.).— On יִמָּצֵה for יִמָּצָה, see Gramm. § LXVII. 14.*a*. — It is probable that this section (vers. 1—13, or at least vers. 7—10), is contemporary in origin with the corresponding portion on the *holocausts* of birds (I. 14—17), since the former evidently refers to the latter, "And he shall offer the second according to the Law" (כמשפט, ver. 10; comp. IX. 16; 2 Chr. XXXV. 13); for as probably sacrifices of birds are of later date than sacrifices of quadrupeds (see on I. 1—9), so are sin-offerings of later origin than burnt-offerings. — The sacrifices here described, different for the rich, the poor, and the very needy, have been termed by the Talmud "ascending and descending offerings" (קרבן עולה ויורד in contradistinction to חטאת קבועה; see p. 262 note 3).

### *β.* Trespass-offering (אָשָׁם), V. 14—26.

**14. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 15. If a**

**14—26.** Inferior in religious importance, though earlier in origin, than the sin-offerings were the trespass-offerings (אָשָׁם). The significance which the sacrifices possessed for a theocratical community formed the principle of arrangement in this section (ch. IV and V); that consideration was deemed more essential than their historical or genetic sequence; and as

soul commits a misdeed, and sins unawares *by taking* from the holy things of the Lord, then he shall bring *as* his forfeited debt to the Lord a ram without blemish out of the flock, according to thy estimation by shekels of silver, after the shekel of the Sanctuary, for a trespass-offering. 16. And he shall pay what he has sinfully appropriated of the holy things, and shall add thereto the

naturally religious ideas advanced in process of time, the order in which the various classes of sacrifice are here introduced, is exactly the reverse of that warranted by their chronological origin (see the Introduction). In the compiler's or reviser's time, the political organisation of the state, established on a securer footing, had been rendered more independent of religious institutions; his object was, therefore, in this part of the legislative code, not the creation of a *people*, but of *a holy people;* and he readily gave precedence to those regulations which more directly contributed towards the latter aim, although he could not but be aware that he thus disturbed, nay inverted, the natural order of his documents. He was, therefore, not content with placing the laws of the sin-offering first (IV. 1—V. 13), and among them again giving precedence to their latest and highest form (ch. IV); but he arranged the regulations concerning the trespass-offering so that their origin and true nature are best recognised in the very last portion (vers. 20—26). For him frauds upon the sacred property, such as firstlings, tithes, portions due to priests, or devoted objects (חֵרֶם, Josh. VII. 1), were the gravest offences of this class; he therefore commenced with them (vers. 14—16), though the precepts treat of an *unintentional* appropriation (בִּשְׁגָגָה) of such property, and atonement for inadvertent sins marks a much later stage in the history of religious training. He then proceeded to unjust acquisition in the general spheres of social life (vers. 17—19), though these cases are so vaguely defined, that he could hardly have hoped to convey to his readers a distinct notion and to afford them a practical guidance (see *infra*). But he concluded with ordinances, which evidently formed an independent portion (vers. 20—26); they are introduced by a separate heading (ver. 20); and they unmistakeably disclose the antiquity of their date. They treat of intentional offences, and of offences of such a kind as are both most frequent and most dangerous in primitive societies, of daring encroachments upon the rights of a neighbour, defalcation of lost or entrusted property, deceitful fraud or violent plunder, lying and perjury. It was for such crimes as these that trespass-offerings had at first been instituted, as an important and welcome aid in the administration of justice. Though strictly offences against fellow-men, they were regarded and described as offences against God, who had pronounced against them His solemn warnings and interdictions; and thus their gravity and reproach were enhanced, "If a soul sins, and commits a misdeed against the Lord, and lies to his neighbour" (ver. 21). Not only was the property to be restored and the fifth part of its value to be added to it, but an offering was to be presented to remind the guilty person of his transgression, and to deter him from a repetition of it by the consciousness that he thereby not only violated human laws, but incurred the displeasure of

**fifth part of it, and give it to the priest; and the priest shall make an atonement for him with the ram of the trespass-offering, that he may be forgiven.**

**17. And if a soul sins, and does any of all the prohibitions of the Lord which ought not to be done, and he does not know *it*, and becomes guilty, and bears**

God. How different is this from simple and precise enactments like these, "If a man steals an ox, or a sheep, and kills it, or sells it, he shall restore five oxen for an ox and four sheep for a sheep" (Exod. XXI. 37); or, "If the theft be found in his hand alive, whether it be ox, or ass, or sheep, he shall restore double" (XXII. 3; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 413—415). Again, with regard to entrusted property, the provisions of the civil code are equally plain (Exod. XXII. 6—12); a reasonable responsibility was imposed upon the depositary; multiple restitution was demanded in cases of neglect or fraud; and the judges were, in all cases, the arbiters, whether witnesses could be procured, or an oath was to be administered (see Comm. on Exod. p. 419); there no mention is made of sacrifices; the statutes are positive and formal; and in the third case set forth in our passage, that concerning found property, the restoration was simply made a moral duty enjoined with pathetic earnestness (Deut. XXII. 1—3; comp. Exod. XXIII. 4; Comm. on Exod. p. 444). How are these differences to be reconciled? We must again distinguish between the various documents and their authors. The legislation in Exodus (and Deuteronomy) is conceived in a secular and a strictly political, that of this part of Leviticus in a religious or theocratic spirit; the former was framed on the assumption that the authorities were strong enough to protect the weak and to curb the refractory; the latter was devised when that assumption was found to be groundless, and a religious check, in addition to that afforded by the penal law, was deemed advisable, and could, in harmony with the newly developed Levitical ideas, be safely ventured upon. Of the numerous traces of the gradual progress of ideas, two additional examples bearing on our section may be mentioned. We find here that perjury deliberately and basely committed was to be atoned for merely by a *trespass*-offering, together with increased restitution of the property acquired by the criminal oath (vers. 22, 24). But not much later, even a heedless oath sworn without a conscious defiance of the Divine name, was to be expiated by a *sin*-offering, holier in import and more solemn in ritual (p. 269); the sacrifice had no longer a worldly, but an entirely spiritual end; while, from another point of view, the sacredness of the name of God was merely enforced as a paramount duty of the pious, without being guarded by ceremonials (Exod. XX. 7; Lev. XIX. 12). The other instance is more striking still and larger in its scope. Let the reader weigh with an unbiassed mind the following precept, "If a soul sins, and does any of all the prohibitions of the Lord which ought not to be done (ועשתה אחת מכל מצות יהוה אשר לא תעשינה), and he does not know it . . . ; then shall he bring a ram without blemish . . . for a trespass-offering" (vers. 17, 18). It is as comprehensive and general as the corresponding commands with regard to sin-offerings (IV. 2, 13, 22, 27); it must clearly be understood of all offences whatsoever; and it forces

his sin; 18. Then shall he bring to the priest a ram without blemish out of the flock, according to thy estimation, for a trespass-offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his error which he committed unawares, and did not know *it*, that he may be forgiven; 19. It *is* a trespass-offering; he has indeed trespassed against the Lord.

20. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 21. If a soul sins, and commits a misdeed against the Lord,

us to the conclusion that at the time when it was conceived, trespass-offerings were supposed to expiate *all* unintentional sins, whereas they were, later, almost superseded by the more solemn and sacred class of sin-offerings; yet as they were retained for the expiation of sins committed against the rights of property, the reviser here inserted that passage among the commands treating of offences of that nature; and from the contrast in which it stands to the preceding law on *holy* property, it was probably meant to refer to property in general. However, another step was made in the direction of the Levitical system. If the owner of defrauded property, at the time when the delinquent was discovered, had died without leaving a legal heir, the restitution was to be made to the priests, who then already could venture to claim it as the representatives of God (Num. V. 6—8). Thus everything tended to promote the rearing of an edifice which it required the struggles of centuries to complete.

In all cases of restitution, the fifth part of the value of the fraudulently acquired property was to be added to the original amount (vers. 16, 24; XXII. 14); the significance of the number *five* is derived from that of its double *ten* which typifies completeness and is usually employed in connection with Divine manifestations (see the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. III); the addition of one fifth is, therefore, also commanded with reference to the redemption of property sanctified to God, whether of houses or fields, of tithes or animals (XXVII. 13, 15, 19, 27, 31); the number five occurs, besides, in some other Levitical ordinances (Num. VII. 17, 23, 29, etc.; XVIII. 16), and on the imposition of taxes (Gen. XLI. 34; XLVII. 24; comp. XLIII. 34). The valuation was to be made by the "holy shekel" (ver. 15; comp. XXVII. 25; Exod. XXX. 13; Num. XVIII. 16), which was of greater weight, and which was here prescribed in order to mark the sacrifice as a religious act, and not as a merely pecuniary transaction. The victim to be selected for the trespass-offering was to be a ram (אַיִל); and it is not improbable that this animal naturally offered itself, because sheep, and especially rams, were from early times employed as means of exchange and currency, and would therefore be deemed peculiarly appropriate for a class of sacrifices which centred in the restoration of property (see pp. 83, 278). In conclusion, if an argument were wanted to prove how much the Levitical legislation fluctuated, we might point to a clear case of appropriation of holy property in which simply restitution, but no trespass-offering was prescribed (XXII. 14), whereas in our section, the latter appears of equal importance with the former (vers. 14—16).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — On מַעַל (from מָעַל to cover — comp. מעיל

and lies to his neighbour concerning a trust or a deposit or plunder, or has defrauded his neighbour; 22. Or has found lost property, and lies concerning it, and swears falsely regarding any of all *the things* which a man does, to sin thereby; 23. Now, if he *so* sins, and

cloak —, to act covertly, insidiously, or faithlessly; comp. בֶּגֶד from בָּגַד in the same meaning) see p. 267 note 20. — The words וחטאה מקדשי יהוה (ver. 15) contain a *constructio praegnans*, "and sins *by taking* from the holy things of the Lord" (see Gramm. § 104. 3). — קֳדָשִׁים are *holy things*, *holy property*, all that is dedicated to God, or belongs to the Sanctuary, or is assigned to priests and Levites (comp. Exod. XXVIII. 38; Lev. XXII. 15, 16; etc.).— He shall bring as his debt (אֲשָׁמוֹ, like ver. 6) a faultless ram *according to thy estimation by shekels of silver* (בְּעֶרְכְּךָ כֶּסֶף־שְׁקָלִים), which words cannot mean that the ram shall be so selected as to equal in value the debt contracted by the guilt or unlawful appropriation (so Riehm, Stud. und Krit. 1854, pp. 118, 119, a. o.): for, besides the אשם, the actual or rather an increased restitution of the property was commanded. It is not clear whether the ram was to be worth *two* shekels (שקלים; Vulg., Rashi, Luther, Cornel. a Lapide, Mendelssohn, Arnheim, Bertheau — Gruppen p. 158 — , a. o.), or *at least two* shekels (Ebn Ezra, Abarb., Knobel, Öhler — l. c. p. 645—, *Keil* — Lev. p. 41— , see also *Michael.* Mos. R. V. § 244, p. 69); for שְׁקָלִים is too general to express either the one or the other with distinctness; so much is certain that the terms, "according to thy estimation by shekels of silver, after the shekel of the Sanctuary", are meant to convey that the ram should be of a superior quality; but its value in relation to the amount of property in question was entirely unessential; the one needed, not even approximately, to be proportionate to the other; nor could it, in many instances, be so; for some frauds committed might possibly amount to a much larger sum than the price of even the most superior ram, whereas the cost of different faultless rams could not materially vary. The debt itself was to be actually paid, and the religious guilt was expiated by a sacrifice, which in all cases represented the offender, not the offence. It is, therefore, as needless as it is at variance with the spirit of the Law to suppose, that the victim, by the declaration of the priest, received "an imaginary value" (*Hengstenb.* Pent. II. 216) or "symbolical significance" (*Keil*, Archäol. I. 236, Levit. p. 43; similarly *Baumgarten*, Comm. p. 138). — There is no authority whatever for inserting או before בערכך (as Clericus and Rosenmüller do; also Sharpe, Historic notes p. 21, "money was so far common and found convenient that the Hebrews were allowed to send the sin-offering of a ram in money instead of in kind"; comp. 1 Sam. XX. 12), so that the sense would be, he shall either offer a ram, or, if the debt be smaller or greater than the price of a ram, money according to the estimated value of the property; but irrespective of the obscurity and abruptness of the language inconceivable in a legal enactment, the ram was certainly to be presented in any case, however small or large the amount in question; for the trespass-offering was the necessary religious element in the transaction and the principal means of atonement. — בְּעֶרְכְּךָ *according to thy estimation* is indeed here immediately

**is guilty, then he shall restore the plunder which he has violently taken, or the spoil which he has acquired by fraud, or the trust which has been delivered to him to keep, or the lost property which he has found, 24. Or whatever *it***

addressed to Moses, but refers, as a general rule, to the officiating priest (comp. XXVII. 12; Num. XVIII. 16), not to the worldly authorities, as Michaelis (Mos. R. V. pp. 68, 69, § 244) and Rosenmüller suppose, misled by their erroneous "juridical" view concerning expiatory offerings (see pp. 257, 258). — The construction of בערכך כסף שקלים is *according to thy estimation of silver*, namely, *of shekels* (comp. 2 Sam. XXIV. 24; Neh. V. 15), so that כסף שקלים is equivalent to שִׁקְלֵי כֶּסֶף (comp. 1 Chr. XXI. 25), and כסף is a genitive dependent on בְּעֶרְכְּךָ, though the latter has a suffix; the meaning is not, as in similar cases, "according to the estimation of thy money" (Gramm. § LXXXVII. 11), and שקלים stands in apposition to כסף. — עֶרְכְּךָ gradually became so distinct a legal or technichal term that it even took the article (הָעֶרְכְּךָ, XXVII. 23; comp. un monsieur, una madonna, etc.); it is not a noun of the form פעלל for עֶרְכְּךָ, nor much less a compound noun composed of עֵרֶךְ and כה "a value of so much" (Wessely, Wogue in loc.). — The multifarious ordinances and speculations, which Jewish tradition has based on our verses (14—16) in connection with Num. V. 6—8, may be seen in the Mishnah and Talmudical tractatus Meilah. — וְאִם (ver. 17) connects this clause with the preceding one, and כִּי marks it as a distinct case; although, strictly considered, one of the two particles is superfluous. — The vagueness of the terms of the second case of trespass-offerings (vers. 17—19) has given rise to manifold interpretations. Some suppose that it refers to doubtful sins, that is, to sins, in regard to which the person is uncertain whether he has committed them or not (so Jewish tradition which sees here אשם תלוי in contradistinction to the אשם ודאי, according to the canon, that the אשם תלוי was offered in cases שזדונו כרת ושגגתו חטאת, *Mishn.* Kerith. VI. 3; Horay. II. 3, 4; see p. 266 note 3; comp. *Reland*, Antiqq. pp. 559, 560, 566—569 ed. Rav.; so also *Ranke*, Untersuchungen, II. 77, in a laboured exposition); but the words ולא־ידע are evidently synonymous with ונעלם ממנו (vers. 2, 3), if not with בשגגה, so that they cannot form the distinctive feature of these commands (*Hengstenb.* Pent. II. 219), the less so as ונודעה (in IV. 14) and או הודע (IV. 23, 28) presuppose an anterior ולא ידע (comp. *Bertheau*, Sieben Gruppen, p. 159). Others understand offences against *ceremonial* precepts in opposition to *moral* duties treated of in the preceding chapter (Rosenmüller); but thus much is unquestionable from the context, that the rights of *property* are here concerned. Others again think of a curtailment of the claims which God is entitled to enforce upon His people Israel (*Keil*, Archäol. I. 221; Levit. p. 41); but this is not only artificial, but would also nearly coincide with the preceding enactment (vers. 14—17). Or it has been supposed that the trespass-offering was prescribed for sins that had remained unknown for a *considerable* time (*Hofmann*, l. c. p, 259), which is equally indefinite as a law and arbitrary as an interpretation; or that it was required for sins committed from *ignorance* of the law (*Saalschütz*, Mos. R. I. 332, and *Kurtz* in Mos. Opfer), but it is impossible to see why the same word שגגה is here to express ignorance of the law, and in the fourth chapter, with

*may be* about which he has sworn falsely; and he shall restore it in the principal, and shall add thereto the fifth part of it, *and* give it to him to whom it belongs on the

reference to the sin-offering (vers. 2, 13, 22, 27), inadvertency or unconsciousness. Or it is averred that here the offender sees his guilt at a later time himself and confesses it spontaneously, while in the case of the sin-offering, he is convicted of it "objectively", by witnesses or evidence (או הודע אליו, *Winer*, Real.-W. II. 483); but the text nowhere intimates such a distinction, and as in both cases the sin was unwittingly committed (comp. IV. 2, 22, 27; V. 17, 18), there was no real difference between a confession and a conviction, for the offender was ready to confess as soon as he became conscious of his guilt. Or it has heen maintained that our verses treat of the same class of offences as the preceding ones (vers. 14—16), that is, of unlawful appropriation of sacred property, but that they "give to those special laws a general validity", for which purpose the author applied a formula from the law of sin-offering (*Riehm*, Stud. und Krit. 1854, pp. 98, 99); however, not only the phrase ואם נפש כי תחטא, but the whole tenour of our verses, argues that they refer to a different category of sins; no unbiassed reader can understand them of sacred property exclusively, and the preceding clause is so distinct and comprehensive that it required no generalisation, which the framer of that opinion (Riehm) indeed deems it "possible, nay probable, to have been added by a later hand"— an opinion which has been adopted by subsequent writes (f. i. by Kurtz, Opferc. p. 166, who retracted in its favour his own view set forth in Mos. Opfer p. 211; he admits, however, in Opferc. p. 173, that both here and in IV. 27 כל מצות comprises all the Divine commands alike, yet that this term is here limited to משפטים, and in IV. 27 to those מצות which are not at the same time משפטים — comp. *supra* p. 265 — conceptions which are wholly visionary and without any foundation in the wording of the precept). In this perplexity, one interpreter (Michaelis) boldly proposed to alter the received text and to read (in ver. 17) ולא עשתה אחת מכל־אשר תעשינה, and explained the passage to refer to sins of *omission*, an expedient as arbitrary as it is ineffectual; another (Geddes) considered this clause as an interpolation from IV. 27, or as an imperfectly expressed ordinance deficient in some qualifying condition; and a third translated "if a person sins with regard to *any other* of the forbidden things" (Dathe, si quis peccatum commiserit in ullo alio eorum quae lege divina interdicta sunt). The most probable opinion is, that the compiler intended these verses to be understood of violation of secular, in contradistinction to violation of holy property treated of immediately before; although we have above attempted to point out, that they had originally a much wider import; and as they relate to any transgression whatever, no restitution, whether simple or increased, is commanded, since in many cases it was neither necessary nor feasible (comp. on the other hand, Num. V. 6—8). The אשם and חטאת are not identical, and both terms are not synonymous (as *Vater*, Pentat. II. 170, III. 451, maintains); but the אשם was at first all but universal in application, till its sphere was gradually restricted by the more solemn, though more recent חטאת; our passage and IV. 27 contain two different laws, and reflect two distinct stages in the sacrificial legislation. — More surprising still are

day *of the confession* of his guilt. 25. And he shall bring *as* his trespass-offering to the Lord a ram without blemish out of the flock, according to thy estimation,

the opinions proposed with reference to the next portion (vers. 20—26); some of them are not derived from an unprejudiced examination of the text, but suggested by preconceived theories, with which these verses were forced into an artificial agreement. Thus it has been extensively supposed that the sins were committed under mitigating circumstances; but these were differently defined. Philo (De Victim. c. 11), though understanding intentional sins, explains the command in the following manner: if a person is suspected of the offences specified, and then protests his innocence on oath, and if he thus appears to have escaped all conviction at the hands of his accusers, "he shall himself become his own accuser, and being convicted by his own conscience within, he shall reproach himself for the things which he has denied and concerning which he has sworn falsely, and shall come forward and openly confess his sin and implore pardon", then he shall obtain forgiveness by the means prescribed in the text. But this conception has evidently been devised in order to make the offences here enumerated, in some manner, analogous to unintentional sins, by attributing to the offender spontaneous repentance— of which, however, there is not the faintest trace in the wording or the spirit of our passage. Yet this untenable view of Philo recurs in various modified forms. Bähr (Symb. II. 404) and others who follow him, believe the אשם in general to have been set apart for sins "which had been revealed by the offender's own scruple of conscience and confession"; but his deduction is based upon the erroneous assumption that vers. 1—13 of this chapter treat of אשם, not of חטאת (see *supra).* Riehm (l. c. pp. 103, 104) applies the command to violations of the law, which, for want of witnesses, could not be judicially punished, but were ascertained by the offender's self-confession only, when the repentance thus evinced deserved a greater leniency; but the absence of legal witnesses is an unwarranted assumption in no manner countenanced by the text. Ranke (Untersuchungen, II. 78) sees here "a beautiful clemency of the Law", which prescribes for designed offences against property, after having been confessed and amply amended, no other atonement than for unconscious sins. Knobel finds the mitigating point in the circumstance that "the unlawful acts are traceable to some weakness or failing, such as selfishness or levity, and not exactly to evil intentions" — an opinion which is overthrown by a mere perusal of our passage. Besides, various other expedients, all equally unsatisfactory, have been devised. Bähr (l. c. p. 403) refers the clause to theocratic property, like the opening one (vers. 14—16), to firstlings and tithes, which the proprietor had intended to offer to God, but which had been wrested from him by fraud or violence, an interpretation refuted by the words alone מכל אשר־יעשה האדם לחטא בהנה (ver. 22), besides being entirely unsupported by the context. And as if conscious of the inefficiency of this explanation, the same writer, attempting another one, maintains, that the sins, although intentionally committed, had remained unknown and concealed, and had, therefore, not been judicially punished; but the difficulty is just why they were

**for a trespass-offering to the priest: 26. And the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord, that**

not so punished when detected, but were expiated by increased restitution and a trespass-offering, contrary to the enactments of the secular code. Ranke tries to establish a distinction between the two verbs שגג and לא ידע, the former meaning *to err unintentionally*, the latter *to err unwillingly*, and he refers IV. 27 to unintentional sins, but V. 17 to transgressions at once unintentionally and unwillingly committed (l. c. p. 77); but that distinction is fictitious; for שגג and לא ידע are synonymous terms (comp. vers. 17 and 18). Hengstenberg (Auth. des Pent. II. 219) conveniently passes over the difficulty by omitting in IV. 22 בשגגה. In short, no exposition of these verses can be acceptable which does not recognise that they relate to *all* offences of fraud and violence committed against property, and committed intentionally. — The Sept. and Vulg. (and also Luther, Engl. Vers., a. o.) begin a new chapter with ver. 20, which is uncalled for, as vers. 20—26 relate to trespass-offerings, like vers. 14—19. A new chapter at ver. 14 would be more appropriate to mark the commencement of the laws of trespass-offering. — Offences against a neighbour are described as offences against God in the sense above indicated (p. 517); they are hardly so called because the whole land and all it contains were regarded as belonging to God (Lev. XXV. 23) who had only granted them as fiefs and loans to the Israelites, so that an encroachment upon a citizen's property was a fraud perpetrated against Jehovah Himself (so *Riehm*, l. c. p. 102); the idea upon which this view is based is indeed unquestionable, but its application to practical legal injunctions is artificial, and is nowhere intimated in the text. — פִּקָּדוֹן (ver. 21) is a *trust* in general (comp. Gen. XLI. 36); תְּשׂוּמֶת יָד, literally something that is placed (of שׂום) in the hands of some one else (Rashi שם בידו ממון), a *deposit* (Gr. Ven. ἐμβολή); it is, therefore, not materially different from פקדון (the Vulg. renders בפקדון או בי, depositum quod fidei ejus creditum fuerat), for which reason it is not again mentioned in the general recapitulation (in ver. 23); it is hardly *partnership*, or *fellowship*, as it is rendered by Onkelos (שותפות ידא), the Septuagint (κοινωνία), Philo (De Victim. c. 11), Ebn Ezra, English Version, Rosenmüller (who explains, "proprie significat *positionem manus*, deinde in genere omnem societatem, quae injecta manu solet confirmari, *stipulationem*, *sponsionem*"), a. o.; comp. 2 Ki. X. 15; Jer. L. 15. — The Roman law was severer still with regard to found property; failing to return it, even without denying the possession by an oath, was punishable as a theft (Digest. L. 47, Tit. 2. leg. 43 § 4: Qui alienum quid jacens lucri faciendi causa sustulit, furti obstringitur, sive scit cujus sit, sive ignoraverit; nihil enim ad furtum imminuendum facit, quod cujus sit ignoret): but this enactment has an exclusively civil character, and implies a social organisation of the most perfect order and power. — ראש (ver. 24) is *the sum* or *capital* (Exod. XXX. 12; Num. I. 2, 49). The offender shall repay the unjust acquisition בְּרֹאשׁוֹ "according to its sum or amount", that is, simply, the amount (Exod. XXX. 12; Num. I. 2; etc.; comp. ראש and *capital*); and he shall add to it *the fifth part of it* (חֲמִשִׁתָיו, the plural for the more usual singular חֲמִישִׁיתוֹ, ver. 16; XXII. 14; XXVII. 13, 27, 31; Num. V. 7; see Gramm. § LXXXV, and on the plural termination ים § XXIII. 5. c. β); not *two fifths*, as Ebn Ezra con-

he may be forgiven for any of all *the things* which he has done *so as* to trespass therein.

tends (מיעוט רבים שנים), and much less *many fifths*, as Rashi believes (רבתה תורה חמשיות הרבה). — The offender is to make the reparation בְּיוֹם אַשְׁמָתוֹ *on the day of his guilt*, that is, on the day when his guilt is discovered or confessed (Sept. correctly, ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ ἐλέγχθῃ), which is indeed, as regards the sense, on the day when he presents his expiatory sacrifice (Engl. Vers., *in the day of his trespass-offering*), but this is not correct as a *translation*, the Hebrew words being בְּיוֹם אַשְׁמָתוֹ, not בְּיוֹם אֲשָׁמוֹ.

# B. ANOTHER CODE.

## Chapters VI and VII.

### 1. On the Service of the Altar of Burnt-Offering, VI. 1—6, and 2. On Bloodless Offerings, VI. 7—11.

## CHAPTER VI.

**Summary.**—This code contains 1. the law of the daily public burnt-offerings and of the perpetual fire to be kept on the brazen altar (VI. 1—6), and 2. The law of the bloodless offerings and the priest's share of them (VI. 7—11); 3. The ordinance regarding the bloodless offering to be presented by every High-priest, in all future time, on the day of his consecration (VI. 12—16); 4. The law of the sin-offering (VI. 17—23); and 5. of the trespass-offering (VII. 1—7); 6. Regulations concerning the portions of the priests in burnt- and bloodless offerings (VII. 8—11); 7. The law of the thank-offering (VII. 11—21); 8. The prohibition of fat and blood (VII. 22—27); 9. Precepts regulating the portions to be left to the priests in thank-offerings (VII. 28—34); and 10. A comprehensive conclusion of this code (VII. 35—38).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Com-

**1—11.** It might appear that in the preceding part of the Book, the outlines of the sacrificial laws were completed, or if any addition seemed desirable, that it would be appended by distinct reference to the former sketch; for the four different classes of sacrifice have been introduced and treated of in the natural order of their origin — first the holocausts and bloodless offerings (ch. I, II), then the thank-offerings (ch. III), and lastly the expiatory sacrifices (ch. IV, V). Yet we find here a new series of laws on burnt-offerings (vers. 1—6) and on bloodless offerings (vers. 7—11), in some respects coherent in themselves, and compiled from a new point of view. Now let us suppose that we read for the first time the following injunctions, without being

mand Aaron and his sons, saying, This *is* the law of the burnt-offering. This — the burnt-offering — *shall be* on the place of burning upon the altar the whole night till the morning, and the fire of the altar shall burn by it. 3. And the priest shall put on his linen

aware of the connection in which they here occur: "And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, Command Aaron and his sons, saying, This is the law of the burnt-offering: This — the burnt-offering — shall be on the burning-place upon the altar the whole night till the morning, and the fire of the altar shall burn by it." The character of these commands would not for a moment be doubtful; our impression would unavoidably be that we have before us a separate and independent ordinance on burnt-offerings; nor would that impression be unfounded. For both the language and the spirit of the portion disclose its anterior origin. The wording is unusual, archaic, hard, and partially obscure; and the contents are just such as would most likely be embodied in the earliest outlines of a law concerning the earliest class of sacrifice: they refer to the regular or daily holocausts to be offered for the nation; they are written for the exclusive guidance of the priests; they embody no precept or allusion that concerns the Israelite; they are, in fact, designed to regulate the public worship and to instruct the public ministers. Nor is it difficult to discover the reason why the compilers of Leviticus assigned to this portion the place it occupies. The enactments concerning burnt-offerings, contained in the first chapter, though not complete, are both more systematic and more intelligible; they suffice as a manual for the people whom it was above all deemed advisable to teach and to induce to acts of religious worship. They were, therefore, placed at the beginning of the Book, together with the laws on the three other classes of sacrifice, with which they had for some time formed one code (ch. I to V). It may be that the revisers omitted here some details which they deemed it unnecessary to repeat; nor is it unlikely that they desired to have this section considered as a supplement or appendix to the more comprehensive precepts of the first chapter; but the general nature of the portion cannot be mistaken; it relates to the priests and to the Sanctuary; and it bears the stamp of a higher antiquity.

If the Sanctuary was to be marked as the centre of the religious life of the nation, nothing was of greater importance than the perpetual and uninterrupted exercise of some significant act of devotion. But nothing appeared to serve this purpose better than daily and regular sacrifices designed for no other end than to express, in the name of the whole people, God's unlimited sovereignty (see pp. 234, 235). Therefore, when a law had ordained, that a holocaust should be offered in the Tabernacle every morning, and another in the evening, the Sanctuary was emphatically described as the Tent of Meeting between God and Israel: "And there I will meet with the children of Israel, that it be hallowed by My glory . . . And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God" (Exod. XXIX. 38—46; comp. Num. XXVIII. 2—8); for wherever the odour of sacrifices might ascend to heaven, God promised to appear and to bless the worshipper (Exod. XX. 24). The victim was in-

garment, and *his* linen drawers shall he put upon his flesh, and take up the ashes to which the fire has consumed the burnt-offering on the altar, and he shall

variably to be a lamb one year old, which represented the usual animal food of the nation, and was hence by general custom so decidedly used for ordinary sacrifices, that it was here not even mentioned. But another and even more striking symbol was adopted for conveying the idea of the constant and incessant worship of God, a symbol which a general Eastern or rather ancient custom readily offered, but which, among the Hebrews, assumed a peculiar character and meaning, in accordance with their monotheistic views. An old and intelligible conception assigns to the deity the attributes of fire, and declares the nature of both as entirely kindred (*Porph.* De Abst. II. 5, *ὡς ἂν μάλιστα τοῖς θεοῖς ὁμοιότατον*). It arose among tribes which worshipped the sun because they considered it as the central fire of the universe or as the great god himself; or because they regarded fire as the primary element of creation, and the preserving and vivifying power of nature. The Hindoos raised fire, separating it from the nature and person of Shiva, to a distinct deity under the name of *Agnis*, that is, the Swift, who bore also the names of *Hutâsas* or Consumer of Sacrifices, and *Pavaka* or Purifier, and was looked upon as one of the guardians of the world and the mediator between men and gods (comp. the sacrificial prayers of the Rig- and Sâma-Veda; and *Bohlen*, Alt. Ind. I. 237; *Rhode*, Religiöse Bildung der Hindus, II. 31). The deity was frequently supposed to have appeared in the form of a brilliant fire or light (*Hom.* Od. XIX. 36—40; comp. Exod. III. 2—4; XXIV. 17). The Persians, in common with many other nations, maintained a perpetual fire upon their altars; they carried some of "the sacred and eternal fire" with them on their military expeditions; to whatever god they intended to sacrifice, they first addressed a prayer to fire; and whoever blew the flame with his breath instead of fanning it, or threw upon the fire any carcass or unclean thing, was punished with death (*Strabo*, XV. iii. 14, 15; *Curt.* III. 3 or 7; comp. IV. 13 or 48, 14 or 55; *Diod. Sic.* XVI. 66; *Clem. Alex.* Admon. ad Gent. p. 43 ed. Colon. 1688; Comm. on Exod. pp. 234, 235). Therefore, like some other nations both of the old and the new world, they considered it a profanation of the holy element to burn the dead (*Diog. Laert.* Prooem. 6 or 7). King Darius requested the Carthaginians by special messengers to bury the dead instead of burning them (*Justin.* XIX. 1); and when Cambyses ordered the mummy of the Egyptian king Amasis to be burnt, he did, as Herodotus (III. 16) declares, an "impious" thing and one "repugnant both to the Persians and the Egyptians"; for the Persians, he says, "consider fire to be a god, and they deem it not right to offer to a god a dead body of a man; and by the Egyptians fire is held to be a living beast, devouring all it can lay hold of, and then expiring with what it has consumed"; and even at present the Parsi, evidently in observance of a very old custom, in order to prevent the pollution of a sacred element, neither bury nor burn their dead but expose them on a high scaffolding, to be consumed by the birds of prey (comp. *Herod.* I. 140; *Porph.* Abstin. IV. 21; *Procop.* Bell. Pers. I. 7; *Bohlen*, Altes Indien, II. 179, 180). The Hindoos kept a perpetual flame in that apartment of the house which was de-

put them beside the altar. 4. Then he shall put off his garments, and put on other garments, and carry forth

voted to sacrificial and other sacred rites (*Manu*, III. 84; Rig-Veda-Sanhita, Hymn. 73, ver. 4, p. 195 of Wilsons translation); the offerings poured into the fire were deemed more particularly devoted to the gods (*Manu*, III. 70, 76, 81); and the Brahmans were believed to possess the same purifying power as that element (*Manu*, III. 212; comp. also *Colebrooke*, Essays, pp. 32, 33, ed. 1858). The Japanese hold that, in order to please the Spirits or *Kamis*, it is necessary to keep up a pure fire in the firm conviction, that the prayers pronounced before that symbol of the highest deity are most efficacious to secure remission of sins, innocence of the soul, and removal of the five chief evils fatal to mankind, namely, the devastations of the elements, disease, poverty, exile, and premature death (comp. *K. F. Neumann* in Ersch und Gruber's Encyclop. II. xiv. 375). The Greeks considered the fire, divine in its origin and therefore rising heavenward, to have at first been in the exclusive possession of the gods, till it was either spotaneously granted by them to men, or stealthily taken by Prometheus from the celestial abodes. Hence they extensively maintained a sacred flame in their temples, and were particular even in the selection of the wood or the oil to be used as fuel (*Pausan*. I. xxvi. 7; V. xxvii. 3; xv. 5; VIII. ix. 1; xxxvii. 8; etc.); they considered it as the most efficient means of purification and of symbolical removal of sin, and therefore devoted to the gods sacrifices almost exclusively through the flames of the altar; "fireless offerings" (ἄπυρα) were extremely rare exceptions, as those presented to Athene at Lindus (*Hermann*, Gottesd. Alterth. § 25, note 6). But they deemed "pure" fire only fit for the service of the altar. When after the battle of Plataeae, they desired to celebrate the victory by sacrifices, they were commanded by the oracle of Delphi, to erect an altar to Jupiter, but not to sacrifice before they had extinguished the fire in the whole neighbourhood because it had been polluted by the presence of the barbarians, and to kindle a pure flame from the common hearth at Delphi (*Plut*. Arist. 20). In some parts, it was the general custom to fetch fire for religious festivals from certain temples of special sanctity (*Pausan*. VIII. xv. 9). If anyone died in a house, the fire was deemed "defiled" (μεμιασμένον), was extinguished, and other fire was brought from an adjoining house (*Plut*. Quaestion Gr. 24); even the sin of man was held to contaminate the fire; therefore, at the annual festival of purification celebrated at Lemnos, the fire of the whole island was extinguished, and was replaced by that fetched from Delos (*Philostr*. Heroic. XIX. 14). The Lacedaemonians, when marching out on a war-expedition, took with them from Sparta some of the fire of the last sacrifice, never allowing it to be extinguished, and employing it for all sacred acts (*Xenoph*. Rep. Laced. XIII. 2). The colonies brought the fire to be used for the sacrifices from the public hearth of the mother town (comp. *Welcker*, Götterlehre, I. p. 480; *Schömann*, Griech. Alterth. II. 214, 215). Almost identical with these views were those of the Romans. Numa, so observes Florus (I. 2), entrusted the charge of the hearth and the perpetual fire to the Vestal virgins, that "the flame might watch as guardian of the empire after the image of the heavenly stars"; the same ordinance was renewed in the laws of the Twelve Tables

the ashes without the camp to a clean place. 5. And the fire upon the altar shall be burning by it; it shall not be extinguished; and the priest shall burn wood on

(*Cic.* Legg. II. 8 or 20, virgines Vestales in urbe custodiunto ignem foci publici sempiternum), and the custom was noticed and approved of by later historians and poets (*Hor.* Od. III. v. 11; *Virg.* Aen. II. 297; IV. 200). Often the sacred fire was traced to a miraculous origin; it was supposed to have descended from heaven (πῦρ οὐρανοπετές), whether as a free gift of the deity, or in consequence of fervent prayer; it was hence most scrupulously guarded, and its extinction was believed to cause the inevitable downfall of the commonwealth (*Pausan.* V. xxvii. 3; *Sueton.* Tiber. c. 14; *Val. Max.* I. i. 6, 7; *Hor.* Sat. I. v. 99; *Plin.* H. N. II. 107 or 111; *Appian*, Syriac. c. 56; *Plut.* Cicer. c. 20; *Ammian. Marcell.* XXIII. 6, 34; *Serv.* ad Virg. Aen. XII. 200; comp. notes on IX. 22—24). If it still happened to die away, it was not to be lighted again from another, but a new fire was to be made by producing from the sun, by means of burning-lens or mirrors, "a pure and undefiled flame", a mode of obtaining the sacrificial fire regularly adopted by several ancient tribes at their vernal festivals (comp. *Dougtaei*, Anal. Sacr. I. pp. 79—81, Excurs. XLVI; *E. B. Tylor*, Researches into the Early History of Mankind, pp. 248, 249). It is related that the *Sagnicas*, a Hindoo sect numerous at Benares, when entering the priestly order, light with two pieces of the hard wood *semi*, a fire which they never allow to go out during the whole of their lives, but which is used for their sacrifices, the nuptial ceremonials, the obsequies of their relations, and their own funeral pile (*Jones*, Asiat. Res. II. 60). It was generally held that "fire purifies, while water sanctifies" (τὸ πῦρ καθαίρει, τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ἁγνίζει, *Plut.* Quaest. Rom. 1; comp. *Eurip.* Herc. fur. 937, καθάρσιον πῦρ; Helen. 865, 872; Iphig. in Taur. 1193, θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τἀνθρώπων κακά; *Strabo* XV. iii. 14: indeed the word πῦρ *fire* is believed to be etymologically connected with the root pû *to purify*, lat. *purus*; comp. *Pott*, Etymol. Forschungen, I. 217; *Curtius*, Griech. Etym. II. 317; and on the purifying character of the water see p. 232, and *Hermann*, Gottesd. Alterth. § 23 notes 7—9). Yet at the rites of initiation in certain mysteries, fire was employed, while water was avoided mainly because the latter is the opposite of the former (*Porphyr.* De Antr. Nymph. c. 15); or the water was hallowed by immersing in it a burning log taken from the altar (*Eurip.* Herc. fur. 928, 929; *Athen.* IX. 76). Leaping over the fire, a rite observed on the Roman festival of the Palilia, was supposed to have a purifying effect (*Ovid*, Fast. IV. 727, 781, 782; *Tibull*, II. v. 90; *Prop.* V. iv. 77, 78; *Dion. Hal.* I. 88; comp. p. 381 note 19). Among the Greeks, children were, on the fifth day after their birth, purified by being carried round the fire on the domestic hearth (by the ceremony of ἀμφιδρόμια; comp. *Preuner*, Hestia-Vesta, pp. 52—59, and in general pp. 64, 65, 125—140, 190—201, *et passim*). It was a rule both among the Greeks and Romans, that no sacrifice could possibly be performed without the use of fire (*Serv.* ad Virg. Aen. I. 292, Nullum sacrificium sine igne est, unde et Vesta et Janus in omnibus sacrificiis invocantur). The bright and rising blaze of the flame was regarded as auspicious, the dull and smoky fire as ominous (*Soph.* Ant. 1005—1011; *Virg.* Ecl. VIII. 105, 106; *Sueton.* Octav. 94; Tib. 14; *Lucan*,

**it [the fire] every morning, and arrange the burnt-offering upon it — and he shall burn thereon the fat of the thank-offerings. 6. A perpetual fire shall burn upon the altar; it shall never be extinguished.**

Phars. I. 550 *sqq.*; *Senec.* Oedip. 309 *sqq.*); and the sacrificial fire was, therefore, a common means of augury (comp. *Hermann*, l. c. § 39 note 12). Now the Hebrews shared with other nations some of the conceptions just stated. Fire was with them the pure and purifying element. It was called the purest of all essences (*Philo*, Vit. Mos. c. 18, *καθαρώτατον τῆς οὐσίας*). When Isaiah was initiated as prophet, a seraph took a live coal from the altar, laid it on Isaiah's mouth, and said, "Behold this has touched thy lips, and thy iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is purged" (Isai. VI. 6, 7; comp. Mark IX. 49, *πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται*). God is described as "a devouring fire" (Ex. XXIV. 7; Deut. IV. 24; IX. 3; Ps. XVIII. 9, 13; Hebr. XII. 29). He reveals Himself in fire (Gen. XV. 17; Exod. III. 2; XIX. 18; XXIV. 17; 1 Ki. XIX. 12; Ezek. I. 4, 13; Dan. VII. 9; see Comm. on Exod. p. 45); and His word is fire (Deut. XXXIII. 2; Jer. XXIII. 29; etc.; comp. Acts II. 3; 1 Cor. III. 13, *ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα δηλώσει ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται κτλ.*). It was no doubt this train of ideas which suggested the perpetual fire upon the altar of burnt-offering in the Court, and the perpetual light (נֵר תָּמִיד) in the Holy of the Sanctuary (Exod. XXVII. 20); yet according to the Pentateuch, the fire on the altar did not represent the Deity, but His worship; it was no symbol of God, much less identical with Him; it could, therefore, not possibly be watched and examined as a means of augury (see p. 313); it was no more than a permanent proof that the Israelites were earnest in their endeavours to be the holy people, and an incessant exhortation to urge them on towards that grand aim. But Jewish tradition, as if unable to appreciate the simplicity of the Biblical notions, invented fabulous accounts nearly approaching the pagan ideas; it contended that the perpetual fire on the altar of burnt-offering had fallen from heaven (comp. IX. 24; X. 2; and notes *in loc.*); that it was clear and pellucid, like the sun; that it emitted no smoke; that it did not require the care of the priests, but miraculously fed itself; that it was never extinguished by the rain (*Mishn.* Avoth V. 5), and that its rising column of smoke was never disturbed by any wind or tempest however violent (*Mishn.* l. c.; *Talm.* Yom. 21 *a*); that it rested on the altar like a lion; that it consumed fluids no less than dry things (comp. *Talm.* Yom. 21 *b*); that it burnt uninterruptedly to the time of Solomon, when it was renewed (comp. 2 Chr. VII. 1), and then lasted to the reign of Manasseh who removed it (*Talm.* Zevach. 61 *b*); but that, at the destruction of the Temple, it was by the priests concealed in an empty cistern, and then, after the return from the Babylonian exile, recovered in an extraordinary manner (2 Macc. I. 19—22, 33; II. 1). But independently of this sacred fire, they fabled of "the fire of the burnt-offerings", lighted indeed from the former, but requiring fuel, especially the wood of the wild fig-tree; and of "the fire of fumigation", from which the coals were taken for the burning of incense (see *supra* p. 478; comp. *Buxtorf*, Historia ignis sacri; *Cramer*, De Ara extera, cap. 6; *J. G. Bohn*, De igne Gentil. sacro, in Ugolini Thes. X.; *Van Dale*, De Idolatr. c. 8, pp. 149 *sqq.*; *Deyling*, Observ. II. 167—177; V. 47—63; etc.).

As, according to the Bible, the day

7. **And this *is* the law of the bloodless offering: the sons of Aaron shall offer it before the Lord, before**

begins with the evening (and is, therefore, called *νυχθήμερον*; see Comm. on Gen. pp. 66, 67), the evening holocaust is here exclusively prescribed, "it shall be ... on the altar the whole night till the morning"; but it naturally follows, that the morning holocaust was to burn on the altar, during the day, till the time of the next evening sacrifice, which took place between the declining and the setting sun (בֵּין הָעַרְבָּיִם, see p. 171).— While performing his holy functions, the priest was to wear his sacred garments, of which, though consisting of four pieces, two only are here mentioned — the *tunic* (כְּתֹנֶת, here מַד; comp. Ps. CXXXIII. 2), the long tight robe of fine white linen or byssus (בַּד), without folds, covering the whole body, and reaching down to the feet, with sleeves, woven as one entire piece, and with forms of squares intermixed and hence called tesselated (חשבץ; see Comm. on Exod. p. 526); and the *drawers* (מִכְנְסַיִם) reaching from the loins to the thighs, and principally designed for decency (עַל־בְּשָׂרוֹ; see Comm. on Exod. p. 527). The two other articles of the priestly dress are not referred to — the *girdle* (אַבְנֵט) tied over the tunic, and the *turban* (מִגְבָּעָה). It is uncertain whether they are omitted accidentally and for the sake of brevity, or because they had, at the early date of our portion, not yet been fixed as essential and indispensable, whereas the tunic at least seems to have then already been the common and ordinary vestment of the priest ("he shall put on his linen garment"). It is undoubted that sacerdotal garments were subject to manifold changes, as the descriptions of Josephus, himself a priest, compared with those of the Old Testament sufficiently prove (comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 528).— It is unnecessary to point out that *linen*, because absorbing perspiration and not easily harbouring vermin, like wool, was a favourite material for priestly robes among ancient nations. The dress of the Egyptian priests especially was entirely of linen; their ministers were therefore frequently designated by Latin poets *linigeri* (grex liniger, linigera turba, etc.); and the linen of their long robes was of a texture so wonderfully fine as to be perfectly transparent, for which reason it was put over a short kilt of thicker quality reaching to the knees, while the chief priest of the temple usually wore a leopard-skin over it. The ordinary garment of common Egyptians even was a linen tunic fringed below; they indeed wore generally over it a white woolen raiment; but this they were obliged to take off when entering a temple; and nothing that was made of or contained wool was permitted to be buried with them. The same rules were adopted by the votaries of Isis in Rome; and a similar custom was rigidly maintained by the Hebrew priesthood (comp. Gen. XLI. 42; *Herod.* II. 37, 81; *Ovid*, Metam. I. 747; Ex Ponto I. i. 51, 52; Ars Am. I. 77; *Juven.* VI. 533; *Martial*, XII. xxix. 19; *Senec.* Vit. beat. c. 26, linteatus senex; *Sil. Ital.* III. 24, 25; *Sueton.* Otho c. 12, and Perizon. in loc.; *Lucan*, Phars. IX. 158, 159; *Plut.* De Isid. cc. 3, 4; *Lucian*, Syr. Dea c. 42; *Plin.* H. Nat. XIX. 1 or 2; *Saubert*, De Sacrif. I. 9; *Braun*, De Vestit. Sacerd. I. cc. 6, 7, pp. 116—157; *Celsius*, Hierob. II. pp. 283—312; *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. III. 5, pp. 682—693; *Hengstenberg*, Die Bücher Moses und Aegypten, pp. 149—154; Commentary on Genesis p. 650, on Exodus pp. 487—489; Exod. XXVIII. 39, 42; XXIX. 27—29; 1 Sam. II. 18; XXII. 18, אֵפוֹד בַּד;

the altar. 8. And *one of them* shall take of it his handful, of the flour of the bloodless offering and of its oil, and all the frank-incense which *is* upon the bloodless

comp. Ezek. IX. 2; XLIV. 17, 18, (לא יחגרו ביזע). The reason of the preference given to linen over wool for priestly raiments is hardly because the former has its origin in the purified interior of the earth, while the latter comes from the most indolent animal (so *Dougtaei*, Anal. Sacr. I. p. 78); wool was not in itself despised; it was interwoven in the hangings of the Tabernacle; but it was, from considerations of cleanliness, less eligible for garments than linen. Now the priest, dressed in the prescribed manner, was commanded to approach, in the morning, the brazen altar in the Court, to take off the ashes, into which the holocaust of the preceding evening had, in the mean time, been converted, and to put them temporarily in the appointed place, eastward of the altar (I. 16; see p. 205). He then had to supply the altar with fresh wood, and to arrange and to burn upon it the holocaust of the morning, and the fat and the fat parts of the thank-offerings which might be presented by members of the community. Herewith ended his functions at the Sanctuary; it remained for him only to remove the ashes from the Court to a spot appropriated for them without the camp; and as he was never to wear his holy garments beyond the precincts of the Sanctuary, he was ordered, before proceeding with his last task, to exchange them for his common or ordinary dress (comp. Ezek. XLIV. 19). Whether he took the ashes every day to the place without the camp, or whether he did so from time to time only, is immaterial, although the context of our passage would lead to the former inference. And lest the spirit and essence of these commands be misunderstood, the text emphatically concludes with the repeated injunction, "A perpetual fire shall burn upon the altar; it shall never be extinguished" (ver. 6); it was meant to serve at once as a monitor and a witness of Israel's piety and of their unremitting zeal in the service of their God, as a visible symbol of their spiritual aspirations and their religious duties. — We have little historical evidence to prove to what extent the idea of a perpetual fire was really carried out among the Hebrews. Granted even that it was conceived in so early a time as that of Moses, it could not be acted upon during the wanderings in the desert, where the scarcity of fuel alone would have rendered it impossible, or during the earlier wars of conquest in Canaan. It is expressly stated that, whenever the Israelites changed their encampments, the altar with all its vessels was carefully wrapped up in purple cloth and badgers' skins, and carried on poles (Num. IV. 13, 14). Jewish tradition tries to explain the difficulty by the supposition of a constant miracle which caused the fire to glimmer on without fuel and without injuring the cloth and the skins (comp. *Witsius*, Miscellan. Sacr. vol. I. p. 406, II. i. 16); and later apologists curiously confine the "perpetual" fire to the time when the Tabernacle was at rest (*Clericus* on Num. IV. 14, p. 304; a. o.). The holy fire that accompanied the Persians and other ancient nations on their military expeditions, is analogous to the "column of fire" which is said to have preceded the hosts of the Hebrews, but not to the "perpetual fire" to be kept on the brazen altar (see *supra*). Thus much is certain that burnt-offerings were presented, at some chief or national sanctuary, from the time

**offering, and shall burn *it* upon the altar *for* a sweet odour, its memorial to the Lord. 9. And the remainder of it shall Aaron and his sons eat; unleavened shall it**

of the Judges down to the period of the captivity (pp. 27, 238, 239); and after the return, we have distinct information with regard to the wood that was offered and gathered for the brazen altar (Neh. X. 35). From this time the sacred fire was no doubt kept up with constant continuity which was only interrupted, for a short interval, during the Syrian war against Antiochus Epiphanes (comp., however, *Talm.* Yom. 21*b*). In these later periods, the wood was collected by appointed persons nine times every year (*Mishn.* Taan. IV. 5); on one day a festival (ξυλοφόρια) was celebrated, when it was "customary for every one to bring wood for the altar, that there might never be a want of fuel for that fire which was unquenchable and always burning" (*Joseph.* Bell. Jud. II. xvii. 6); and the wood was deposited in a special cell (לשכת העצים) in the north-eastern corner of the Court of the Women; the latter task was fulfilled by Aaronites afflicted with some bodily defect, and therefore unfit for the immediate service of the Temple. Wood that was worm-eaten was strictly excluded from the altar (comp. *Mishn.* Middoth II. 5).

It is not improbable that the bloodless offering (מִנְחָה) here described (vers. 7—11) is meant to be understood of that cereal oblation which, in the Tabernacle and Temple, was to accompany the daily holocausts, and which was to consist of the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour mingled with the fourth part of a hin of beaten oil (Exod. XXIX. 40, 41). But the intention of the compiler or reviser of the different documents is one thing, and the original import of these documents individually is another; and it cannot be doubted that the precepts here stated refer to bloodless oblations in general: "And this is the law of the bloodless offering; the sons of Aaron shall offer it before the Lord, before the altar" (ver. 7); the succeeding verses do not contain a single allusion to morning or evening sacrifices, whereas the holocausts are distinctly and repeatedly described as such; and the injunctions possess a variety or almost completeness of detail which points to their universal application. Cereal offerings were indeed frequently presented alone and independently of animal sacrifices (p. 220); it was, therefore, important to define their ritual and their character, and to fix the portions that could be claimed by the priests. They probably consisted at first of simple flour (comp. II. 1—3), neither prepared in an oven, pan, or pot (II. 4—10); but oil and frankincense, sacred emblems throughout the East, were from early times deemed indispensable, as the one was used for libations, the other, extensively, for separate offerings (pp. 90, 116—120). They were considered as "most holy", because they had always been entirely appropriated to God and His servants, and had thus been wholly surrendered by the worshipper. They could be dealt with by sacred persons only; "every one that touches them shall be holy" (ver. 11). They are here even described as equal in solemnity to the expiatory offerings (כַּחַטָּאת וְכָאָשָׁם, ver. 10); this is indeed not literally correct; for some kinds of sin-offering (חַטָּאת) were regarded as so pre-eminently holy that not even the priests were allowed to partake of them, and were therefore to be delivered entirely to the flames; but this inaccuracy corroborates interestingly a conjecture which

**be eaten in the holy place; in the Court of the Tent of Meeting they shall eat it. 10. It shall not be baked**

offers itself from other and larger considerations, namely, that this comparison "like the sin-offering and the trespass-offering" is a later addition (see *infra*, Phil. Rem.), yet not so late as to fall into the time when the highest forms of the sin-offering were developed (comp. ver. 23).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — It cannot be doubted that the portion under discussion (ver. 1—11) formed originally a little document for itself, embodying some general laws on the two earliest, and probably coeval, classes of sacrifice, the holocausts and the bloodless offerings; it has its own heading (ver. 1), and is clearly separated from the following sections by a similar introduction (vers. 12, 17). But a later reviser seems to have missed in this document an allusion to the two other classes of sacrifice, the eucharistic and the expiatory offerings, and he found means, in some measure, to supply the deficiency; for he manifestly interpolated, in ver. 6, the words והקטיר עליה חלבי השלמים, and in ver. 10 the words כחטאת וכאשם. The priest is commanded to burn on the brazen altar, every morning, not only the daily holocaust, but also "the fat of the thank-offerings" (comp. Exod. XXIX. 25). Every one must feel that these words, occurring in a section headed "this is the law of the burnt-offering" (ver. 2), are extremely strange in their place; they pre-suppose, moreover, the assumption that private thank-offerings, which were wholly voluntary, would unfailingly be presented every morning. Again, the מנחה is, inaccurately, described as most holy "like the sin-offering and like the trespass-offering"; the mention of expiatory sacrifices can have found no place in so old a document; while it cannot be surprising that a later compiler should try to enhance the sanctity of the מנחה by comparing it to that of the חטאת and אשם familiarly known in his time. Both additions, though fragmentary and insufficient, are meant to secure at least the rights of the altar. — That ch. VI and VII are *additions* to ch. I to V (as even Vater believes), is entirely out of the question; that they describe the "ritual" of the sacrifices, while the preceding chapters contain their "classification", is erroneous; their character has, on the whole, been correctly stated by Bertheau (Sieben Gruppen, p. 161), who, however, fails to point out their exact relation to ch. I—V, and divides them in accordance with his fanciful principles (see the Introduction). — It is too superficial to say that the permanent fire was intended to prevent the possibility of the necessary fire ever failing on the altar through negligence of the priests (Clericus, Rosenmüller); but monstrous is the opinion that the fire, by which a sweet odour was to rise to God, and the peace and happiness of man were to be restored, typifies the eternal flames of hell that await the sinner (see p. 207 note 15), a conceit which Bähr (Symb. II. 349) has taken the trouble seriously to refute (comp. also *Kurtz*, Opferc. § 73). — The words הוא העלה על מוקדה (ver. 2) are literally, *it — the burnt-offering — shall be on the burning-place* all the night, that is, on the part of the brazen altar set aside for burning the sacrifices; and העלה is an apposition or qualification to הוא (Gramm. § XIV. 4). It is erroneous to render הוא הָעֹלָה *that burnt-offering*, namely that described in I. 1—9, as our section treats of public, the first chapter of private holocausts. — מוֹקְדָה, derived

leavened; I have given it *to them for* their portion of My offerings made by fire; it *is* most holy like the sin-offering and like the trespass-offering. 11. All the males

from יָקַד *to burn*, with מ *locale* (like מִזְבֵּחַ the place of sacrificing, the *altar*, מוֹשָׁב the place of sitting, the *seat*, etc.), is the *place of burning* (De Wette, Brandstelle), not simply *burning*, which permits but a very vague conception (Sept. *ἐπὶ τῆς καύσεως*, Engl. Vers. because of the burning; Vulg. cremabitur in altari; Luther, Das Brandopfer soll brennen). Nor can the words ואש המזבח תוקד בו mean, "and the fire of the altar shall be burning in it" (Sept., Engl. Vers., Knobel), which would be a tautology — the fire of the altar shall burn on the altar —, or it would necessitate unwarranted additions (as Vulg. ignis ex eodem altari erit; Luther, es soll aber allein des Altars Feuer darauf brennen; and so Rosenmüller, "non assumetur ignis alienus et extraneus sed sacer"; Ebn Ezra, ולא חוץ ממנו, evidently with an allusion to the sacred or heaven-sent fire, see *infra)*; it is equally simple and appropriate to refer the suffix in בּוֹ to the burnt-offering, that is, the victim, itself, and to render, "and the fire of the altar shall burn by it." The masculine בּוֹ in connection with the feminine עלה, is not surprising (comp. ver. 8 מִמֶּנּוּ in reference to מנחה; Exod. XI. 6; XXVIII. 25, etc.; see Gramm. § 77. 21; comp. also p. 483. — מִדּוֹ בַד (ver. 3) *his linen garment*, stands for the more usual מַד בַּדּוֹ (see Gramm. § LXXXVII. 11), the ו being really the suffix and not the mark of the construct state (Gramm. § XXVI. 1.*b*), as Ewald (Krit. Gram. § 348, p. 636) contends. — Some take here מד in a collective sense, as *garments* or *dress*, in order to account for the omission of two articles of the sacerdotal attire (Targ. Onk. and Jonath. render לבושׁ, the Samaritan reads מדו, etc.), but the girdle and the turban (מגבעה) can hardly be understood by the term מד, and a complete enumeration was perhaps not even intended. On the different Hebrew names by which linen is expressed (שׁשׁ, פשתה, בד, בוץ), see Comm. on Exod. p. 487. — The priest shall put his drawers עַל־בְּשָׂרוֹ *upon his flesh*, a euphemism instead of עַל־בְּשַׂר עֶרְוָה (Exod. XXVIII. 42) *the flesh of his nakedness*, the *pudenda* (comp. XV. 2, 3). — According to Jewish tradition, a priest appointed to the function by lot, had to take off (הרים) every morning a *part*, at least a shovel full of the ashes, and to carry it without the camp, whereas from time to time, when the ashes had inconveniently accumulated, they were to be *entirely* removed (הוציא) to the same place: a distinction which our passage does not warrant (comp. *Talm.* Zevach. 46*a*, 105, 106; Yom. 20*a*, 24*a*, 68*a*; Sanhedr. 42*b*; Kerith. 6*a*; Meil. 11*b*). — In the phrase הדשן אשר תאכל האש את־העלה, the verb תאכל governs two accusatives, one being the simple object (את־העלה), and the other the thing into which the fire changes or transforms it by burning (אשר, sc. הדשן); the literal translation is, therefore, "the ashes into which the fire has consumed the burnt-offering", that is, the ashes produced by the fire which consumed the burnt-offering (Ebn Ezra correctly הנשאר מאכילת האש); and אכל is, here construed like a verb of *forming* or *creating* (Gramm. § 102. 5; comp., however, Am. II. 1; Luther correctly as regards the sense, "und soll die Asche aufheben, die das Feuer des Brandopfers auf dem Altar gemacht hat"). It is not easy to discover the meaning of some translations (as Sept., *καὶ ἀφελεῖ τὴν κατακάρπωσιν, ἣν ἂν καταναλώσῃ τὸ πῦρ, τὴν ὁλοκαύτωσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου,*

among the children of Aaron shall eat of it, *as* a statute for ever in your generations, from the offerings of the

or Vulg. tolletque cineres quos vorans ignis exussit, or Engl. Vers. he shall take up the ashes which the fire has consumed with the burnt-offering on the altar). — In later periods, the holy garments were deposited in the cells within the precincts of the Temple, where they remained till again required for the service in the Sanctuary (Ezek. XLIV. 19; comp. Ezra II. 69; Neh. VII. 70). — That the original design of the permanent fire of the altar was not the perpetuation of the heaven-sent fire (IX. 24), will be obvious from subsequent remarks (on IX. 22—24), although that opinion has been very extensively maintained (comp. *Philo*, Vit. Mos. III. 18; *Douglaei*, Anal. Sacr. I. p. 79; *Öhler*, l. c. p. 633; *Kurtz*, Opferc. p. 126; etc).

The absolute infinitive הַקְרֵב (ver. 7) has the force of the imperative (comp. II. 6; see Gramm. § 97. 4). — אֶל־פְּנֵי expresses motion more distinctly than לִפְנֵי (comp. IX. 5). — The subject of וְהֵרִים (ver. 8) is *one* of the sons of Aaron, or he who officiates. — The masculine suffix in מִמֶּנּוּ points to the material of the מנחה collectively, and has almost the force of the neuter (comp. Gramm. § 84. *a*); the reading ממנה is unnecessary. — הַמִּזְבֵּחַ *on the altar*; comp. II. 2, המזבחה. — חק (ver. 11), *statute*, is here *portion fixed by legal statute*; and חקך וחק־בניך נתנו *they have been given as thy legal portion and the legal portion of thy sons* (X. 14; comp. VII. 34; X. 15; Num. XVIII. 8; Ezek. XLIV. 14). — The bloodless offerings were to be eaten by the male descendants of Aaron only; "every one that touches them shall be holy" (כל אשר־יגע בהם יקדש, ver. 11), that is, a priest or sanctified person only must touch them; but the term *to touch* (נגע) has here a wider meaning (comp. Gen. XXVI. 11, 29; Josh. IX. 19) — whoever is concerned or has to do with them, and especially whoever eats them, so that those words are a qualification of the preceding part of the verse, "all the males among the children of Aaron shall eat of it." This sense is perfectly appropriate to our context as well as to the other passages in which the same phrase occurs, namely in reference to the flesh of the sin-offerings (ver. 20), to the altar of burnt-offering (Exod. XXIX. 37), and the utensils of the Tabernacle (Exod. XXX. 29); the first of which cases is entirely analogous to ours, while, in the two others, those who "touch" the sacred vessels are the persons officiating at or with them, that is, the priests. Some critics, however, understand the words under discussion to mean, "whoever touches the offering shall be dedicated and given over to the Sanctuary", whether "to be instantaneously devoured and destroyed by it" (*Ewald*, Alterthümer, p. 85) "or to be obliged to do service at it" (so Theodor. Quaest. 5 ad Lev., Ebn Ezra, Kurtz, Knobel, a. o.); or, with a certain modification, that person shall thenceforth be bound to keep aloof from uncleanness in the same manner as the ordained priests (XXI. 1—8), without, however, participating in priestly honours and privileges (Keil), a law than which none more arbitrary or more troublesome could be conceived. To lessen the inconvenience, it has indeed been supposed that the person who had thus involuntarily been "forfeited" to the Sanctuary, was at liberty to redeem himself by a sum of money, in the manner of individuals who had devoted themselves to God by a vow (XXVII. 2*sqq.*); but not one of the passages in question contains the slightest allusion to such an expedient, and this can certainly not be

Lord made by fire: every one that touches them shall be holy.

12. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 13. This *is* the offering of Aaron and of his sons, which they shall offer to the Lord in the day when he is anointed —

evolved from the words כל אשר־יגע בהם יקדש, which can legitimately have no other sense than that above indicated. The Talmud understands them to mean — all the profane meat that touches the bloodless or the expiatory offerings, shall become holy like these: but the antithesis of כל־זכר בבני אהרן and כל אשר proves, that the latter words also refer to *persons*, not to *things*. It was reserved for Ghillany to discover that the layman who by chance touches holy things was to be *sacrificed* to God (comp. p. 413). The case of a private Israelite coming unwittingly into contact with sacred food or sacred utensils, was not provided for, and was indeed not easy to deal with; for the layman could not become unclean by touching most holy things, and could, therefore, not be ordered to submit to any of the ordinary modes of purification; nor could he become holy by a mere and accidental contact; as, therefore, none of the fundamental laws applied to him, he was probably left to decide upon the proper manner of reetifying the mistake, and a sin-offering, which was ordered for all involuntary sins falling within the theocratic sphere (IV. 27), was most likely the usual means of atonement.

## 3. On the Bloodless Offering of the High-priest on the Day of his Consecration, VI. 12—16.

**12—16.** From a comparatively remote period, some fixed ceremonial was observed at the consecration of the religious chief of the people; it was extremely simple and contrasted strikingly with the complicated, solemn, and highly symbolical ritual that was adopted or recommended at a later epoch and a more advanced stage of theocratic institutions (ch. VIII). How this striking change could be made, although the ordinance is here enjoined *for ever* (תמיד, ver. 13), and as an *eternal* statute (חק־עולם, ver. 15), and how yet both sections so contradictory to each other could be inserted by the compilers of Leviticus almost successively, will not surprise those who have made themselves familiar with the composition and gradual growth of the Book. It is hardly probable that our passage was desired to be understood of the consecration of the *later* High-priests, and the eighth chapter of that of Aaron himself; for here also we read, "This is the offering of Aaron and his sons" (comp. ver. 15). Now this sacrifice was to consist simply of two bloodless offerings, one presented in the morning, and the other in the evening, probably in analogy to the two daily holocausts burnt from an early age. It was indeed so unpretending that the quantity of flour used for each oblation was below the minimum later prescribed for even the very poorest of private individuals, which was an omer or the tenth part of an ephah (V. 11); for it was no more than half an ephah (ver. 13); this circumstance has given rise to the supposition that both offerings, that

**the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour *for* a bloodless offering perpetually, half of it in the morning and half of it in the evening. 14. In a pan it shall be made**

of the morning and that of the evening, formed *one* sacrifice; they were evidently so understood by Jewish tradition, which ordained that the High-priest should bring from his house the whole ephah at the same time, and divide it afterwards (*Mishn.* Menach. IV. 5); however, each oblation was complete in itself; and the double offering, at the beginning and the conclusion of the day, was evidently designed to impress the idea that the High-priest's whole existence should be devoted to his sacred duties and to the glory of God (comp. p. 40). It was prepared in the following manner. The flour was put into a pan, soaked or saturated with oil (מֻרְבֶּכֶת), and of course mixed with salt (II. 13); this mass was divided into pieces, and so baked or toasted (ver. 14, see *infra*); for the "pieces" were meant to be analogous to the limbs into which the animal holocaust was divided before it was burnt (pp. 197, 198, see also p. 483). This ceremonial was to be repeated at the consecration of all the descendants of Aaron that might succeed him in the pontifical office (ver 15). But the offering could not be eaten by the High-priest because he presented it in his own name, nor by an ordinary priest, who was subordinate to the chief of his order; and it was, therefore, to be burnt entirely. With this individual case the writer or compiler connected the general rule, "Every bloodless offering of a priest shall be wholly burnt; it shall not be eaten" (ver. 16): for, in principle, the entire sacrifice, at least if falling within the class of "most holy", belonged to God, who might leave a part of it to His representatives, the priests; but if these representatives themselves offered a sacrifice, it was claimed by God alone, and no one else could expect a share in it.

Philological Remarks. — It cannot be doubted that these verses treat of the consecration of the High-priest, and of the High-priest only. The term הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ (ver, 15) is decisive; for it is applied to the High-priest alone (see on IV. 3—12). Then the singular אתו (in the phrase ביום המשח, אתו, ver. 13) points to one particular priest; and the words תחתיו מבניו (ver. 15) can only be explained on the same supposition (see *infra*). The terms מנחה תמיד (ver. 13) and חק עולם (ver. 15) imply merely, that the rites here detailed shall be observed at all times whenever a new High-priest is initiated (comp. *Ravius* in Relandi Antiqq. p. 621). But the Talmud, referring our law both to the common priests and the High-priest, believes that the former had to offer the oblation here described on the day of his consecration only, but the latter *daily*, namely after the regular holocaust with its *minchah* and before the drink-offering; (comp. *Mishn.* Menach. III. 2; IV. 5; XI. 3; *Rashi* in loc.; see *infra*). Now it is not improbable that this became later the practice among the Jews, since it is also mentioned by Josephus (Ant. III. x. 7, *θύει δὲ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀναλωμάτων, καὶ δὶς ἑκάστης ἡμέρας τοῦτο ποιεῖ κτλ.*), by Philo (De Vict. c. 15, Opp. II. 250, *σεμίδαλις γὰρ ἡ ἐνδελεχὴς θυσία ἐστὶν αὐτῶν, μέτρον ἱεροῦ τὸ δέκατον καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν κτλ*; comp., however, Quis Rer. Div. Her. c. 36, Opp. I. 497; see *infra*), and in the New Testament (Hebr. VII. 27, *ὃς οὐκ ἔχει καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνάγκην, ὥσπερ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς . . . θυσίας ἀναφέρειν*; see Sirach XLV. 14, *θυσίαι αὐτοῦ ὁλοκαρπωθήσονται καθ' ἡμέραν ἐνδελε-*

with oil; thou shalt bring it well soaked; roasted cakes, an oblation of small pieces, shalt thou offer *for* a sweet odour to the Lord. 15. *And he who will be* the anointed

*χῶς δίς*, where possibly the same custom may be referred to; comp. *Origen.* Homil. IV. in Levit., jubetur pontifex ex die qua unctus fuerit, semper et in perpetuum offerre similaginem etc.; *Outram*, De Sacrif. p. 90; *Reland*, Antiq. p. 621 note 7, p. 623 note 8; *Lundius*, Jüd. Heiligth. III. ix. 17, p. 514; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 212; *Baumgarten* in loc.; *Öhler*, l. c. p. 636; *Kurtz*, Opferc. pp. 302—305, containing many specious assertions, a. o.; and on the other hand, Ebn Ezra, Rashbam, *Kliefoth*, Liturg. Abhandl. IV. 111, 112; *Knobel* in loc.; *Keil*, Archaeol. I. 174, 175; *Thalhofer*, Unblut. Opfer, pp. 139—156, whose results are questionable, while his argumentation is feeble and unhistorical; *Delitzsch*, Hebräerbrief, pp. 315*sqq.*, 761): but these later testimonies prove nothing as to the meaning of the Biblical statement and the earlier usage; בְּיוֹם המשח אתו cannot signify *"from* or *after* the day of his being anointed" (so Arab. Polygl. منذ يوم مسحه, Rosenm., Kurtz, who vainly refers to several inconclusive passages and among them to VII. 36, ביום משחו אתם, see notes in loc.); the circumstance that the High-priest himself, and not, as in the eighth chapter, Moses is reported as officiating, affords no argument, as the sacrifice here ordained stands in no connection whatever with the ceremony later described; the words מנחה תמיד, the only support for the supposition of a *daily* sacrifice, does certainly not necessitate that conception; nor do they mean *"during* the seven days continuously" in which the anointment was performed (*Keil*, l. c.), as the rite set forth in our passage is limited to *one* day, and is neither mentioned in the detailed command in Exodus (ch. XXIX), nor in the full account of its execution (in ch. VIII), and can, therefore, have formed no part of the seven days' consecration; much less do they point to the ordinary daily *minchah* that accompanied the morning and evening holocaust (*Philo*, Quis Rer. Div. Her. l. c., *τὰς ἐνδελεχεῖς θυσίας ὁρᾷς εἰς ἴσα διῃρημένας, ἥν τε ὑπὲρ αὑτῶν ἀνάγουσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς διὰ τῆς σεμιδάλεως, καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν δυοῖν ἀμνῶν, οὓς ἀναφέρειν διείρηται*; *Cleric*, in loc., a. o.), since that oblation consisted merely of flour mingled with oil (Num. XXVIII. 5) and not of the differently prepared gift here described. As regards the untenable conjecture that the offering here ordained was to be presented by the High-priest daily, but by the common priests on the day of their consecration only (when they were 20 years old, *Abarbanel*, Introd. to Lev. c. 2, a. o.); nothing in the tenour of our verses justifies such distinction; and the 16th verse, the only one which alludes to the common priest, is a general remark suggested by the words just preceding with regard to the total burning of the offerings of the High-priest; nay that verse is possibly a later addition or gloss, the character of which it apparently bears, exactly as the following portion on the sin-offering (vers. 17—22) concludes with an addition of a general import (ver. 23, see *infra*). אהרן ובניו (ver. 13) is, therefore, *Aaron and his descendants*, a meaning of בניו which it has in ver. 15 also (מבניו). — The construction בְּיוֹם הִמָּשַׁח אֹתוֹ, the passive of the verb (הִמָּשַׁח) with the accusative אֹתוֹ, *on the day of his being anointed*, must be explained by the active form of expression which was in the writer's mind, "on the day

**priest in his place among his sons shall offer it: *it is* a statute for ever to the Lord; it shall be wholly burnt. 16. And every bloodless offering of a priest shall be wholly *burnt;* it shall not be eaten.**

when they anoint him", a mode of speech not unusual in Hebrew; comp. יִשָּׂרֵף אֹתוֹ (Josh. VII. 15) *he shall be burnt*, that is, you shall burn him (see Gram. § 76. 2). — מִנְחָה תָּמִיד *a perpetual offering* for מִנְחַת תָּמִיד (comp. עֹלַת תָּמִיד Exod. XXIX. 42), see Gramm. § 87. 10. — For בְּעֶרֶב the Samar. text has בין הערבים (comp. Exod. XXIX. 41; see p. 171). — On מֻרְבֶּכֶת *soaked*, see p. 105 note 23. — The words תֻּפִינֵי מִנְחַת פִּתִּים (ver. 14) are difficult chiefly on account of the ἅπαξ λεγόμενον תֻּפִינֵי, which has been referred to very various roots. It has been derived 1. From חפן *to become hard*. so that תֻּפִינִים are cakes which by frying are covered with a hard crust (so *Ravius* in Relandi Antiqq. p. 623); but that root does not exist in Hebrew. 2. From תפה (Arab. تفى) *to put upon, to raise* (comp. Targ. in 2 Ki. IV. 38; Ezek. XXIV. 3), referring here either to the tripod or the stones upon which the pot or pan was put to the fire, or to the shape in which the cakes were heaped or piled up, like the *strues* of the Romans (comp. *Fest.* p. 310; *Cato*, R. R. 134, 141, struem commovere or facere; *Ovid*, Fast. I. 276), which usage is, however, not applicable to our passage, although a certain arrangement was customary with regard to the shew-bread (hence called לחם המערכת, Neh. X. 34). 3. From אפן *to diminish*; thus Rosenmüller who (followed by Thalhofer a. o.), believes that תֻּפִינִים is identical with תֻּאֲפִינִים, and explains this word as "*comminuta*, frustulatim concisa muneris frustorum"; but to diminish is not equivalent with to break or divide in pieces; and the latter meaning has evidently been given to the word on account of the accompanying פִּתִּים (comp. II. 6) with which it was supposed to be identical; and so already the Sept. (ἑρικτά, *fracta, contusa, frusta*, though Vat. et Complut. have ἑλικτά, and Gr. Venet. κλιβανώματα *coctilia*), Samar., Pseudojon., Targ. Jerus., Syr., Saad.; and so Maurer a. o.). 4. From אָפָה *to cook* or *bake* (Rashi, Kimchi, Rashbam, Ebn Ezra, Mendelssohn, Gesenius), so that תֻּפִּין would stand for תֻּאפִין, with *nun formativum* (*Gesen.* Thes. p. 136), and תֻּפִינִים would be *cooked things* or *cakes* (Gr. Venet. *supra*); so explain Rashi and others, "thoroughly cooked; for the priest, after the frying, cooked the pieces in an oven, and then he fried them again in a pan"; and תֻּפִינִים have hence been translated *placentae biscoctae*, or *biscuit* (Mendelss. *Zwieback*). But the radical objection to this etymology lies in the impossibility of a formation תֻּפִּין for תֻּאפִין from אָפָה, of which there is no analogy. More satisfactory is the derivation 5. From תּוּף *to burn, to roast* (comp. תֹּפֶת and תָּפְתֶּה *a place for burning* the dead, 2 Ki. XXIII. 10; Isai. XXX. 33, etc.; see p. 366), so that תֻּפִּין or תּוּפִין would be something *roasted* or *baked* (so Fürst; comp. Aram. תֻּפָא *cake*, תַּפְיָא *hearth*), and the words תֻּפִינֵי מִנְחַת פִּתִּים would mean "roasted cakes of an offering of pieces", that is, an offering consisting of small roasted cakes, obtained in the manner described above. The construction is obvious (Gesen. cocticnes ferti in frusta comminuti, i. e. more ferti in frusta comminuti). Josephus (Antiqq. III. x. 7) vaguely describes the offering ἄλευρον ἐλαίῳ μεμιγμένον, καὶ πεπηγὸς ἱκανῶς

**17. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 18. Speak to Aaron and to his sons, saying, This *is* the law of the sin-offering: In the place where the burnt-offering is killed, shall the sin-offering be killed before the Lord; it *is* most holy. 19. The priest that offers it for expiation shall eat it; in the holy place shall it be eaten,**

*βραχεία*; the Vulgate renders quite inaccurately, "offeres autem eam calidam"; and absurd is a Talmudical explanation (reproduced by Saad., Ben Gannach, a. o.) that תֻּפִינֵי is identical with תֵּאָפֶה נָא or תְּ' נָ' "it shall be baked half-raw." Knobel (Lev. p. 403) proposes to read תְּפִינֵי; but the Samar. and Onkelos already have תופני; and his arguments in support of *strues*, which meaning he adopts in a modified form, do not accord with his usual simplicity of conception and soundness of judgment.—And the anointed priest תַּחְתָּיו מִבָּנָיו יַעֲשֶׂה אֹתָהּ (ver. 15) *among his sons in his place shall do it*, that is, that son or descendant of Aaron who will occupy his place (תַּחְתָּיו) as the anointed or High-priest (comp. Exod. XXIX. 30).

## 4. ON SIN-OFFERINGS, VI. 17—23; and
## 5. ON TRESPASS-OFFERINGS, VII. 1—7.

**17—23** and **VII. 1—7.** To the laws concerning the holocaust and the bloodless offering (vers. 1—16), regulations regarding expiatory sacrifices (ver. 17—VII. 7) and eucharistic gifts (VII. 11—21) were later appended by a reviser desirous to complete the code in accordance with the progress which the sacrificial system had in the mean time made. Thus a certain consistency and fitness of arrangement are observable in these sections. Yet that arrangement is far from perfect. While the first two portions of this chapter (vers. 1—11) treat of general classes of offering, the third relates to a very particular and special case (vers. 12—16), but is again followed by laws on several great divisions of sacrifice (vers. 17—VII. 21). The sin-offering (חַטָּאת) precedes the trespass-offering (אָשָׁם), contrary to the natural sequence of their respective origin; and more anomalously still, the thank-offering follows after the expiatory sacrifices, though it is considerably anterior to them in antiquity. From the compiler's point of view, however, these incongruities may be easily explained. He left the regulations concerning the High-priest's offering in the place in which he found them (vers. 12—16), because he saw that they could be understood as an appendix to the preceding laws on bloodless oblations (vers. 7—11), especially as he desired the latter to be referred to the regular cereal gift which was to accompany the daily holocausts (see *supra*); but he gave to the expiatory sacrifices the precedence over the eucharistic offerings, because he attached to the former far higher religious importance; and from the same consideration, he placed the sin-offering, in which the theocratic worship culminated, before the less solemn trespass-offering.

However, the ordinances respecting the expiatory sacrifices are quite general in their nature; there is indeed the main division into sin-offering and trespass-offering; but the distinction between these two species is vague and little defined; the victims are in both cases to be

in the Court of the Tent of Meeting. 20. Whoever shall touch its flesh shall be holy: and if anyone sprinkles of its blood upon any garment, thou shalt wash that whereon he has sprinkled *it* in the holy place. 21. And the earthen vessel wherein it is cooked shall be broken; and if it be cooked in a brazen vessel, then it shall be scoured and rinsed in water. 22. All the males among the priests shall eat it; it *is* most holy. 23. But no sin-offering, whereof *any* of the blood is brought into

killed in the same place (VII. 2; VI. 18); they are both "most holy" (VII. 1, 6; VI. 18, 22); they are both to be eaten by male priests alone, in the holy place or the Court (VII. 6; VI. 19, 22); the same parts of the animal were burnt in either sacrifice, though they are mentioned in the law of the trespass-offering only (VII. 3, 4); it is, in fact, expressly urged, "The sin-offering is like the trespass-offering, there is one law for them" (VII. 7); which rule, though immediately referring to the portions of the priests, appears to have a much larger scope. If there is a difference intended, it can be conjectured rather than ascertained. From the force and emphasis with which the writer cautions non-Levites against any contact whatever with the sin-offering, especially its blood (VI. 20, 21), it appears that he attributed, in some respect, a higher degree of sanctity to the sin-offering than even to the trespass-offering; but by what ceremony that superiority was conveyed, if it was conveyed at all, is in no way indicated. It may be contended that it was expressed by a different mode in the disposal of the blood, and that a statement to this effect was deemed unnecessary, because it had been previously made (IV. 30, 34). But such assertion is based upon an erroneous estimate of the relative ages of the present and the previous sections (ch. IV), and is in no way borne out by the tenour and spirit of our verses (comp. pp. 40—42). On the contrary, these regulations betray a time when the latest class of sacrifice had not been introduced long. Evidently to render them more intelligible to the reader, they are connected with the oldest and most familiar kind of offering, the holocausts, "In the place where they kill the burnt-offering, shall they kill the trespass-offering" (VII. 2), and, "In the place where the burnt-offering is killed, shall the sin-offering be killed" (VI. 18; comp. IV. 24); it is commanded that all the blood (אשר דמו) of the trespass-offering shall be sprinkled "on the altar round about" (על־המזבח סביב, VII. 2), or on all its sides, exactly as was the case with the burnt-offerings (I. 5, 11), to which they were thus rendered equal in a most essential point; and the comprehensive maxim, "The sin-offering is like the trespass-offering, there is one law for them" (comp. XIV. 13), almost compels the conclusion that, at first, there was scarcely any distinction between the two beyond the choice of the animals and the nature of the offences for which they were respectively presented. From all this it seems manifest, that the general rule with which the chapter concludes, "But no sin-offering, whereof any blood is brought into the Tent of Meeting, to make atonement in the Holy, shall be eaten; it shall be burnt in the fire" (ver. 23)—that this rule is the addition of a much later time, when the gradation between the sin-offering of the High-priest, the

the Tent of Meeting to make atonement in the Holy,
shall be eaten; it shall be burnt in the fire.

## CHAPTER VII.

1. And this is the law of the trespass-offering: It
*is* most holy. 2. In the place where they kill the burnt-
offering, shall they kill the trespass-offering; and its
blood shall he [the priest] sprinkle round about upon
the altar. 3. And he shall offer of it all its fat; the
tail, and the fat that covers the bowels, 4. And the two

whole nation, the ruler, and the common Israelite (ch. IV), had been established, and was chiefly indicated by the manner in which the blood, the medium of atonement, was applied, whether it was disposed of in the Court or in the Holy, and whether it was sprinkled round the whole altar or put on the horns, its most characteristic part. This addition caused the precepts under discussion (VI. 17—22), which were originally meant to have general application (ver. 18, זאת תורת החטאת), to be restricted to the sin-offering of the common Israelite only. But it was considered the more necessary as, from the tenour of the preceding verse (22), it might have been inferred that all sin-offerings alike could be eaten by the priests, and thus mistakes, deemed very grave from a theocratic point of view, might easily have been committed.—As sin-offerings became customary for transgressions which more immediately concerned the character of the holy community, they were naturally invested with greater sanctity and were more scrupulously guarded against every possible defilement. Not only were priests alone permitted to touch the flesh, but if by chance some blood was sprinkled upon a garment, it was to be washed out by the priest in the holy place, that is, in the Court of the Sanctuary, not by the Israelite to whom the garment belonged; because the holy blood could be touched by none but priestly hands, and it would be profaned were it taken, with the garment, beyond the precincts of the Sanctuary. If the flesh was cooked in an earthen vessel, the latter was to be broken, because the juice of the holy meat might soak into the unglazed earthenware, and then by cooking enter into a layman's food, or be applied to some unworthy use; but if the utensil was of metal, especially of brass, it required merely to be thoroughly washed and scoured with water (Jewish tradition says, with *boiling* water), because its hardness did not admit the holy fluid (VI. 20, 21).

The ritual of both sin- and trespass-offering is but imperfectly stated; but it appears, that the ceremonies necessarily common to all sacrifices and well-known from the practice of the *earlier* classes, particularly the holocaust, were designedly not specified in detail; so for instance is the rite of imposition of the hand omitted, though it was undoubtedly performed; for the personal connection which it typifies between the offerer and the victim, was pre-eminently essential and significant in expiatory sacrifices (see pp. 175, 176). Nor are the animals mentioned, though the allusion to the "fat tail" (אַלְיָה, VII. 3) in connection with the trespass-offering, proves that, for this class,

kidneys, and the fat that *is* on them, which *is* by the flanks, and the great lobe of the liver, which he shall take off by the kidneys. 5. And the priest shall burn them upon the altar *for* an offering made by fire to the Lord; it *is* a trespass-offering. 6. Every male among the priests shall eat it; it shall be eaten in the holy place; it *is* most holy. 7. As the sin-offering *is*, so *is*

sheep were the ordinary victims (see pp. 83, 489, 490). If a priest presented a trespass-offering, it was, no doubt, entirely burnt, like the bloodless oblation of a priest (VI. 16), and for the same reasons (see *supra* p. 538).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS.—The construct state (בִּמְקוֹם) before the relative (אֲשֶׁר, VI. 18; VII. 2; IV. 24, 33) is not unusual in Hebrew, because, in such cases, the logical relation exists as between a noun and a dependent genitive (Gramm. § 87. 8); so here "in the place of the killing of the burnt-offering"; although אֲשֶׁר has, in this connection, less the power of a relative pronoun, than of the adverb *where* (comp. Gramm. § 107. 3). — The verb חִטֵּא, in Piel (VI. 19) usually signifies *to expiate*, and is synonymous with כִּפֵּר (see p. 476); but it has here the wider meaning *to perform a sin-offering*, and הַכֹּהֵן הַמְחַטֵּא אֹתָהּ is *the priest who offers it* (the חַטָּאת) *for expiation* (comp. IX. 15; Sept. ὁ ἀναφέρων αὐτήν, Vulg. qui offert, but Onkel. כהנא דִמְכַפַּר בדמה "the priest who makes atonement with its blood", and Ebn Ezra הזורק דם כאלו אמר המסיר חטא החוטא, etc.). — The words ואשר יזה to the end of the verse (20) are an *anacoluthon* (Gram. § 104. 5), but only as regards the general construction, not the persons of the verb whom it is important to understand quite literally, "and he who sprinkles of its blood on any garment — thou shalt wash in a holy place that on which he has sprinkled", that is, if any one (any common Israelite) sprinkles of its blood upon a garment, thou (Aaron or the priest, not he, the Israelite) shalt wash in a holy place that on which he has sprinkled. The Samar. has, therefore, erroneously יכבס. Ebn Ezra explains, "*or* if somebody *else* sprinkles upon *the meat*" (עליה), which is forced and objectionable. — The Talmud observes, that a garment on which blood not destined for sprinkling was put, did not require to be washed; but this is against the spirit of the ordinance; for מִדָּמָהּ is, quite generally, *any of its blood*. — On הַבֶּגֶד (with the article) *any garment* see Gram. §. 83. 6. — The Hebrews used, for cooking, utensils of earthenware (כְּלִי־חֶרֶשׂ), of wood, and of copper (נְחֹשֶׁת, ver. 21; XI. 33; XV. 12); the law concerning the two former was, of course, identical, as the same considerations applied to both. Utensils of copper could hardly be dangerous to a people trained and induced to cleanliness by a ceremonial law of great minuteness and rigour. — On the addition of ver. 23, see *supra*. — The later Jewish conception and development of the law concerning the blood of sin-offerings that fell on a garment or a vessel, may be seen in *Mishnah*, Zevach. XI. 1—8. The Sept. renders (in VII. 1), correctly as regards the meaning, καὶ οὗτος ὁ νόμος τοῦ κριοῦ τοῦ περὶ τῆς πλημμελείας, on account of האליה (in ver. 3, see *supra*; comp. *Maimon*. Maas. Hakkorban. VIII. 1—10). — The victims were killed by those who offered them, but the blood was sprinkled by the priests, hence

the trespass-offering; *there is* one law for them: the priest that makes atonement therewith, shall have *it*.

8. And the priest that offers any man's burnt-offering, the priest shall have to himself the skin of the burnt-

the plural ישחטו, but the singular יזרק (VII. 2). — The silence of the text with regard to imposition of the hand, has led some critics to suppose that this rite was not performed in trespass-offerings, because "it was excluded by their character as sacrifices of compensation and restitution" (*Rink*, Stud. u. Krit. 1855, pp. 375, 376); or because "the imposition of the hand which expressed the free surrender of the victim, was inappropriate in a sacrifice which was presented as a forfeited debt" (Knobel); but the imposition of the hand did not, in all cases, denote surrender, and the notion of *debt* for which restitution is required, does not exhaust the character of the trespass-offering (pp. 175 note 18, 273, 274). The rite is not mentioned in the corresponding short statements regarding the sin-offering either (VI. 18, 19); but as this omission does not prove its non-observance, so is the silence in the laws of the trespass-offering inconclusive. — The Sept., the Syr., and Targ. Jerus. read (in ver. 3) ואת־האליה, instead of את־האליה (*καὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν*, etc.), and the Vulg. has merely, *offerent ex ea caudam* etc., leaving out ואת כל־חלבו, from considerations that have been specified above (p. 494). — The Samaritan text reads, and the Sept. expresses, at the end of the third verse ואת כל־החלב אשר על־הקרב, which addition is appropriate (III. 3, 9, 14; IV. 8, etc.), though not indispensable, as it is implied in the general term ואת כל־חלבו, at the beginning of the verse. — The equality of the sin-offering and trespass-offering (ver. 7) consists indeed, in the first instance, in the equality of the portions falling to the share of the priests; but the terms point to a greater and more general affinity.

## 6. THE PORTIONS OF BURNT-OFFERINGS AND BLOODLESS OFFERINGS TO BE LEFT TO THE PRIESTS, VII. 8—10.

8—10. One of the principal ends of the second code of laws (ch. VI and VII) is to define the portions which should belong to the priests in the various classes of sacrifice. With this view, some small but significant interpolations were inserted in preceding sections (VI. 5, 10); and with the same view some additions are here made, designed to further that object. They concern the holocausts and the bloodless offerings, which, in the writer's time, appeared to require more definite regulations. In holocausts, all the meat and fat were indeed to be consumed upon the altar (I. 8, 9, 12, 13); but no law seems to have existed with respect to the hide of the victim, which, for obvious reasons, was not burnt in the sacred flames. It is not impossible that originally the skin, not claimed by the Deity, remained the property of the worshipper. But when the character of the holocaust, as an offering *entirely* to be delivered to God (כָּלִיל, p. 238), was more decidedly urged, it was deemed appropriate that the offerer should renounce the skin of the victim also, and surrender it to the priests, who in the mean time had grown into a numerous order, and required more ample provision. This arrangement

**offering which he has offered. 9. And every bloodless offering that is baked in the oven, and every one that *is* prepared in the pot and in a pan, shall belong to**

must have appeared both more natural and more practicable at a time, when the introduction of expiatory offerings accustomed the Israelite to give up the whole animal to the sacred service, whether a part of the flesh was eaten by the priests, or the whole, including the skin, was burnt either on the altar or in a clean and appointed place (IV. 11, 12). But the hide of animals presented as thank-offerings, was most probably returned to the offerer, since it is nowhere alluded to as a priestly appurtenance (comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. XII. 3). Among other nations also, as the Greeks, the skin of victims, though occasionally burnt on the altar (*Plut.* Sympos. VI. viii. 1; *Lucian*, De Sacrif. c. 13), generally belonged to the priests (Schol. ad Aristoph. Plut. 1181; Vesp. 715), who, however, superstitiously used it for seeking prophetic dreams by sleeping upon it (p. 377); in some instances, the offerer knelt upon the hide, and placed the victim's feet and head upon his own head, in order to indicate the animal's vicarious death (p. 298).

In a preceding section of this code (VI. 8—11), portions of the most simple kind of offerings only, those consisting of flour, oil, and incense, were assigned to the priests. It was deemed essential to secure for them the corresponding shares in all other classes of cereal oblations, especially those prepared in the oven, the pot, or pan (comp. II. 4—10); and the reviser, therefore, here supplied this omission (ver. 9). Now, it was the most natural practice, that the legal share in the offering should be allowed to the priest who performed the ceremonies of its presentation; this is expressly mentioned, in the earliest regulations on the sacrifices, in reference to the trespass-offering, "The priest that makes atonement therewith shall have it" (VII. 7), and to the sin-offering, "The priest that offers it for expiation shall eat it" (VI. 19); and now the same injunction is added with regard to the holocaust, "The priest that offers any man's burnt-offering, he shall have to himself the skin of the burnt-offering which he has offered" (ver. 8), with regard to many kinds of bloodless oblation, "Every bloodless offering that is baked in the oven, and every one that is prepared in the pot and in the pan, shall belong to the priest that offers it" (ver. 9), and to the thank-offering, "And he shall offer of it one out of each oblation as a gift to the Lord; to the priest who sprinkles the blood of the thank-offering shall it belong" (ver. 14). But when the order of priesthood was, or was to be, better organised, it was found expedient, to reserve a part of the revenues to those priests also who did not exercise sacrificial functions, whether they were occupied at the Sanctuary, or were, for any reason, prevented from assisting in its work; therefore, some of the perquisites were to be collected for all priests alike, as a common stock, and to be distributed among them equally, thus affording subsistence to all; these perquisites were the simplest kind of the cereal oblations, "Every bloodless offering, mingled with oil, or dry, shall belong to all the sons of Aaron, to one as well as to another" (ver. 10), an ordinance later extended to all classes of cereal offering (II. 3, 10); and the right shoulder of the thank-offering, "He among the sons of Aaron, that offers the blood of the thank-offerings, and the fat, shall have the right shoulder for his portion" (ver. 33); whereas

the priest that offers it. 10. And every bloodless offering, mingled with oil, and dry, shall belong to all the sons of Aaron, to one *as well* as to another.

11. And this *is* the law of the sacrifice of thank-offerings, which shall be offered to the Lord. 12. If *a man* offer it for praise, then he shall offer with the sacrifice

the breast belonged to all the priests alike (ver. 33; comp. notes on II. 1—13, and the Treatise on Priesthood, sect. III. 13).—The "bloodless offering mingled with oil" comprises not only the cereal oblation which accompanied the burnt offering (Exod. XXIX. 40; Num. XXVIII. 5), but also all independent cereal gifts so prepared; whereas the "dry bloodless offering" (חֲרֵבָה) embraces only the cereal sin-offering (V. 11) and the "offering of jealousy" (Num. V. 15), to which neither oil nor frank-incense was to be added (p. 283). The reason why the bloodless oblations dressed in an oven, pan, or pot, belonged to the officiating priest exclusively, was no doubt, because the latter assisted in, or at least directed, their preparation, and had, therefore, greater labour to bestow upon them; evidently not, because they were to be consumed more rapidly, which end would have been better secured by their distribution among all priests; or because they were but rarely and sparingly offered, whereas the simpler oblations were presented in such abundance that the officiating priest could not possibly consume them (Keil).— an unsupported conjecture, weakened by the circumstance that each oblation might have been presented by a different priest. — It is a matter of course, though here not mentioned, as it is omitted elsewhere (ver. 14), that of all the bloodless offerings "a memorial" (אַזְכָּרָה) was to be burnt to God (II. 2, 9, 16); for it is of the very nature of sacrifice that at least a part of it is to be devoted to the deity.

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — The force of the injunction by which the hide of holocausts was to be secured to the officiating priest (ver. 8), is reflected in the peculiarly emphatic wording, which almost proves that the ordinance was new or unfamiliar: it is to the priest, and to none else, that the skin should belong; and therefore הַכֹּהֵן begins the sentence, the construction is then inverted — לַכֹּהֵן, to which the personal pronoun or suffix, לוֹ, is again added to enhance the weight of the sentence (comp. Gram. § 75. 4). — "The command to leave the hides to the priests, assumes a greater significance by a reference to the first garments of men made of the skins of animals by the mercy of God (Gen. III. 21)" — observes Baumgarten with gravity. — The Vulgate renders אִישׁ כְּאָחִיו (ver. 10) correctly, cunctis filiis Aaron mensura aequa per singulos dividetur.

## 7. REGULATIONS REGARDING THANK-OFFERINGS, VII. 11—21.

11—21. The thank-offerings have, in the preceding part of this document, but incidentally and rather incongruously been alluded to in what is probably a later insertion (VI. 5). They are now treated of with considerable minuteness, yet more in reference to their ritual and their nature than with regard to the shares to be claimed by the priests. They were divided into

of praise unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil, and fine flour soaked *in oil and made into* cakes mingled with oil. 13. Besides *unleavened* cakes, he shall offer *for* his offering leavened bread with the sacrifice of praise of his thank-offering. 14. And he shall offer of it one out of each oblation *as* a gift to the Lord; to the priest who sprinkles the blood of the thank-offering shall it belong. 15. And the flesh of the sacrifice of his thank-offering for praise shall be eaten on the day of its sacrifice; he shall not leave *any* of it until the morning. 16. But if the sacrifice of his offering *be* a vow or a voluntary offering, it shall be eaten on the day that he offers his sacrifice; and on the morrow the remainder of it shall be eaten. 17. And the remainder of the flesh of the sacrifice shall be burnt with fire on the third day. 18. And if *any* of the flesh of the sacri-

two chief classes, those presented in grateful acknowledgment of some Divine favour, or "for praise" (עַל־תּוֹדָה, ver. 12), and those offered in consequence of a vow or as a free-will gift (נֶדֶר או נְדָבָה, ver. 16). The former was the more sacred kind, evidently because it was the spontaneous expression of pious devotion, whereas the vow rendered the sacrifice dependent on some future boon and was then compulsory, and even the free-will gift was probably regarded as a covert or indirect mode of supplication, and thus bore a less unselfish character. The animal praise-offering, connected as it was with a social repast, was accompanied by a very copious bloodless oblation which consisted not only of three kinds of unleavened cakes, but, besides, of leavened loaves, because the thank-offering had indeed a religious aspect, like every sacrifice, but as it generally referred to temporal prosperity, to rescue and safety, it was appropriately coupled with the ordinary staple of subsistence, or the daily bread. But though the latter was offered up together with the unleavened cakes, no portion of it was burnt on the altar as a part of the memorial (אַזְכָּרָה), because the prohibition that nothing leavened should rise in the sacred flames "as an offering made by fire to the Lord", or "for a sweet odour" to Him, was universal and admitted of no exception (II. 11, 12). Now the priest who performed the sacrifice or "who sprinkled the blood of the thank-offering", received one cake or loaf of each of the four kinds presented, while the rest belonged to the worshipper, to be consumed by him and his guests together with his share of the victim's meat. But the meals were to be held within a certain specified time so limited that their connection with the sacrifice remained vividly impressed upon the offerer and his associates, and that, though joyful and convivial, they were to be felt as *sacrificial* repasts and as endowed with a character of holiness. How the law arose that the praise-offering (זֶבַח תּוֹדָה) was to be consumed on the day of sacrifice itself, while the vow- and voluntary offerings were permitted on the following day also; why the contravention of this

fice of his thank-offering be yet eaten on the third day, he that offers it shall not be accepted, it shall not be imputed to him; it shall be an abomination, and the person that eats of it shall bear his iniquity. 19. And the flesh that touches any unclean *thing* shall not be eaten; it shall be burnt with fire; and as for the flesh, everyone *that is* clean may eat *of the* flesh. 20. But the

injunction was threatened with the awful penalty of excision (כָּרֵת); how the extreme sacredness of the flesh was guarded (vers. 19—21); how we may discover traces of an earlier character of the שְׁלָמִים as offerings for the confirmation of treaties, oaths, and vows, and as offerings of supplication; these questions and others connected with thank-offerings have been discussed in another place (pp. 36, 37, 211, 248).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — The Septuagint (except the Ed. Complut.) commences the seventh chapter with the eleventh verse, which is not inappropriate, as at least the law of the אשם (vers. 1—7) ought to be connected with that of the חטאת (VI. 17—23).— The thank-offering אשר יקריב ליהוה, "which *one* offers to the Lord", that is, המקריב *the offerer*, or *he who offers it*, an ellipsis not unusual in Hebrew; comp. בזאת יתהלל המתהלל (Jer. IX. 23) *in this let him glory who glories*, that is, let men glory in this (see Gramm. § LXXVI). — It is well known that עַל has the meaning of *besides, in addition to*, or *together with* (ver. 30; Gen. XXVIII. 9; Ex. XII. 8. 9; Lev. XXIII. 18; comp. Gramm. § 105. 5), and in this sense it is repeatedly used in our passage: he shall offer *with the praise-offering* (על־זבח התודה) unleavened cakes etc. (ver. 12); and *besides* these unleavened cakes (על־חלות, ver. 13), he shall offer leavened bread for his offering (יקריב קרבנו), *together with* the animal killed for the praise-offering (על־זבח תודת שלמיו). This is the meaning of the injunctions; the words על־חלות וכ׳ do not, therefore, prove the prevalence of the custom "of placing unleavened cakes prepared with oil upon a leavened cake as upon a plate or saucer" (*Winer*, Real-W. II. 494; Michael., a. o.); nor was the leavened bread an unessential part of the oblation "which the offerer brought with him as a matter of course to eat with the meat" (Knobel, Keil), as we have above alluded to its peculiar significance in connection with thank-offerings; in fact, the לחם חמץ is distinctly designated קרבנו (ver. 13), which word, according to the context as just explained, does not refer to the unleavened, but to the leavened bread. Indeed חַלֹּת and לֶחֶם חָמֵץ are contrasted with each other as the two necessary, if not equally important, ingredients of the cereal oblation; and for this reason חַלֹּת, though referring to the unleavened cakes described immediately before, has not the article— "besides unleavened cakes he shall bring leavened bread for his offering." The third sort of unleavened cakes, though rather incoherently described (סֹלֶת מֻרְבֶּכֶת חַלֹּת בְּלוּלֹת בַּשָּׁמֶן ver. 12, literally, fine flour soaked, cakes, mingled with oil), may be ascertained with safety, as in some passages it is more simply termed חַלַּת לֶחֶם שֶׁמֶן (VIII. 26; Ezek. XXIX. 23): fine flour soaked with oil was baked into cakes, which were again softened and mingled with oil. The Sept. renders inaccurately *καὶ σεμίδαλιν πεφυραμένην ἐν ἐλαίῳ*, omitting two words (חלות בלולות); Vulg. coctamque similam et collyridas

person that eats *of the* flesh of the sacrifice of thank-offering, that *belong* to the Lord, having his uncleanness upon him, that person shall be cut off from his

olei admistione conspersas, incorrectly translating מרבכת *coctam* (see p. 105), and adding *et* before חַלֹּת; Onkel. quite literally, וְסוֹלְתָּא רְבִיכָא גְּרִיצָן דְּפִילָן בִּמְשַׁח.—The officiating priest received אֶחָד מִכָּל־קָרְבָּן "one of *each* oblation", i. e. one cake of each of the four kinds of cereal offerings (comp. VIII. 26; Exod. XXIX. 23: חלת מצה אחת וחלת לחם שמן אחת ורקיק אחד), not "one of the *whole* oblation", which would require מִכָּל־הַקָּרְבָּן (comp. Gramm. § 83. 13); nor is it probable that the law would have left it uncertain from which of the four kinds the priest was to take the "gift" (תְּרוּמָה; for "gift", not "heave-offering" is here, as in almost all passages, the meaning of תְּרוּמָה, see p. 203, note 10); the singular יִהְיֶה refers to אֶחָד which has distributive meaning (Gramm. § 75. 7. c, d). According to the Talmud, 40 cakes were to be offered, so that the priest, receiving one of each sort, had the tenth part. — The meat of the thank-offering presented as a vow or a free-will gift was to be eaten on the day of the sacrifice וּמִמָּחֳרָת וְהַנּוֹתָר מִמֶּנּוּ יֵאָכֵל "and on the following day the remainder of it shall be eaten" (ver. 16), for after expressions of time capable of being resolved into a first clause, the other part of the sentence may be introduced by וְ as a second clause, "and when the following day comes, then the remainder of it shall be eaten" (comp. אַחַר וּבָנִיתָ בֵיתֶךָ Prov. XXIV. 27, "afterwards thou shalt build thy house;" Num. XVI. 5; Gram. § 96. 8). The וְ is, therefore, not exactly superfluous (Rashi, who inaptly compares וְאַיָּה וַעֲנָה in Gen. XXXVI. 24, where וְ...וְ is *both ... and*); nor does it mean *also* (Rosenm. *reliquum quoque*, which, in connections like ours, is against the Hebrew usage); nor do we require distorted constructions, like that of Mendelssohn — "und Tages darauf (aber nur was übrig bleibt) darf man essen", a mode of expression which cannot be supposed in a style of plain prose; nor does the Hebrew text warrant inaccuracy (as Vulg. sed et si quid in crastinum remanserit, vesci licitum est; Luth. so aber etwas überbleibt auf den andern Tag, soll man's doch essen), or indistinctness (Onkel. וביומא דבתרוהי ודאשתאר וכ׳), or incompleteness of translation (as Sept. merely *καὶ τῇ αὔριον*). — The words וְאִם הֵאָכֹל יֵאָכֵל וכ׳ mean simply "but if it be eaten on the third day", which is perfectly adapted to the context. Artificial is the explanation of the Mishnah (Zevach. II. 2—5, III. 6), the Talmud (Zevach. 29*a*), and Rabbinical writers (as Rashi, a. o.), adopted by Mendelssohn in his translation, and laboriously but speciously defended by Wessely in the *Biur*, "but if the meat of the thank-offering was, at the time of its being killed, intended by the offerer to be eaten on the third day" (Mendelss. Hätte aber von dem Fleisch der Freudenopfer auch am dritten Tage gegessen werden sollen); so that לא יחשב לו would be *this shall not be thought* or *intended by him* — a premeditated and wanton contravention not to be expected from one engaged in a pious sacrifice (Rashbam, always inclined to a literal interpretation, remarks disapprovingly חכמים עקרוהו מפשוטו). Even more objectionable is the definition of פגול that it means a "sacrifice at the presentation of which *the officiating priest* harboured any unlawful thought" (comp. *Hottinger*, Jus Hebr. pp. 196—198, lex CXLV), which would place the efficiency of a

**people. 21. And if a person touch any unclean *thing*, *whether* uncleanness of man, or *any* unclean beast, or any unclean abomination, and eat of the flesh of the sacrifice of thank-offerings, which *belong* to the Lord, that person shall be cut off from his people.**

sacrifice beyond the power of the worshipper, rendering it dependent not on his own piety but on extraneous circumstances. The words in question mean clearly, "it (the offering) *shall not be imputed* or *counted to him* (the offerer), who has to present another one instead; Onkel. correctly לא יתחשב ליה, and Jonath. more clearly לא יתחשב ליה לְזְכוּ, it shall not be imputed to him as righteousness or merit (comp. Gen. XV. 6; etc.). — The offerer to whom the meat belonged was responsible for its lawful disposal; therefore, if it was eaten by any one beyond the prescribed time, he had to bear the consequence of his negligence which annulled the effect of his sacrifice, while he who ate of the meat after the legal period "bore his guilt" (עונה חטאה). — On לא יֵרָצֶה comp. I. 3, 4, pp. 8, 475. — The flesh eaten on the third day after the sacrifice is described as פִּגּוּל (ver. 18; comp. XIX. 7), the meaning of which is certainly *abomination, abhorrence, nauseousness* (from פגל used in the Talmud in Piel *to render foetid*, and Hithp. *to be made foetid*, comp. Arab. بعل, فكل, and perhaps kindred to פגר, which word Targ. Jonath. renders in 1 Sam. XVII. 46 by פגול); it is used in parallelism with נְבֵלָה וּטְרֵפָה flesh of animals that died of themselves or were torn by wild beasts (see *infra* on vers. 22—27; comp. Ezek. XIV. 14, בְּשַׂר פִּגּוּל), and in connection with חֲזִיר *pig*, in reference to idolatrous sacrifices (Isai. LXV. 4, מְרַק פִּגֻּלִים broth of abominable things, coupled with בְּשַׂר הַחֲזִיר); and so Sept. *μίασμα*, or in Ezek. IV. 14 *κρέας βέβηλον* (al. lect. *ἕωλον*); Parch. מאוס; Luth., De Wette,

a. o. Gräuel; less strongly Onkel. מְרַחַק, Targ. Jerus. and Uzz. פְּסִיל, Talm. (Pesach. 82*b*) change of appearance (עיבור צורה), and so Kimchi הבשר שנשתנה ריחו ומראהו. — The sense and construction of the nineteenth verse are clear and appropriate, "the flesh that touches any unclean thing shall not be eaten, it shall be burnt with fire; and as for the flesh, every one that is clean may eat of it" (והבשר כל־טהור יאכל בשר), the principal notion, though the accusative, being put at the beginning (והבשר), but repeated in its due place (בשר, Gram. § 196. 6); the latter word has not the article, because it has indefinite meaning, *any part of the flesh*, or simply *of the flesh* (similarly Onk., Jon., Ven. Gr., Ar. Erp.). The received text is, therefore, quite satisfactory, and requires no emendations; some read בָּאֵשׁ יִשָּׂרֵף הַבָּשָׂר (Sam., Syr., Houbigant), so that the conclusion of the verse is כָּל־טָהוֹר יֹאכַל בָּשָׂר; while Michaelis proposes בָּאֵשׁ יִשָּׂרְפוּ הַבָּשָׂר כָּל־טָהוֹר יֹאכַל בְּשָׂרוֹ, adding to the last word בשר the ו of the first word of the following verse (והנפש), evidently on account of the wanting article in בָּשָׂר, the omission of which, however, may be explained in the manner indicated. — Nor is the alteration of שֶׁקֶץ (ver. 21) into שֶׁרֶץ called for (an alteration adopted by the Samar., Onkel., Syr., Saad., and found in 6 mss. of Kennicot and 2 of De Rossi; comp. V. 2), and certainly not on account of the adjective טָמֵא with which it is connected; for שֶׁקֶץ טָמֵא is no un-Hebrew tautology (Knobel compares תועבה רעה, Ezek. VI. 11; VIII. 9; Sept. *βδέλυγμα*, Vulg. omnis

22. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 23. Speak to the children of Israel, saying, You shall not eat any fat, of ox, or of sheep, or of goat. 24. And the fat of *the beast* that dies of itself, and the fat of that which is torn *by beasts*, may be employed for any *other* use: but

rei quae polluere potest; and so Pers., Ar. Erp., Gr. Ven., etc.), so that שֶׁקֶץ טמא is almost equivalent to כל דבר טמא, but includes especially the unclean fishes, birds, and the reptiles (comp. XI. 10—13, 20, 23), in contradistinction to the impurity of *man* and *animal* בטמאת אדם או בבהמה טמאה (comp. Ezek. VIII. 10; see the Treatise before the eleventh chapter).

## 8. Prohibition against eating the Fat and Blood of Animals, VII. 22—27.

22—27. The aversion rooted in the Hebrew mind against partaking of what was supposed to be the seat or the emblem of animal life, was too strong and too universal, not to be embodied in a series of laws relating to animal sacrifices. Therefore, just as the interdiction against eating the blood and fat was appended to the code which begins the Book (III. 17), so it was inserted in the second code, but with greater fulness of detail. As the unlawfulness of eating fat was probably of later date and less familiar to the people, it was treated of first, and with unmistakeable clearness: the fat of the sacrificial quadrupeds, the ox, the sheep, and the goat, was to be avoided, even if these animals were not killed as sacrifices, and of course if they died of themselves or were torn by beasts (נְבֵלָה וּטְרֵפָה), since then they were entirely unclean (XVII. 15; XXII. 8); in the latter case, however, the fat was permitted for other purposes, "it may be employed for any *other* use" (יֵעָשֶׂה לְכָל־מְלָאכָה); but in what manner that of clean sacrificial animals, whether slaughtered for the altar or not, was to be disposed of, is not specified in the Pentateuch. However, it must be observed that the laws with regard to fat seem to have arisen from the sacrificial system; therefore, the fat of other clean quadrupeds which were not offered, such as stags and roes, or of clean birds, was lawful; the fat on the bowels, the kidneys, and the flanks only (III. 4) was forbidden, not that imbedded in the flesh and remaining invisible unless the latter is cut; and the prohibition was probably at first limited to the places where offerings were presented, and but gradually extended universally (III. 17; see p. 131). More comprehensive still is the precept concerning blood; it relates to all quadrupeds, whether sacrificial animals or not, and to all birds, and it is applicable to all times and countries: but the blood of fishes, and according to the Talmud, of the clean locusts (XI. 22), is not interdicted, probably because they were never presented as offerings; and thus we see here the partial operation of the same rule which pervades the regulations on fat. Hence Jewish tradition, though acknowledging the unlawfulness of all blood (ver. 26), restricted the dread punishment of excision to "the blood of life" (דַּם הַנֶּפֶשׁ, XVII. 11), that is, to the blood the loss of which causes the cessation of life; while it attributed a more lenient penalty to eating the blood found in

**you shall certainly not eat it: 25. For whoever eats the fat of the beast, of which *men* present an offering made by fire to the Lord, the person that eats *it* shall be cut off from his people. 26. And you shall eat no blood in all your habitations, *whether it be* of fowl or**

the limbs, the liver, or the spleen (Yoreh Deah § 67); as indeed atonement also was wrought by "the blood of life" only, and not by any other (see p. 124). Why the prohibition of blood and fat is enforced with such vehement severity, and how it arose and took root, has been explained before (pp. 123—129).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — The injunction of the law against eating fat and blood both here and in III. 17, especially as that injunction occurs in either place in a modified form, must be regarded as one of the various proofs to show that the first seven chapters of Leviticus consist of at least two independent codes. The defence of their unity which has been attempted, is extremely vague and artificial; so observes Ranke, one of the calmest and clearest apologists (Untersuchungen, II. 79), that all classes of sacrifice are, in the seven chapters, discussed twice, first from their Divine, and then from their human side; thus in III. 17 the blood and fat are forbidden because they belong to God, in VII. 22—27 because they are unlawful food of men; for this reason, the prohibition occurs both times in connection with the thank-offerings, which were associated with public repasts; and the second passage is the natural and legal development of the first, so that both stand in their proper place. But all this is utterly untenable. 1. Not all classes of sacrifice are discussed twice; the laws concerning the oblation of the High-priest on the day of his consecration (VI. 12—16), has no corresponding enactment in the earlier chapters; moreover, more or less important deviations have been pointed out with regard to almost all the other passages. 2. In III. 17 also the prohibition is entirely restricted to the *eating* of fat and blood, "it shall be an eternal statute for your generations throughout your dwellings, You shall eat neither fat nor blood"; and in VII. 25, the interdiction of the fat is distinctly connected with the laws of sacrifice and the altar. 3. The section VII. 22—27 can hardly be considered to stand "in connection with the thank-offerings", as it has its own heading and is followed by a new introduction; it must, therefore, be regarded as a distinct precept in itself, and helps to prove the compound character of these chapters. 4. So far from being "the legal development" of III. 17, it is rather a restriction of that command (see *supra*). — נְבֵלָה, from נָבֵל, kindred to נָפַל *to fall*, *to fade* or *die away*, is properly a *corpse* or *carcass*, like מַפֶּלֶת (Judg. XIV. 8; comp. Jer. IX. 21; Sept. *σῶμα*, *νεκρός*, *θνησιμαῖον*), whether of men (Deut. XXI. 23; XXVIII. 26; 2 Ki. IX. 37; Isai. XXVI. 19; Ps. LXXIX. 2; etc.) or of unclean animals (Lev. V. 2; XI. 11, 24, 27, 28, etc.); and, therefore, the flesh of a beast that had fallen or died of itself (Kimchi explains הגויה המתה הנופלת, and adds נבלה היא מענין נפילה, and so Parchon); while טְרֵפָה, from טָרַף *to tear*, is the flesh of an animal torn by beasts of prey, and is frequently coupled with נְבֵלָה (XVII. 15; XXII. 8; Deut. XIV. 21; Ezek. IV. 14; XLIV. 31). — The preposition ל in לעוף ולבהמה (ver. 26) means *with regard to*, as in ver. 30; V. 3, 4 (Gram. § 105. 3). — Ebn Ezra (note on ver. 18) believes

of beast. 27. Any person that eats any blood, that person shall be cut off from his people.

28. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 29. Speak to the children of Israel, saying, He that offers the sacrifice of his thank-offering to the Lord shall bring his oblation to the Lord of the sacrifice of his thank-offerings. 30. His *own* hands shall bring the offerings of the Lord made by fire, the fat with the breast shall he bring, the breast to be waved *for* a wave-offering before the Lord. 31. And the priest shall burn the fat upon the altar; but the breast shall belong to Aaron and his sons. 32. And the right shoulder shall you give to the priest as a gift from the sacrifice of your

that the fat of *thank-offerings* only, not that of other animal sacrifices is here forbidden, an opinion utterly at variance both with the words and the spirit of these commands (vers. 23, 25); the place which they occupy in the midst of the ordinances of thank-offerings, affords no proof, since they form a separate law introduced by a separate heading (ver. 22). — The curious opinion of Michaelis who discovered in the interdiction of fat an indirect measure for encouraging the cultivation of the olive-tree, and who, strange to say, has found many adherents, and several other untenable views on the motive of our law, have been above alluded to (p. 132). — It has been contended that the words "in all your habitations" are meant to express that the Hebrews were indeed to abstain from blood *in their homes*, while they were permitted to eat the blood of *sacrifices (Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, p. 610), an opinion connected with a complete system of absurd and perverse, if not malignant, distortions of the Old Testament (pp. 403—416).

## 9. THE PORTIONS OF THANK-OFFERINGS TO BE LEFT TO THE PRIESTS, VII. 28—34.

**28—34.** As with regard to the holocausts and the bloodless offerings (vers. 8—10), so with regard to the thank-offerings, it appeared important to the reviser to add injunctions on the share which the priests were entitled to claim. The offerer was to bring the gift which belonged to God and to His servants, with his own hands, spontaneously and cheerfully (see p. 249). On the altar were burnt the fat and the fat parts; the officiating priest was rewarded with the right shoulder; and the common order of the priests received the breast (comp. *supra* on vers. 8—10). The shoulder was a portion (תְּרוּמָה) or a present (מָנָה) for the acting Aaronite, and was, therefore, "taken from" the whole victim (הֵרִים); but the breast was to be devoted to God by the peculiar rite of "waving" (תְּנוּפָה), which marked the offering as consecrated to the Lord of heaven and earth (see pp. 199—201). The *right* shoulder was intended as a peculiar distinction; for the right side was, among ancient nations, generally regarded as pre-eminently honourable

**thank-offerings. 33. He among the sons of Aaron, that offers the blood of the thank-offerings, and the fat, shall have the right shoulder for *his* portion. 34. For the wave-breast and the gift-shoulder have I taken of the children of Israel from the sacrifices of their thank-offerings, and have given them to Aaron the priest and**

or auspicious; right hand and happiness became identical terms — notions which were partially shared by the Hebrews from early times (see p. 176, note 2; and on the subject of this section in general see the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. III).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS.— The term קָרְבָּנוֹ (in ver. 29) means that part of the thank-offering which the worshipper devotes to God as his gift (see p. 72; Sept. τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ), not, as the Vulg. renders, the drink-offering which is to accompany the thank-offering (offerat simul et sacrificium, id est libamenta ejus). — As not the offerer but the priest had to perform the rite of waving (תְּנוּפָה, see p. 199), the infin. Hiphil לְהָנִיף (ver. 30) must be rendered in the passive, "he shall bring the breast to be waved before the Lord", and the expression is, therefore, properly impersonal, "that one might wave it"; and so הִקְרִיב in ver. 35, "on the day when they were presented"; comp. Gramm. § 101. 2.— חָזֶה (from חזה, kindred to חצה, *to separate* or *distinguish*, comp. *Meier*, Wurzelwörterb. p. 125; according to others from חזה in the sense of *adspectui patere*, or the part *moved* and agitated by the pulsation of the heart) is properly the middle part, that is, the breast, which was particularly prized as a dainty (comp. *Athen.* II. 70; IX. 10, *πνίγειν τε πηχίων ἀρνίων στηθύνια*); thus the Sept. *στηθύνιον* (i. e. according to Pollux, Lib. II. col. 123 ed. Basil. 1536, *τῶν στηθῶν τὸ μέσον*), Josephus (Ant. III. ix. 2), and Venet. Gr. *στῆθος*, Vulg. pectusculum, Onkel. and Jonath. חַדְיָא, Arab. قص. — שׁוֹק is the *shoulder*, that is, the upper part of the fore-legs (Sept. *βραχίων*, Vulg. armus), which most valuable part of the animal was generally apportioned to honoured guests (comp. 1 Sam. IX. 24; etc.), and for this reason delivered to the priests. It is impossible to take שׁוֹק as "the part of the body from the knee to the foot" (Gesen.), or as the shinbone or tibia (*κνήμη*, *Joseph.* l. c. or *σκέλος* Venet. Gr.), which is of very little value; שׁוֹק is indeed occasionally used for *foot*, that is, the medium of *running* (comp. the verbs שׁוק and שׁקק), but it is so employed in poetical passages only (Isai. XLVII. 2; Cant. V. 15; comp. Ps. CXLVII. 10), where one part of the leg is, by way of metonomy, taken for another, or a part for the whole (Prov. XXVI. 7); even the proverbial phrase הִכָּה שׁוֹק עַל־יָרֵךְ (Judg. XV. 8) seems to imply that שׁוֹק is adjoining the thigh (יָרֵךְ), that is, the upper and not the lower part of the leg; nor is it *Keule* (that is, the ham, or hough, or the quadruped's *hind leg*, Knobel, Fürst, Bunsen, and others), which meaning has been shown to belong to כרעים (p. 478). — For the sake of completeness and easy survey we add here at once the explanation of the term זְרֹעַ, although it occurs only in later sections of the Law (Num. VI. 19; Deut. XVIII. 3). It obviously denotes a part of the animal connected with the fore-legs, since it corresponds to the arms of human beings (Isai. XVII. 5; XL. 11), or more particularly the fore-arm (brachium, as distinguished from lacertus קָנֶה; comp. Job XXXI.

to his sons, for an eternal statute, from the children of Israel.

35. This *is* the portion of Aaron, and the portion of his sons, from the offerings of the Lord made by fire, in the day *when* they were presented to minister as priests to the Lord; 36. Which the Lord commanded to be given them of the children of Israel, in the day that He anointed them, *for* an eternal statute throughout their generations. 37. This *is* the law of the burnt-

22, אֶזְרֹעַ מֵקְנָה חֲשָׁבָר; Exod. VI. 6; Deut. IV. 34; etc.). Again, it is certain that זרוע is different from שוק, as both are mentioned together as distinct parts of the victim (Num. VI. 19, 20). It is, therefore, undoubted that זרוע in animals signifies the joint, by which the shoulder is connected with the neck (comp. ἀρμός from ἄρω to join together, Lat. armus, and corresponding to humerus in man; see *Plin.* Hist. N. XI. 43 or 98; *Ovid*, Met. X. 700, ex humeris armi fiunt), that is, the shoulder where it is fitted to the shoulder-blade or scapula, or the fore-shoulder (in contradistinction to suffrago in the hind-legs; *Plin.* Hist. Nat. VIII. 45 or 70; XI. 45 or 102). — The term תְּרוּמָה (vers. 32, 34) signifies here, as in ver. 13, simply the *gift* that is *taken* (הורם) from the sacrificial animal, not an offering presented by the rite of "heaving", nor this rite itself, as is proved by the context (see p. 203).

## 10. CONCLUSION OF THIS CODE, VII. 35—38.

**35—38.** Now the reviser considered that he had fully accomplished his object; he had supplemented the document, which he found treating of the ritual of the chief classes of sacrifice, by the insertion or addition of regulations regarding the share which the priests could demand in each case; and therefore, desirous that this sacrificial code so enlarged and qualified, should be looked upon as complete in itself, he appended a double formula of conclusion, one comprising the portions assigned to the priests (vers. 35, 36) which he is careful to describe as granted "by an eternal statute for all generations", and one reviewing all the various kinds of offering referred to in the code — the holocaust (VI. 1—6; VII. 8), the bloodless offerings (VI. 7—11; VII. 9, 10), the sin-offering (VI. 17—23), the trespass-offering (VII. 1—7), the offering of consecration (מִלּוּאִים, VI. 12—16), and the thank-offering (VII. 11—21, 28—34), besides the prohibition of blood and fat applying to all classes alike (VII. 22—27); and he described all these ordinances as having been communicated to Moses "on Mount Sinai" (בְּהַר סִינָי), whereas the compiler of the later code, who had formed a more complete theory of the progress of revelation, declared them to have been proclaimed "from the Tent of Meeting" (מֵאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, p. 472). This document, the first outlines and beginnings of which were an early effort of composing a sacrificial system, though its interpolations are of much later date, found its place *after* a subsequent and more developed code for reasons which have been indicated above (p. 534).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — It is impossible to restrict the words "this is

**offering, of the bloodless offering, and of the sin-offering, and of the trespass-offering, and of the offering of consecration, and of the sacrifice of the thank-offering; 38. Which the Lord commanded Moses in mount**

the portion of Aaron and the portion of his sons from the offerings of the Lord made by fire" (מֵאִשֵּׁי יְהוָֹה, ver. 35) to the thank-offerings only (Keil a. o.); they manifestly include the share of the priests in all the offerings treated of, and form, therefore, a part of the general conclusion. — It seems unquestionable that these final sentences were originally written for the code only after which they follow (ch. VI and VII); for the thank-offerings (שְׁלָמִים) are named last, as they indeed are explained last; whereas in the preceding code (ch. I—V) they stand before the expiatory offerings; and the revelation "from mount Sinai" marks this collection of laws as distinct from the preceding one which purports to have been conveyed to Moses "from the Tent of Meeting"; yet when the two codes were arranged in the order which they occupy in the Book, that formula was understood, and meant to be understood, to include all the laws from the beginning of Leviticus (I—VII). — בְּהַר סִינָי (ver. 38) signifies plainly *on mount Sinai* (comp. Ex. XXXI. 18; XXXIV. 32; Gen. XXII. 14, etc.), not "*in the vicinity of* or *in the mountainous region of Sinai* (comp. Gen. XXXI. 23, 25; Exod. IV. 27; etc.); though it must in this latter sense be understood by those who attribute ch. I—VII to one author, or who, like the revisers of Leviticus, desire them to be so regarded (comp. Num. XXVIII. 6; see *supra*). — מִשְׁחָה (ver. 35) or מָשְׁחָה (Num. XVIII. 8), from מָשַׁח in the sense of *measuring*, as it occurs in Chald., Syr., and Arab., means the *measured* or *fixed portion*, the *appointed share* (Saad. حصة *portion*). Whether this word is designedly used because it recalls to the mind the anointment of the Aaronites (VIII. 12), and therefore the elevation (Onk. רְבוּת) of the priests who receive their revenues from the people as the king does as the *anointed* of God (Knobel), this we leave undecided, though either explanation appears rather artificial; but the translation *anointment* (Sept. χρῖσις, Vulg. unctio, Luther Salbung, etc.) is unmeaning in our context, and requires forced interpretations and expansions to render it at all suitable, as the "rewards" and "privileges" of anointment, which fell to the lot of the priests on account of their being anointed (Sept. in Num. XVIII. 8 γέρας, Ebn Ezra, Rashb. שְׂכַר מִשְׁחָה, Mendels. Salbungsrecht, Engl. Vers. the portion of the anointing; Vulg. pro officio sacerdotali, and so Luther in Num.).— בְּיוֹם הִקְרִיב or מָשְׁחוֹ אֹתָם *on the day or at the time when he presented or anointed them* (comp. Gen. II. 4; etc.; see Comm. on Gen. p. 44), not "on the eighth day after the anointment" (Wessely), on which the priests first received the sacrificial portions (VIII. 31), nor even precisely on the first day of their anointment, when they acquired the right of demanding their revenues, and certainly not "from the day" (בְּיוֹם, see on VI. 13). — The translation of ביום הקריב אתם וכ׳ by "as often as they offer sacrifices and perform their priestly office, that is, every day" (Vater), is grammatically impossible.— מִלֻּאִים is derived from מִלֵּא sc. אֶת־יַד פ׳ to fill the hand, or to place into it the emblems of authority (see Comm. on Exod. p. 553), to strengthen it, to give it power, and therefore, *to install*

**Sinai, in the day that He commanded the children of Israel to offer their oblations to the Lord in the wilderness of Sinai.**

*into an office*, and more specially the sacerdotal office (Exod. XXVIII. 41; XXIX. 9, 29, 33, 35; Lev. VIII. 33; XVI. 32; XXI. 10; Num. III. 3; Judg. XVII. 5, 12), different from מִלֵּא אֶת־יָד לְ, literally, to fill one's own hand for somebody, to provide one-self with something for another, that is, *to offer a present* or *to dedicate* (1 Chr. XXIX. 5; 2 Chr. XXIX. 31; XIII. 9; Exod. XXXII. 29; see on VIII. 33—36); מִלֻּאִים is, therefore, *the act of installation* (Exod. XXIX. 22, 26; Lev. VIII. 22, 29, 33) or *the offering that attended the installation* (Ex. XXIX. 34; Lev. VIII. 28, 31), and it refers here (ver. 37) undoubtedly to the bloodless offering presented by the High-priest on the day of his consecration, and described in the earlier part of this code (VI. 12—16). Its mention in this place does not therefore deserve the censure of Clericus, "perpetua haec est Hebraeorum veterum ἀμεθόδεια". To assert that it points back to Exod. XXIX. 29—31, or forward to ch. VIII. IX, as a means of connection or transition, is to betray a complete want of insight into the composition of Leviticus. It cannot be introduced here merely because it probably was "little different from the other, especially the expiatory sacrifices" (*Ewald*, Alterth. p. 73), which would impute to the author a blamable looseness of style. — Michaelis (Typisch. Gottesgel. p. 60) strangely connects with the term מִלֵּא אֶת־יָד the idea of punishment for sin, ("der Gedanke gab zu figürlichen Ausdrücken Anlass"); and Vatke (Theol. des A. T. I. 273) supposes that it originally referred to a bounty or present which the priest received, but that later the meaning was lost, and the act replaced by a symbol; however, there is no proof to support this conjecture.

# B. THE CONSECRATION OF THE SANCTUARY AND ITS UTENSILS, AND OF AARON AND HIS SONS AS PRIESTS.

CHAPTERS VIII TO X.

## PRELIMINARY ESSAY.

### ON THE HEBREW PRIESTHOOD.

### I. SURVEY OF THE ORDINANCES OF THE PENTATEUCH WITH RESPECT TO THE PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

In order to arrive at a distinct view of the origin and progress, the nature and value of the order and system of priesthood among the Hebrews, it appears expedient to commence with a plain and accurate sketch of the ordinances of the Pentateuch regarding the priests and Levites; then to attempt an impartial estimate of these laws and arrangements; next to prove how they varied and fluctuated within the compass of the Pentateuch itself; and then to proceed to the testimonies of history tending either to support or to disprove their existence; after which we shall be enabled to draw, at least in general outlines, a picture of the gradual growth of priestly and Levitical institutions among the Israelites.

1. It is not difficult to deduce the nature and character of the Hebrew priesthood from the statements of the Pentateuch. The definitions are so distinct and the allusions so unmistakeable, that they scarcely leave room for conjecture or hazardous combination. It is true that the etymology of the Hebrew term of priest (כֹּהֵן) is doubtful;[1] but at the time of

[1] The most plausible derivation seems yet to be from the Arabic root which signifies *to predict the hidden future*, so that the noun (كاهن) means a *soothsayer* (Koran LII. 28; LXIX. 42), since the offices of priest and prophet were usually combined in early ages, and sacrifices were means of augury (p. 313); or it may be traceable to the same root in the sense of *acting in the interest of others* and *promoting their objects*, so that the substantive would signify *interpreter*, *representative*, since priests were regarded as the mouth-pieces of the deity. The meaning of *ministering* or *serving*, which has been attributed to the verb in Arabic (*Giggejus*, Lex. III. 1691), so that כֹּהֵן would be *διάκονος*, *administrator*, *official*, *servant* (*Buttmann*, Lexil. p. 219; *Movers*, Chron. p. 301; *Saalschütz*, Mosaisch. Recht, I. 107, 108; comp. *Talm.* Bab. Bathr. 110*a*), or even *prince* or *noble*,

even the oldest part of the Pentateuch, the etymological meaning, even if it were still preserved in the consciousness of the nation, was less considered than the notion with which the word had gradually been invested. Now when the priests were consecrated to their office, they are said to have been *brought near* (הקריב) *God.*[1] It was their function *to come near God* (קרב),[2] or *to approach Him* (נגש).[3] They are, therefore, those that are *near God* (קרֹבים ליהוה[4] or קְרֵבים).[5] They live and work in His presence, ready both to bring before Him the pious or penitent devotions of Israel, and to convey to the latter from Him peace and atonement. They preserve the purity of the Divine abode which is constantly defiled by the transgressions of the community.[6] They receive, in particular, the flesh of the sin-offerings, in order "to remove the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord."[7] They are appointed to fill up the vast chasm that separates the holiness of God from the sinfulness of His people. They "belong"

---

because the כֹּהֵן had the right of ministering to the king, this meaning is more than questionable (*Kamus*, p. 1799); the word has in all passages often quoted in support of the latter meaning (2 Sam. VIII. 17, 18; XX. 25, 26; 1 Ki. II. 35; IV. 2—6; 2 Ki. X. 11), the sense of *priest*, though the occurrence of the word in several of these texts has given serious offence from the earliest time (see *infra* Sect. IV. 10). With still less probability, some refer the word to the verb كهن *to be near* (*Coccej.* Lex. sub verb.; *Schultens*, Origg. Hebr. p. 228; Clavis p. 250; *Vitringa*, Comm. in Jes. II. p. 974; *Venema* ad Ps. XCIX. 6; *Bähr*, Symb. II. 15; *Plumptre* in Smith's Dict. of the Bible, II. 914), so that כהנים would be "those that are near God", as they are indeed described in the Old Testament (קרֹבים or קְרֵבים); for this is not the primitive, but a much later meaning which was connected with the term at the time when the priesthood was fully developed (see *infra*). The derivations from כהן in the sense of כון *to stand by* or *to assist* (*Hitzig* on Isai. LXI. 10), or *to perform* (הֵכִין), viz the sacrifices, like ῥέζω (*Ewald*, Alterthümer, p. 272; comp. Isai. LXI. 10; *Öhler* in Herzog's Real-Enc. XII. p. 174), or of גהן or גחן *to bend, to incline oneself*, a rite frequently performed in divine worship (Maurer), appear quite unacceptable, although Gesenius (Thes. p. 662) is disposed to adopt them; and *Hupfeld* (Psalmen, IV. 179) tries to support at least the former one by various modifications, interpreting both actively *stator* or *apparitor*, and passively *constitutus* and *institutus*, which double explanation proves sufficiently the questionable nature of either. On the later use of the word *presbyter* or *priest*, see *Stanley*, Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, II. 405.

[1] Lev. VII. 35; Num. XVI. 5; comp. Exod. XXVIII. 1.

[2] Lev. XXI. 17; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 15, 16.

[3] Exod. XIX. 22, הכהנים הנגשים אל־יהוה; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 13 (יגשו אלי לכהן לי).

[4] Lev. X. 3; Ezek. XLII. 13; XLIII. 19.

[5] Ezek. XL. 46; XLV. 4; comp. Jerem. XXX. 21.

[6] Lev. XVI. 16; Num. XIX. 13, 20.

[7] Lev. X. 17; comp. Exod. XXVIII. 38; Num. VIII. 19; XVIII. 1.

to God,[8] and to Him alone, for whose sake they must desert father and mother, and fight and suffer.[9] They are His "servants" or ministers.[10] They have been "chosen" by Him,[11] not on account of their merit, but by a free act of His mercy.[12] Therefore, whoever opposes them, is guilty of revolt against the majesty of God.[13] No other or "stranger" (זָר) is permitted, under penalty of death, to perform the priests' functions.[14] Hence their chief characteristic must be *holiness*, since they were elected to be perpetually near the Holy One and to serve Him;[15] they were singled out from the rest of their brethren "to be sanctified as most holy".[16] To hallow and to install as priests are used as correlative terms.[17] By neglecting what contributes to their sanctity they profane the holiness of God;[18] and the High-priest is himself "the holy one of the Lord".[19] Thus "to bring near God" means, in its deeper and more internal sense, to approach to His sanctity, and to remove, by securing pardon for the sins of the people, the distance by which they are separated from God, and to hallow them by expiation.—It is obvious that all these attributes of the priests coincide, in nearly every particular, with the characteristics by which the Pentateuch distinguishes the people of Israel. God bore the Hebrews on eagles' wings, and brought them to Himself.[20] He has designed them as an instrument of blessing for all nations.[21] He has chosen them to be His peculiar people,[22] not on account of their power and greatness, but from the love He feels towards them,[23] since He has declared Israel to be His firstborn son.[24]

---

[8] Num. XVI. 5, ויודע יהוה את־אשר־לו. [9] Exod. XXXII. 27—29; Deut. XXXIII. 9. [10] Deut. XXI. 5; Ezek. XL. 46; XLIII. 19; 1 Chr. XXIII. 13.

[11] Num. XVI. 5, 7, את אשר יבחר בו יקריב אליו; XVII. 5, 20; comp. Ps. LXV. 5; Exod. XXVIII. 1; Deut. XXI. 5; 1 Sam. II. 28; Hebr. V. 4.

[12] Num. XVIII. 7, "I have given your priest's office to you as a service of gift", עבדת מתנה אתן את־כהנתכם; comp. Hebr. V. 4; see also *Joseph.* Contr. Ap. II. 22.

[13] Num. XVI. 1*sqq*; XVII. 5, 28; comp. Bammidbar Rabb. 18, pp. 148, 149, ed. Stettin 1863; *Schöttgen,* Hor. Hebr. p. 948; *Grotius*, Opp. III. 209.

[14] הזר הקרב יומת, Num. III. 10, 38; IV. 15, 19; XVIII. 7. Some doctors of the Mishnah understand death "by the hand of heaven" (בידי שמים, *Mishn.* Sanhedr. IX. 6), that is, death through the direct intervention of God, as in the case of Korah, or Nadab and Abihu; but this view, which is upheld by recent writers also (as *Saalschütz,* Mos. Recht, I. 317), is against the spirit of the Biblical statements.

[15] Num. XVI. 5, ויודע יהוה את־אשר־לו ואת־הקדוש.

[16] 1 Chr. XXIII. 13, ויבדל אהרן להקדישו קדש קדשים.

[17] Exod. XXIX. 33, למלא את־ידם לקדש אתם; comp. vers. 1, 44; XXVIII. 41; XL. 13. [18] Lev. XXI. 6—8.

[19] קדוש יהוה, Ps. CVI. 16.

[20] Exod. XIX. 4. [21] Gen. XII. 3; XXVIII. 14; Comm. on Gen. p. 330.

[22] Exod. XIX. 5; Deut. VII. 6; XIV. 2; XXVI. 18; Ps. XXVIII. 9; CXXXV. 4.

[23] Deut. VII. 7, 8; comp. VIII. 17, 18.

[24] בני בכורי ישראל, Exod. IV. 22.

Holiness is to be their aim and constant yearning;[1] they shall be holy, because God is holy.[2] They were, in fact, intended to be a "kingdom of priests."[3] Every Israelite was, therefore, meant to be able to "come near God", or to act as priest for himself. Yet this great scheme of converting into a holy nation a people just redeemed from degrading bondage, was, according to the Pentateuch, too arduous to be at once accomplished. The Hebrews themselves felt their own unfitness for the mission. When they heard the Ten Commandments proclaimed from Sinai with thunder and lightning, they fled in consternation from the mountain, and implored Moses, "Speak thou with us, and we will readily hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die;" and then "they stood afar off,"[4] while Moses "drew near to God."[5] They renounced, not only spontaneously but eagerly, the full exercise of their sacerdotal rights, and God approved of their diffidence.[6] Hence arose the necessity of electing and appointing certain persons authorised and endowed to approach God as the mediators between Him and His people; but though the latter were still far removed from holiness, they were irrevocably chosen and unchangeably loved by God.[7]

Now, from this character assigned to the priests by the Pentateuch, all the arrangements and laws prescribed with regard to them in that Book, may be easily deduced.

**2.** The idea of *election* is, in the simplest manner embodied and conveyed by establishing an *hereditary* right, which, irrespective of personal merit, secures the succession to the son simply on account of his birth. Therefore, Aaron and his descendants were appointed priests for all future time. Though belonging to a tribe which, on several occasions, had proved devoted zeal in the cause of God's worship,[8] Aaron himself had been guilty of culpable weakness in abetting the folly of the people anxious to make the golden calf;[9] and his two eldest sons, Nadab and Abihu, deserved sudden death by their wanton disregard

---

1 Num. XVI. 3; Deut. VII. 6; XIV. 2; XXVI. 19; Exod. XIX. 6.

2 Lev. XIX. 2, קדשים תהיו כי קדוש אני יהוה אלהיכם; XX. 26; comp. XI. 45; Exod. XXII. 30; Deut. XIV. 21; 1 Peter I. 15, 16.

3 ממלכת כהנים, Exod. XIX. 6; comp. Num. XVI. 3; see also *Joseph.* Contr. Ap. II. 22, *παντὸς μὲν τοῦ πλήθους κατεσκευασμένου πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν... ὥσπερ δὲ τελετῆς τινος τῆς ὅλης πολιτείας οἰκονομουμένης*.

4 ויעמד העם מרחוק.

5 ומשה נגש אל־הערפל אשר שם האלהים, Ex. XX. 16, 18 (19, 21); comp. XIX. 21—24; Deut. V. 21—24 (קרב אתה וכ׳).

6 Deut. V. 25, היטיבו כל־אשר דברו; comp., however, 1 Petr. II. 5, 9.

7 See, however, *infra* Sect. II. 2.

8 Comp. Exod. XXXII. 26—29; Deut. XXXIII. 9; see Comm. on Gen. p. 742.

9 Exod. XXXII. 2—4, 21—25, and Comm. in loc.

of the laws of the Sanctuary.[10] He owed, therefore, his installation evidently to an election by the mercy of God. The priesthood was to remain strictly and exclusively not only in his family, but in his own branch of it; thus not only all the posterity of Gershon and Merari were excluded, not only all Kohathites who were not born from the line of Amram (as the offspring of Izhar and Uzziel), but also those members of the latter who were not Aaron's lineal issue; so that Moses and his family were rigidly banished from the priesthood, in reference to which they were classed among those "strangers" (זָרִים) certain to forfeit their lives by arrogating to themselves priestly functions.[11] In fact, the priests are simply designated "the sons of Aaron."[12]

The matrimonial alliances were, therefore, too important a point to be left without legal directions. It was ordained that a priest must marry a Hebrew virgin or a widow of unblemished character; but no unchaste or defamed, nor a divorced woman, "for he is holy to his God;" while in one case (that of the High-priest), the choice was restricted to virgins, for "he must not profane his seed among his people."[13] If the daughter of a priest married an Israelite, she lost the privileges of her birth, but regained them when she returned into her father's house as a childless widow or divorced wife.[14] Hence the pedigree of Aaron's family was most carefully guarded and searched.[15] The purity of sacerdotal families was so scrupulously watched that a priest's daughter guilty of immoral conduct while still in her father's house was to be burnt to death.[16] Though a priest might marry from any tribe of Israel, yet, in later times, alliances with daughters of priests seem to have been preferred.[17] — The question why Aaron and not Moses was hon-

---

10 Lev. X. 1, 2; Num. III. 1—4; see notes on X. 1—7.

11 See *supra* p. 561; comp. Exod. VI. 16—25; Num. III. 15—20; XXVI. 57—61; 1 Chron. XXIII. 6—23.

12 בני אהרן הכהנים or הכהן, Lev. I. 5, 6, 8, 11; II. 2; III. 5, 8, 13, etc.

13 Lev. XXI. 7, 8, 13—15; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 22 (who limits the choice of all priests to Hebrew virgins, though permitting widows of priests); *Philo*, De Monarch. II. 10; *Mishn.* Sot. VIII. 3; see also Ezra X. 18, 19; Neh. XIII. 28—30.

14 Lev. XXII. 12, 13; comp. *Mishn.* Temur. VII. 2; Sot. III. 7.

15 Ezra II. 62; Neh. VII. 64; comp. X. 39; XII. 47; *Mishn.* Midd. V. 4. In later times, the lists, duly authenticated, had to be sent to Jerusalem from all the countries where Jews lived in dispersion; *Joseph.* Ap. I. 7; comp. Vit. 1 (*τὴν τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν διαδοχήν, ὡς ἐν ταῖς δημοσίαις δέλτοις ἀναγεγραμμένην εὗρον κτλ*).

16 Lev. XXI. 9.

17 Luke I. 5; *Joseph.* Ap. I. 7 (*ὅπως τὸ γένος τῶν ἱερέων ἄμικτον καὶ καθαρὸν διαμένῃ προενόησαν*); in the former case, the mothers four degrees upwards both on the side of the father and the mother, were to be examined and declared legitimate; whereas if a priest married the daughter of a Levite or an Israelite, five degrees were required (*Mishn.* Kiddush. IV. 4—6; comp.

oured with the priesthood is not adverted to in the Pentateuch. Moses was scarcely rejected because he had defiled the nobility of his race by marrying Zipporah, the Midianite, but evidently because he was the younger brother.[1] Indeed Aaron, the firstborn, and as such of higher authority, and prominent in the earlier stages of the struggle against Pharaoh, is simply denominated "the Levite" (הַלֵּוִי), as if he were the representative of his tribe.[2] It has been remarked "Moses could not be invested with the priestly dignity; for he was the mediator of the Old Covenant, and, therefore, beyond the pale of the theocracy; his vocation was of an exceptional character, and could not, from its nature, be permanent or hereditary."[3] However, it was not the dignity of "mediator of the Old Covenant" that was to be perpetuated; and there is no conceivable reason why one who had fulfilled such an august mission, should not have been the first High-priest — an arrangement which might appear peculiarly appropriate.[4]

3. The ceremonies prescribed to be performed at the first *consecration* of the priests consisted of "bringing them near" the Tent of Meeting, the abode of God, washing them, clothing them with their holy garments, and anointing them with the sacred oil, the emblem of the Divine spirit;[5] and these rites, pointing to the nature of their office

---

*Philo*, De Monarch. II. 8, *ἐκ καθαρῶν γονέων καὶ πάππων καὶ προγόνων*; and c. 9, *ἵνα...μὲν εἰς ἄβατον καὶ καθαρὰν ἄρουραν ὁ ἱερὸς σπόρος χωρήσῃ καὶ μηδεμίαν κρᾶσιν αἱ γοναὶ πρὸς ἑτέραν οἰκίαν λαμβάνωσιν*; and *λέγω δὲ παρθένον οὐ μόνον ἣ μὴ ἕτερος οὐχ ὡμίλησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐφ᾽ ἣ μηδεὶς ἄλλος ἀνὴρ ὠνομάσθη διά τινων ὁμολογιῶν, καὶ ἂν ἀγνώῃ τὸ σῶμα*). Some doctors, however, ordained only that a priest must not marry the daughter of a foreigner, or of a released slave even in the tenth generation, except if her mother be Hebrew; and that he may marry the daughter of an Israelite and proselyte woman or of a proselyte and an Israelite woman (*Mishn*. Bikkur. I. 5; Kiddush. IV. 7); and Josephus (Ant. III. xii. 2) includes among the prohibitions, besides slaves or captive women, "such as obtain their living by a cheating trade or by keeping inns." The Hindoo law prescribes many similar restrictions; the first wife of a Brahman must be a virgin of a pious and healthy family of his own caste, must have no reddish hair nor any deformed limb, neither too much nor too little hair, a pleasing and auspicious name, "whose gait is graceful like that of a flamingo or a young elephant"; but a second or later wife may be chosen from the lower castes (*Manu*, III. 6—12; and on the Hindoo priests in general ibid. ch. II, and IV—VI *passim*; *Rhode*, Relig. Bildung der Hindus, II. 529—545; *Bohlen*, Alt. Ind. II. 2—4, 12—18; *Lassen*, Ind. Alterthumskunde, I. 801—807).

[1] Comp. 1 Chr. XXIII. 14.

[2] Exod. IV. 14; and Comm. *in loc.*

[3] *Bähr*, Symb. II. 19.

[4] We here argue of course merely within the sphere of the conceptions of the Pentateuch; the historical view will be developed later; see Sect. V.

[5] Exod. XL. 12—15; Levit. VIII. 6—13.

and its responsibilities, were accompanied by a sin-offering, a holocaust, and a thank-offering the blood of which was partially employed in sprinkling the hands, the ears, and the feet of the priests, an act of a plainly symbolical import.[6]

4. During their ministrations, the priests were clad in garments which, by their number — for *four* typifies completeness and absolute perfection[7] —, their materials, their shape, their workmanship, and the symbolical figures woven into them, were designed to recall the character and holiness of their office as one of Divinely-instituted mediatorship between God and the Israelites; they had indeed to wear these vestments "for glory and distinction;"[8] but they approached God and His service unshod, in all humility and in trembling veneration.[9]

5. As the priests were appointed to approach God in the name of the Israelites, their *duties at the Sanctuary* may be easily defined. These were comprehensively stated to embrace the whole service in connection with the sacred utensils, from the altar in the Court and in the Holy, to the functions within the vail which separated the Holy from the Holy of Holies.[10] The priests had, therefore, to perform the more significant operations incidental to offerings, namely, in animal sacrifices, all the rites which succeeded the killing of the victim, especially sprinkling the blood and burning the flesh, and heaving and waving the dedicated portions; and in cereal oblations, taking off and burning "the memorial" (אַזְכָּרָה),[11] and perhaps partly the preparation of the offering itself.[12] They had, in the Court, to preserve the perpetual fire on the brazen altar,[13] there to offer the two regular daily holocausts,[14] and to take away the ashes, as they accumulated.[15] They had, in the Holy, to burn on the golden

---

6 See Comm. on ch. VIII. 6—13.

7 See p. 117.

8 לְכָבוֹד וּלְתִפְאָרֶת, Ex. XXVIII. 40.

9 See Comm. on Exod. pp. 525—530; comp. ibid. pp. 46, 47; *Mishn.* Horay. III. 4; *Maimon.* Kele Hamikd. VII. 14. The priests of the second Temple had a special physician for diseases of the bowels (על חולי מעים, *Mishn.* Shekal. V. 1), to which they were particularly liable, because they trod the pavement unshod, wore thin linen garments, ate much meat, and drank only water. — It is a matter of course that those Aaronites only were so dressed who were fully qualified for the priestly office; whereas the rest had common clothes even in the precincts of the Sanctuary (*Joseph.* Bell. Jud. V. v. 7); and according to Jewish tradition, the qualified priests wore these garments constantly while in the Sanctuary, and even when not performing priestly functions, but were not permitted to sleep in them (*Mishn.* Tam. I. 1). The garments were later preserved in the Temple (Ezr. II. 69; Neh. VII. 70), under the supervision of a special officer (*Mishn.* Shekal. V. 1).

10 Comp. Num. XVIII. 1, 3, 7; see also Ezek. XLIV. 11, 14—16.

11 See p. 185.

12 See notes on VII. 8—10.

13 See notes on VI. 1—11.

14 See p. 235.

15 See p. 532.

altar the frank-incense twice daily;[1] to dress, fill, and light the lamps of the golden candlestick;[2] and to remove, every sabbath, from the shew-bread table the twelve cakes, and to substitute for them fresh ones.[3] During the encampments of the Israelites, the place of the priests was eastward of the Tabernacle, which it was their duty to guard;[4] and on resuming the journeys, they had carefully to wrap up the sacred implements, and to hand them over to the Levites for transport.[5] After the completion of the Temple, they had to watch, both day and night, over the safety of the edifice; those so engaged were called "the keepers of the threshold",[6] and were controlled by an overseer;[7] and in later periods, the regular duties at the Sanctuary were individually assigned to the priests by lot,[8] under the supervision of a "chief of the lots."[9]

6. The Books of Chronicles[10] attribute to David a division of Aaron's descendants into 24 classes,[11] — the progeny of Eleazar into 16, that of Ithamar into 8 — each of which was presided over by a chief,[12] and performed, by lot, the service during one week, from sabbath to sabbath.[13] But this division to which the older Books of the Hebrew canon contain no allusion whatever, was undoubtedly not introduced before the exile,

---

1 Exod. XXX. 7, 8; Num. XVII. 5; Deut. XXXIII. 10; 1 Chr. XXIII. 13; see Comm. on Exod. p. 483.

2 Exod. XXVII. 20, 21; XXX. 7, 8; XXIV. 2—4; Num. VIII. 2, 3; see Comm. on Exod. p. 482.

3 Lev. XXIV. 5—9; see Comm. on Exod. p. 481.

4 Num. III. 38.

5 Num. IV. 4—15.

6 שׁמרי הסף, 2 Ki. XII. 10; XXV. 18; Jer. LII. 24.

7 נגיד בבית יהוה or נגיד בית האלהים, Jer. XX. 1; 2 Chr. XXXI. 13; or *προστάτης τοῦ ἱεροῦ*, 2 Macc. III. 4; or, in the N. T. and Josephus, *στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ*, Acts IV. 1; V. 24, 26; *Joseph.* Bell. Jud. VI. v. 3; comp. Luke XXII. 52; and in the Talmud איש הר הבית or ראש המשער, *Mishn.* Midd. I. 1, 2; comp. Shekal. V. 1, 2, where 15 officers (ממונים) and their respective functions are enumerated — an overseer over the seals of sacrifices, over the drink-offerings, the lots or the division of ministrations, the turtle-doves and pigeons, etc.

8 Luke I. 9; *Mishn.* Yom. II. 1—4; Tamid I. 2, 4; III. 1, 5, 6, 9; IV. 1; etc.

9 *Mishn.* Shekal. V. 1, ממון על הפייסות.

10 1 Chr. XXIV. 3, 4, 19; comp. 2 Chr. VIII. 14; XXXV. 4.

11 מַחְלְקוֹת or מִשְׁמָרוֹת (Sept. *διαιρέσεις* or *ἐφημερίαι*, and so in Luke I. 5; *πατριαί* in *Jos.* Ant. VII. xiv. 7.

12 שַׂר or ראשׁ; Ezr. X. 5; Neh. XII. 7; 1 Chr. XXIV. 5; 2 Chr. XXXVI. 14, *ἄρχων τῶν ἱερέων* Sept. in Neh., and perhaps *ἀρχιερεύς* in *Jos.* Ant. XX. vii. 8; Bell. Jud. II. xvii. 2; Vit. 38; Matth. II. 4; XVI. 21; Luke XXII. 52; Acts IV. 1; V. 24 (comp., however, *Weichselhaus*, Versuch eines ausführlichen Commentars zur Leidensgeschichte, pp. 32 *sqq.*).

13 Comp. 2 Ki. XI. 9; 2 Chr. XXIII. 4, 8; *Joseph.* ll. cc.; *supra* p. 167; see *Cunaeus*, De Republ. Hebr. L. II. c. 8, and in general cc. 1—11; *Carpzov*, App. Crit. pp. 100—102; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. II. 371—375; *Öhler*, in Herz. XII. 183.

but was by the Chronist, in accordance with his usual method, ascribed to David and invested, besides, with the sanction of Solomon,[14] in order to give prestige to the new arrangement, which was so preserved up to the time of Josephus.[15] Each class was, according to Jewish tradition, divided into sections (בתי אבות), 5 to 9 in number, which officiated successively, either singly or in groups, during the first six days of the week, one on each day, while the whole class acted on the sabbath. For the service on the festivals, the aid of additional priests was called in.[16]

---

[14] 2 Chr. VIII. 14.

[15] Comp. pp. 31—34. On the return from the Babylonian exile, indeed four sections of priests only, of about 1000 each, are mentioned (Ezr. II. 36—39; Neh. VII. 39—42; comp. XII. 1 *sqq.*), but they were divided so as to constitute 24 classes (comp. also Neh. XIII. 30; *Joseph.* Vit. 1). Jewish tradition asserts even that Moses himself divided the priests into 8 classes, 4 from the line of Eleazar and 4 from that of Ithamar, that Samuel increased them to 16, and David to 24 (*Talm.* Taan. 27*a*), a statement devoid of historical basis; see also *Vatke*, Theol. des A.T. I. pp. 350—352; *George*, Jüd. Feste, p. 65; *Zunz*, Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie, p. 602; *Kuenen*, Histoire critique des Livres de l'Ancien Testam. (trad. par Pierson), I. 485, who urges that David as a dying old man could not have made such complicated arrangements.

[16] *Mishn.* Succ. V. 7; *Talm.* Menach. 107 *b*. Josephus observes (Contr. Ap. II. 8), that "there are four courses of priests, each of which include above 5,000 men, yet do they officiate on certain days only; and when those days are over, other priests succeed in the performance of sacrifices, and assemble together at mid-day, and receive the keys of the Temple and the vessels by tale" (see also Antiq. VII. xiv. 7).—In Jer. LII. 24, a כֹּהֵן הַמִּשְׁנֶה is mentioned (comp. 2 Ki. XXV. 18), which seems to be simply a priest of second rank (comp. כהני משנה in 2 Ki. XXIII. 4), and to be used in opposition to the High-priest (see *infra*); but that term has by some modern critics been interpreted "superintendent of the Temple" (נגיד בבית יהוה; compare *Hitzig* in loc.; see *supra* p. 566, note 7), while it was by the ancient Jews understood to mean an assistant of the High-priest and the overseer over the whole order of priests (סגן or סגן הכהנים, *Mishn.* Avoth III. 2; Tamid VII. 3; Yom. III. 9; IV. 1; comp. Sot. VII. 7, 8; Targ. Jerus. Jerem. XXIX. 26; Targ. Sheni Esth. I. 2), who has been supposed to be identical with the *στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ*, or the *προστάτης τοῦ ἱεροῦ*, or even, though no doubt erroneously, with the *ἀρχιερεῖς* of the New Testament and Josephus (so *Jost*, Gesch. des Judenth. I. 150; see *supra* p. 566, note 12); or it was taken to describe that "other priest" (כהן אחר) who one week before the Day of Atonement was appointed as the temporary substitute of the High-priest for the possible emergency of the latter becoming unclean and therefore disqualified for the service of that solemn day (comp. *Mishn.* Yom. I. 1; Megill. I. 9; *Jos.* Ant. XVII. vi. 4); it has even been asserted that, ordinarily, no one could become High-priest without having previously been סגן (comp. *Aruch* s. v.; *Selden*, De Success. in Pontif. II. 1; *Vitringa*, Observ. Sacr. VI. 23, pp. 516 *sqq.*; *Buxtorf*, Lex. Talm. pp. 1435, 1436; *Cunaeus*, De Rep. Hebr. L. II.

7. However, not in the Sanctuary only, but wherever the life of individuals or of the nation was to be hallowed or associated with religious observances, it was the office of the priests, the mediators and instruments of sanctification, to administer, or at least to assist in, the rituals. So they were concerned in the ceremonies prescribed at the release of the Nazarite;[1] at the ordeal imposed upon women suspected of infidelity;[2] at the expiation of a murder the perpetrator of which was unknown;[3] and at the examination of unclean, especially of leprous persons, houses, or garments, and their purification. Thus they exercised a kind of sanitary supervision over the people and were hence supposed to possess a certain degree of medical knowledge.[4] They were obliged by their connection with the festivals to regulate the calendar, and by their relation to the sacrifices to watch over the legal accuracy of the weights and measures.[5] They had to make valuations of property which had been vowed or devoted to the Sanctuary, but which the owner desired to redeem.[6] They had, at certain times, to blow the silver trumpets (חצצרות), the sound of which was intended either to summon the whole people or its chiefs for public deliberations, or, on festive days, to enhance the solemnity of the public sacrifices and thereby to rouse the community to a feeling of religious devotion, when this would be "for a memorial before God",[7] or to give the sign for resuming the marches in journeys and campaigns, or lastly for commencing a battle, when

---

c. 3; *Othon.* Lex. Rabbin. p. 624; *Carpzov*, Appar. pp. 98 *sqq.*). — The third place among the priestly officers was occupied by two קתולקין (*καθολικοί*), commanders over the whole Temple; the fourth by 3 to 7 אמרכלים to whom the keys of the Court were entrusted; the fifth by 3 to 7 גזברים treasurers or controllers of the revenues and expenditure; after which followed the chiefs of the classes (ראשי משמר), the chiefs of the בתי אבות, and lastly the common priests (כהני הדיוט). Of these eight orders the five first composed the ecclesiastical council (בית דין של כהנים or זקני כהנים, *Mishn.* Kethuv. I. 5; Yom. I. 5). — On these and other regulations and arrangements of a later time, of which it is not here the place to treat fully, we must at present refer to *Lightfoot*, Opp. I. 678—694; II. 486—489 (on Luke I. 5, 8, 9); *Reland*, Ant. II. iii. 1—6; iv. 1—6; *Othon.* Lex. Rabb. pp. 612—631; *Outram*, De Sacrif. pp. 42—80; *Öhler* in Herz. XII. 184—187; and the historical works of Herzfeld (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, I. 392 *sqq.*), Jost (Geschichte des Judenthums, I. 151 *sqq.*), and Grätz (Geschichte der Juden, III. 113 *sqq.*), a. o.; on the representatives of the people at the sacrifices (אנשי מעמד or מעמדות) see *supra* pp. 167, 168.

1 Num. VI. 13—21.

2 See pp. 282—289.

3 Deut. XXI. 5.

4 Lev. XIII. 2 *sqq.*; XIV. 2; comp. Deut. XXIV. 8; Matth. VIII. 4; Luke XVII. 14.

5 Comp. 1 Chr. XXIII. 29; also Lev. XIX. 35, 36; Am. VIII. 5; Mic. VI. 10, 11.

6 Lev. XXVII. 8, 12, 14, 18, 23; see Comm. in loc.

7 והיו לכם לזכרון לפני אלהיכם, Num. X. 10.

the combatants would "be remembered before the Lord their God and be saved from their enemies",[8] for priests accompanied military expeditions,[9] sometimes with the Ark of the Covenant, for the protection of the army;[10] before the commencement of the battle they had probably to offer a sacrifice; and they were charged to encourage the soldiers by the following address; "Hear, o Israel, you approach this day to battle against your enemies; let not your hearts faint, fear not, and do not tremble, nor be terrified on account of them; for it is the Lord your God who goes with you, to fight for you against your enemies to save you."[11]

8. By virtue of the spirit of God which rested on them through their election and anointment, it was their special mission to search in the Divine Law, to teach, to expound, and to diffuse it; to enforce its supreme authority; and to preserve it in its purity among the nation for ever. They had to "instruct the children of Israel in all the statutes which the Lord had spoken to them through Moses".[12] They were commanded to read the whole Law, after every seven years, on the Feast of Tabernacles, before all the people then assembled at the central Sanctuary, men, women, children, and strangers, "that they may listen, and learn, and fear the Lord, and observe to do all the words of the Law".[13] They were to provide every Hebrew king with a faithful copy

---

[8] Num. X. 2—10; comp. Ezra III. 10; Neh. XII. 35, 41; 1 Chr. XV. 24; XVI. 6; 2 Chr. V. 12; VII. 6; XIII. 12, 14; XXIX. 26; also Josh. VI. 4 *sqq.*; Joel II. 1, 15; *Mishn.* Succ. V. 5; see *Sommer*, Bibl. Abhandlungen, I. 37—39.

[9] Num. XXXI. 6; 2 Chr. XIII. 12, 14; 1 Macc. XVI. 8. According to Jewish tradition, a field-priest specially appointed, and anointed with the same oil as the High-priest (כהן משוח מלחמה), followed the army (*Mishn.* Sot. VII. 2; VIII. 1; comp. *Reland*, Antiq. II. iii. 2; *Othon.*, Lex. Rabb. p. 89), though that officer has sometimes been considered merely as "a legislative idea never actually carried out", or as "existing in theory only and not in history" (*Jost*, Gesch. des Judenth. I. 153).

[10] 1 Sam. IV. 4, 5, 11, 17, etc.; see p. 30, note 1.

[11] Deut. XX. 2—4; comp. 2 Chr. XX. 20, 21. The Mishnah (Sotah VIII. 1) has a longer paraphrase of this address, with various modifications and additions. Among the Romans, on the other hand, the law obtained with respect to the flamen Dialis, "religio est classem procinctam extra pomoerium, id est, exercitum armatum videre"; nay he was not even permitted to ride on a horse which was considered a warlike animal (equo vehi religio est); *Gell.* Noct. Att. X. 15; comp. *supra* p. 147 note 13.

[12] Lev. X. 11. Their duties as instructors were, therefore, not circumscribed "within a very limited circle", and confined to "pointing out ceremonial offerings or duties" or "judging the complicated cases of ceremonial casuistry" (*Stanley*, Jewish Church, II. p. 416); see also *infra* sect. V. 11.

[13] Deut. XXXI. 9—13; comp. vers. 25, 26. In later times, the *king* read

of the Law, which he was enjoined to keep and read "all the days of his life".[1] In a word, "they shall teach God's judgment to Jacob, and His Law to Israel."[2]

9. From the same reason of peculiar holiness, the priests were charged to bless the people in the name of God;[3] and God promised to make that blessing effectual.[4] They were empowered, previous to great national enterprises, especially military expeditions, to consult for an oracle the Ark of the Covenant,[5] or the Urim and Thummim.[6] And as judicial decisions were looked upon as the result of Divine suggestions, since "bringing a matter before the judges" was, in the usage of the language, equivalent to "bringing it before God" (האלהים);[7] the priests were the chief arbiters and authorities in all cases of jurisdiction; "by their word shall every controversy and every violence be tried;"[8] if the local magistrates were unable to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, whether in matters of blood, property, or violent onslaught, the cause was to be referred to the priests and the judges then sitting at the place of the common Sanctuary; their decision was final and irrevocable; disobedience to their decree was visited with death, as a well-deserved punishment on the refractory, and a terrifying example to the evil-disposed;[9] since it was impiety towards God Himself.[10] Thus they naturally acquired important influence, if not a legally defined share, in the public administration;[11] and justly could Josephus observe that the Law "permits the priests in general to be the administrators of the principal affairs and ordains them to be the inspectors of all, the

---

the Law in the Temple (*Mishn.* Sotah V. 8).

[1] Deut. XVII. 18, 19.

[2] Deut. XXXIII. 10; comp. 2 Ki. XVII. 27, 28; Jer. XVIII. 18; Ezek. VII. 26; XLIV. 23, 24; Mal. II. 7; Neh. VIII. 9—11; 2 Chr. XVII. 8, 9; XXXV. 3. The older priests had, of course, to instruct the younger members of their order in their duties (*Talm.* Kethuv. 106 *a*).

[3] Perhaps especially after the conclusion of the daily sacrifices.

[4] Lev. IX. 22, 23; Num. VI. 22—26; Deut. X. 8; XXI. 5; XXVII. 14; comp. 1 Chr. XXIII. 13; 2 Chr. XXX. 27; see *Mishn.* Sot. VII. 6; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. II. 360, 361.

[5] Judg. XX. 27, 28.

[6] Num. XXVII. 21; comp. 1 Sam. XXVIII. 6; Ezra II. 63; Neh. VII. 65; see Comm. on Exod. p. 541.

[7] Exod. XXI. 6; XXII. 8; Comm. on Exod. p. 387.

[8] Deut. XXI. 5.

[9] Deut. XVII. 8—13; comp. XIX. 17; Num. XXVII. 2, 19; Josh. XVII. 4; XXII. 30*sqq.*; Ezek. XLIV. 24; 1 Chr. XXIII. 4; XXVI. 29; 2 Chr. XIX. 8—11; *Gerhard* on Deut. XVII.; *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. I. 72; *Riehm*, Gesetzgeb. Mos. im Lande Moab, pp. 62, 63; *Öhler* in Herzog's Real-Encyclop. V. 58, 59; see *infra* sect. V. 7.

[10] *Joseph.* Contr. Ap. II. 23, *ὁ δέ γε τούτῳ μὴ πειθόμενος, ὑφέξει δίκην ὡς εἰς τὸν θεὸν αὐτὸν ἀσεβῶν.*

[11] Num. XXXI. 12, 13, 21, 26; XXXII. 2; comp. 1 Ki. I. 7, 8, 39.

judges in doubtful cases, and the punishers of those who were condemned to suffer punishment."[12]

10. Nor is it difficult to account for the *qualifications* required of the priests. Those destined to come near the perfect God, and to "present His food" or "the offerings made by fire" (אִשֵּׁי יְהוָה), must necessarily be *perfect* in form and appearance; for as the gifts were to be perfect,[13] so those who laid them before God for His gracious acceptance. The recipients of Divine holiness were demanded to possess that symmetry of physical organisation which, if not deemed an indispensable condition of spiritual and moral excellence, was certainly considered a most desirable accompaniment of it. The priests were, therefore, prescribed to be without blemish (מוּם), not only free from those defects which would incapacitate them for their manual duties, as blindness, lameness, or fracture of the hand, but from those also which cause disfigurement or imply a deviation from the normal structure of the human frame, such as a flat nose, a crooked back, a dwarfish size;[14] whoever was affected with any similar infirmity and yet officiated in the Sanctuary, "profaned" it, and was responsible for his desecration to God who watches over the holiness of His service.[15]

For similar considerations, we must suppose that the period of life during which the priests were qualified for their functions, comprised the best years of their vigour, and that, though no age is stated in the

---

[12] Contra Ap. II. 21. [13] See p. 93.

[14] In later times, the priests, before being admitted to their office, were closely examined (*Mishn.* Midd. V. 4), and Jewish tradition worked out the Biblical precepts with regard to the disqualifying faults with its usual trifling minuteness (see *Mishn.* Bechor. VII. 1—6). If during their period of priesthood, they were afflicted by a bodily defect or by leprosy, they became unfit for further service (*Joseph.* Ant. XIV. xiii. 10; Ap. I. 31). Among the Greeks obtained the law *τὸν ὁλόκληρον ἱερᾶσθαι*, and a *δοκιμασία* determined whether the candidate was *ὁλόκληρος* or *ἀφελής*; comp. *Plato* Legg. VI. 7, p. 759C; Etym. M. p. 176, *καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐδοκιμάζοντο Ἀθήνησιν εἰ ἀφελεῖς καὶ ὁλόκληροι*; *Athen.* Deipnos. VII. 55, *τοὺς ἱερέας ἐνθάδε μὲν ὁλοκλήρους νόμος εἶναι κτλ.*; *Gell.* Noct. Att. I. 12 (with respect to the Vestals) item quae lingua debili sensuve aurium diminuta, aliave qua corporis labe insignita sit. According to the Hindoo law, Brahmans born with a bodily defect or receiving one before their sixteenth year, are excluded from the holy caste and from the rite of consecration, because physical imperfection is regarded as the consequence of sins especially of the parents (comp. *Rhode*, Rel. Bild. der Hindus, II. 531).

[15] Lev. XXI. 17—23, and Comm. *in loc.*; comp. XXII. 1—7; *Jos.* Bell. Jud. V. v. 7. In later periods, priests suffering from a physical defect were employed in the "wood-cell" (לשכת עצים), which was in the north-eastern part of the Court of women, to select and remove from the wood that was to be used on the altar, the worm-eaten or putrid pieces, but they were entitled to a share in the priestly revenues (*Mishn.* Midd. II. 5; see on VII. 8—10).

Old Testament, they were probably neither admitted "too young nor too old", scarcely before their twentieth year,[1] though Jewish tradition considered adolescence sufficient.[2] In later periods, we find frequently young priests, and occasionally very young High-priests; Aristobulus was only 17 years old when appointed by Herod the Great.[3]

External *purity* was, next to integrity of life and perfection of form, considered the most characteristic attribute and emblem of godliness. Therefore, the priest was commanded to avoid everything calculated to render him unclean; he was not permitted to approach dead bodies, except those of his nearest blood-relations, of his father and mother, his son and daughter, his brother and unmarried virgin sister; he was not even to "defile himself" by the corpses of those who were connected with him by marriage only, and not by consanguinity, as his wife, his mother-in-law, or daughter-in-law.[4] The priest who performed functions at the altar while in a state of Levitical impurity, was threatened with excision.[5] Therefore, during his period of active duty, he had to abstain from sexual intercourse, because this rendered him unclean till the evening,[6] a law observed among most ancient nations.[7] Even want of scrupulous cleanliness was visited with death; hence the priests were rigidly enjoined, whenever they entered the holy edifice, to wash their hands and feet with the water of the laver placed in the Court for

---

[1] Comp. 2 Chr. XXXI. 17.

[2] Comp. *Mishn.* Tam. I. 1; Yom. I. 7; *Talm.* Chull. 24*b*. Samuel "ministered to the Lord" almost in his childhood (1 Sam. II. 11, 18; III. 1, 3).

[3] *Joseph.* Ant. XV. iii. 3; comp. *Ugolini*, Thesaur. II. 667; XIII. 927; *Selden*, De Successu in Pont. II. 4. On the age of the Levites in active duty see *infra*. Disqualified also were those who had at any time taken part in an idolatrous or dissenting worship (comp. 2 Ki. XXIII. 8, 9; *Mishn.* Menach. XIII. 10), and those who had committed involuntary homicide were not permitted to bless the people (comp. *Talm.* Berach. 32*b*).

[4] Lev. XXI. 1—4; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 25 (see also XXIV. 16—18); *Mishn.* Horay. III. 5. Plato also (Legg. XII. 3, p. 947 D) requires the priests, as a rule, to keep aloof from tombs. In Messene the priest had to resign his office when he lost a child (*Paus.* IV. xii. 4). Gellius (Noct. Att. x. 15) records with respect to the flamen Dialis, locum in quo bustum est, nunquam ingreditur, mortuum nunquam attingit, funus tamen exequi non est religio. And well-known is the Roman custom "ut polluti funere minime sacrificarent"; and "ramum cupressi ante domum funestam poni, ne quisquam Pontifex per ignorantiam pollueretur ingressus" (*Serv.* ad Virg. Aen. II. and XI.); compare also the interesting remarks of Porphyry (Abstin. II. 50.) with regard to the Egyptian priests, *εἰ δὲ οἱ τῶν τῇδε ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱεροσκόποι καὶ τάφων ἀπέχεσθαι κελεύουσιν ἑαυτοῖς τε καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις κτλ.*

[5] Lev. XXII. 3; comp. *Joseph.* Bell. Jud. V. v. 6.

[6] Lev. XV. 18.

[7] Comp. Exod. XIX. 15; 1 Sam. XXI. 5; *Strabo*, XVI. i. 20, p. 745; *Plut.* Symp. III. vi. 4; see Comm. on Exod. p. 336.

that special purpose.[8] This requirement of permanent purity was, probably, one of the reasons why women, though for a long time and numerously employed at places of worship for various duties,[9] were excluded from the priesthood; yet this exclusion of women may have been prompted by other motives besides, such as the excesses to which their admission gave rise in many heathen worships, and the superiority attributed to the male sex;[10] and when the principle of the substitution of the Levites for the firstborn sons of the Hebrews was currently adopted, the service of women was naturally out of the question.[11]

11. But priests had, above all, to lead a life of holiness and piety. They were called upon to glorify the name of God not by their teaching only, but by their conduct.[12] As they enjoyed the highest privileges, so they were judged with the greatest severity. It was a proverbial adage, "Through those that are near Me I will be sanctified."[13] From their families even the most unexceptional morality was expected; a priest's daughter who abandoned herself to a reproachful life, profaned her father, and she was to be burnt to death.[14] Before or during their ministrations, they were forbidden to drink wine or any strong beverage that might disturb their absorbed attention or self-possesion; a contravention of this precept was visited with death.[15] As their lives were to be devoted to the service of peace and atonement, and to the unwearied study of the Divine Law, they were commanded to shun everything

---

[8] Exod. XXX. 18—21; XL. 31, 32; comp. *Mishn.* Taan. I. 2, 4—II. 1; *Bartenurah* on Mishn. Zevach. II. 1.

[9] Exod. XXXVIII. 8; 1 Sam. II. 22; comp. Ps. LXVIII. 26; Exod. XV. 20; Judg. XXI. 21; see also *Ewald*, Alterthümer, pp. 297, 298. Similar notions certainly prevailed among the Ethiopians, for we are distinctly told, "At the sacrifices in honour of Helios and Selene, the purest deities, the attendance of women was prohibited, in order to protect the sacred act even from an involuntary pollution" (*Heliod.* X. 4); on analogous laws in some of the Greek states see *Schömann*, Griech. Alterth. II. pp. 408, 409.

[10] See *supra* p. 96.

[11] Among the Egyptians also, it was a rule, "A woman cannot serve the priestly office either for god or goddess" (*Herod.* II. 35); although we find, in reality, women admitted to various religious services (comp. *Wilkinson* in Rawlinson's Herodotus, *in loc.).* The Greeks had both priests and priestesses, the latter, on the whole, in excess of the former; the sex of the priest did not invariably follow that of the god. The Druids also had priestesses, some married, and some unmarried, who alone were allowed to perform certain sacrifices.

[12] Comp. *Jos.* Ant. III. xii. 2; *Philo*, De Monarch. II. 5, Opp. II. 225.

[13] Lev. X. 3; see Comm. in loc.

[14] Lev. XXI. 9.

[15] Lev. X. 9; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 21; *Jos.* Ant. III. xii. 2; Bell. Jud. V. v. 7; *Philo*, De Monarch. II. 7 (*τετάρων ἕνεκα τῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων, ὄγκου καὶ λήθης καὶ ὕπνου καὶ ἀφροσύνης*); De Ebrietate cc. 33, 34, Opp. I. 377, 378; see notes on X. 8—11.

tending to destroy the calm serenity of their minds or indicating an undue attachment to temporal boons or interests, since they were to find their happiness mainly in their spiritual mission. Hence they were not to yield to any vehement demonstrations of grief or mourning in cases of bereavement. They were specially forbidden to make baldness upon their heads, shave off the corner of their beards, or make any incision in their flesh;[1] for though the same injunction applied to the whole nation,[2] its transgression was in the ministers of God particularly blameable.

Moreover, in order to relieve them from worldly troubles and anxieties, the Law amply provided for them by imposts levied from the Israelites, and by the shares assigned to them in the various kinds of offering; and they were to receive for their abodes thirteen towns conveniently situated in the vicinity of the central Sanctuary, within the territory of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin.[3] They were exempted not only from military service but from all taxes and civil burdens.[4] Thus freed from all mundane occupation and depressing care, they were to devote their whole existence, undisturbed, to truth and its diffusion, to holiness and pious mediation.[5]

12. Now, if the peculiar character and office of the priests be considered, it will be found, as a natural consequence, that they required, on the one hand, a chief who, by his person and dignity, concentrated the whole power and holiness of their order, and who could, therefore, occasionally represent the whole people of Israel as their intercessor; and that, on the other hand, they could not properly be charged with the menial duties unavoidably connected with the service of the altar and the Sanctuary. The Law of the Pentateuch gave them a visible head in the *High-priest*, and subordinate assistants in the *Levites*.

13. The High-priest was naturally distinguished by peculiar holiness. His duties were more solemn, his responsibilities more grave. He was, in fact, the embodiment of the theocracy itself. As, therefore, he required the spirit of God in an eminent degree, he was consecrated with a more complete and copious anointment than the common priests. He is described as having "the crown of the anointing oil of his God upon him."[6] Every new High-priest was anointed in the same manner

---

[1] Lev. XXI. 5, 6; and Comm. *in loc.*; comp. Ezek. XLVI. 20.

[2] Lev. XIX. 27, 28. [3] Josh. XXI. 4.

[4] Comp. *Jos.* Ant. IV. iv. 3; III. xii. 4 (ἱεροὶ γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ Λευῖται, καὶ πάντων ἀτελεῖς); which privileges were, later, confirmed to them by foreign sovereigns also (Ezra VII. 24).

[5] See *infra* Sect. III. 6—15; comp. also 1 Cor. IX. 1—14; XXXI. 4; Rom. XV. 27.

[6] Lev. XXI. 12, נזר שמן משחת אלהיו

as Aaron, the first, whereas the ordinary priests were in later times not anointed.[7] He was hence simply called "the anointed priest."[8] He was "the great priest",[9] or later "the head-priest",[10] or "the priest" *par excellence*;[11] and as in him the sum of the sanctity of the priesthood was concentrated, he was even designated "the Holy of the Lord."[12] His dignity is therefore hardly exaggerated in these words of Philo, "The Law designs that the High-priest should partake of a nature superior to that of man; he approaches more nearly to that of the Deity; for he stands properly on the borders between the two, in order that men may propitiate God by some mediator, and that God may have some subordinate minister by whom He may offer and give His mercies and boons to mankind."[13]

From this character of the High-priest several points follow as matters of course. One High-priest only was possible at a time; because the whole people in its unity could fitly be represented by one spiritual chief only.[14] The sin of the High-priest caused or implied the sin of the nation, for which he acted as delegate and mediator;[15] and his

---

עליו; comp. ver. 10; and Philo (Vit. Mos. III. 17, Opp. II. 157), *Μωσῆς τὸν ἀρχιερέα πολλῷ λίπει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀλείφει.*

7 Exod. XXVIII. 41; XXIX. 7; XXX. 30; XL. 15; Lev. VI. 13; VIII. 12; XVI. 32; Num. XXXV. 25; see notes on VIII. 6—13.

8 הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ, Lev. IV. 3, 5, 16; VI. 15; XVI. 32; compare notes on IV. 3—12. According to the Mishnah (Horay. III. 4), the High-priest was anointed during the time of the first Temple only, whereas in the period of the second Temple he was installed merely by being clothed in his pontifical vestments, because the holy anointing oil had been concealed in the reign of king Josiah; hence the distinction between הכהן המשיח and הכהן המרובה בבגדים; comp. *Mishn.* Maccoth. II. 6; Megill. I. 9; see also *Cunaeus*, De Republ. Hebr. l. II. c. 7.

9 הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל, Lev. XXI. 10; Num. XXXV. 25, 28; Josh. XX. 6; 2 Ki. XII. 11; XXII. 4, 8; XXIII. 4; Hagg. I. 1, 12; Zech. III. 1, 8; Neh. III. 1; XIII. 28; etc.; Chal. כהנא רבא; Sept. *ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας*, or in Lev. IV. 3 *ἀρχιερεύς*, and so in the Apocrypha, Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament.

10 כֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ (2 Ki. XXV. 18; Ezra VII. 5; 2 Chr. XIX. 11; XXIV. 6, 11; XXVI. 20), or merely הָרֹאשׁ (2 Chr. XXIV. 6), in contradistinction to כֹּהֲנֵי הַמִּשְׁנֶה (2 Ki. XXIII. 4; XXV. 18; Jer. LII. 24), the priests of second rank or the common priests.

11 הַכֹּהֵן, Ex. XXIX. 30; Lev. XXI. 21; comp. IV. 5 and 6, 16 and 17; Num. III. 6 (אהרן הכהן); IV. 33; XXXV. 32, comp. ver. 28; Josh. XIV. 1; XVII. 4; XIX. 51; XXI. 1; 1 Sam. I. 9; II. 11; 2 Ki. XII. 8, 10; Nehem. VII. 65; see 2 Sam. VIII. 17; 2 Esdr. IX. 39, 42; and so כִּהֵן *to fill the office of High-priest* (Deut. X. 6).

12 קְדוֹשׁ יְהוָה, Ps. CVI. 16.

13 De Monarch. II. 12.

14 The Talmud says אין ממונים שני כהנים גדלים (*Talm. Jerus.* Sanhedr. 29*a*; *Siphra* 9*b*; comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. p. 13 note 1).

15 Lev. IV. 3, אם הכהן המשיח יחטא לאשמת העם; see note on IV. 3—12; comp. also X. 6.

expiation wrought at the same time the expiation of the community.[1] The *election* was particularly marked, and confined to Aaron and his descendants through Eleazar, the eldest of his surviving sons. The *hereditary succession* was strictly reserved to his branch of the family and extended to no other.[2] The High-priest was not even permitted, like the common priest, to marry a widow, but none except a Hebrew virgin;[3] and though the ordinance is not quite distinct, it is not improbable that he was enjoined to observe monogamy,[4] as was the case

---

[1] Lev. IX. 7 and notes on IX. 5—14.

[2] Num. III. 32; XX. 28; Deut. X. 6; Josh. XIV. 1; XVII. 4; XIX. 51; XXI. 1; comp. Judg. XX. 28; see, however, *infra*. Josephus (Ant. XX. x. 1) observes, no one that is not of the blood of Aaron, though he were a king, can ever obtain the High-priesthood. He maintains (Ap. I. 7) that the Jews "have the names of their High-priests, from father to son set down in their records for the period of two thousand years"; and it is probably on the authority of some such source that he contends (Antiq. l. c.; comp. Vit. 1), that from Aaron to his own generation, there were 83 High-priests, of whom 13 lived from the days of Moses to the building of the Temple in Solomon's reign, comprising a period of 612 years (whereas the Old Testament states the interval at 480 years, 1 Ki. VI. 1), 18 from Solomon to the Babylonian exile under Nebuchadnezzar, who made the High-priest Jozadak captive, or a period of 466 1/2 years (in 1 Chr. V. 29—41, only 22 descendants of Aaron in direct line are mentioned up to the time of Nebuchadnezzar; see *infra* Sect. IV. 1); 15 (beginning with Jesus, the son of Jozadak, and ending with Onias surnamed Meneclaus) from Nebuchadnezzar to Antiochus Eupator, a period of 414 years; then Jocimus (3 years); then no High-priest for 7 years; then successively Jonathan the Asmonean, 7 years; his brother Simon, 8 years; the son of the latter, Hyrcanus, 30 years; Judas, called Aristobulus, who was both king and High-priest, 27 years; Hyrcanus, his son, 9 years; his brother Aristobulus, 3 1/4 years; then again Hyrcanus, 24 years; Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, 3 1/4 years; Aristobulus the grandson of Hyrcanus; after which time Herod appointed High-priests who were not of the family of the Asmoneans, but of less eminent birth; his example was followed by his son Archelaus and the Romans; and there were 28 High-priests from the days of Herod to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple under Titus or a period of 107 years (from B. C. 37 to A. C. 70). But according to the Talmud (Yom. 9*a*), there were, during the 420 years of the first Temple only 18 High-priests, but during the 420 years of the second Temple more than 300, so that, if the longer time of office of some, as Simon the Just and Johanan is taken into account, each of the rest officiated hardly longer than one year. Comp., however, Chron. Paschale, p. 77; *Selden*, De Succ. lib. II; see also *Reland*, Ant. II. ii. 1—6; *Hervey* in Smith's Bibl. Dict. I. 809—813.

[3] Jewish tradition limited the age from 12 to 12 1/2 years, when the girl was called a נערה, while after that time she was a בוגרת *virgo pubes*, and such the High-priest was not to marry (*Mishn.* Yevam. VI. 4; *Talm.* Yevam. 59*a*). comp. *Demosth.* Adv. Neaer. § 75.

[4] Lev. XXI. 13—15; comp. 1 Tim. III. 2; *Joseph.* Ant. III. xii. 2; *Philo*, De Monarch. II. 8—11; *Mishn.* Yevam.

with the Egyptian High-priests.[5] He held his office for life;[6] for it was impossible that the sanctity once bestowed upon him by God should ever decrease, much less depart from him. Thus the matter was also understood by Jewish tradition, according to which "he remained in his holiness"[7] even after he had resigned his functions; and if he sinned subsequently, he had even then to present a bullock for a sin-offering, whereas a king who had been dethroned or had abdicated, had merely to bring the sin-offering of a private Israelite.[8] His death marked an epoch in the civil and political life of the nation,[9] when the involuntary homicide who had escaped into a city of refuge was permitted to return to his home; since for a theocratic community, there could be no more important event than a change of its spiritual chief. Therefore, Philo describes him aptly thus: "The High-priest is the relation and nearest of kin to the whole nation;[10] he offers up supplications and sacrifices daily on behalf of the whole nation, and prays for the people as for his own brethren, and parents, and children, that every age and every portion of the nation, as if it were one body, may be united into one and the same community and union."[11]

---

VI. 4; *Selden*, Uxor Ebr. L. I. c. 8, pp. 39, 40. — However, the pious High-priest Jehoiada married two wives (2 Chr. XXIV. 3).

[5] *Diod. Sic.* I. 80. With respect to the flamen Dialis, the Roman law ordained, Uxorem si amisit, flaminio decedit; matrimonium flaminis nisi morte dirimi jus non est (*Gell.* l. c.). Later the Jewish laws in this respect were made more rigourous still: no High-priest was, for instance, admitted who was born of a servile or captive mother; though birth in a foreign country was not deemed a disqualification (*Jos.* Ant. XIII. x. 5; XV. iii. 1); similarly a Roman Vestal was ineligible "quae ipsa aut cujus pater emancipatus sit ... item cujus parentes alter ambove servitute servierunt, aut in negotiis sordidis diversantur" (*Gell.* Noct. Att. I. 12). Philo (De Monarch. II. 11) remarks even that the High-priest could marry only "a priestess, the daughter of a priest" (*ἱέρειαν ἐξ ἱερέων*), whereas common priests might marry from any tribe, because the legislator "was not willing entirely to disunite and separate the whole nation from the order of the priesthood"; similarly *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 302 (Die Jungfrau die er zur Ehe nähme, sollte nur aus seinen Stammverwandten sein); see, in general, *Selden*, De Succ. in Pont. II. c. 3; De Uxor. Ebr. I. c. 7, pp. 31 *sqq.*; *Carpzov*, App. crit. pp. 88, 89.

[6] Comp. *Joseph.* Ant. XX. x. 1.

[7] בקדושתו הוא עומד.

[8] כהן משיח מביא פר והנשיא כהדיוט, *Mishn.* Horay. III. 2. Even with regard to the common priest the rule obtained, that he never forfeited his priestly privileges entirely (*Mishn.* Sot. III. 7, כהן אין מתחלל). [9] Num. XXXV. 28, 32.

[10] *Τοῦ σύμπαντος ἔθνους συγγενὴς καὶ ἀγχιστεὺς κοινὸς ὁ ἀρχιερεύς ἐστι.*

[11] *Ἵνα πᾶσα ἡλικία καὶ τὰ μέρη του ἔθνους ὡς ἑνὸς σώματος εἰς μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἁρμόζηται κοινωνίαν*, *Philo*, De Special. Legg. III. 23, Opp. II. 321. Other Jewish authorities consider that the High-priest ought to be pre-eminent בנוי בכח בעושר בחכמה ובמראה (*Maimon.* Kele Hammikd. 5).

14. The relation between the people, the priests, and the High-priest, is, therefore, this. The Israelites are a community of priests; their character and their aim virtually coincide with the character and aim of the priests; but as they have renounced "to approach to God" (see *supra* p. 562) and thus helped or at least consented to confer their peculiar mission on one particular order, every one of them individually must be represented by a priest. But the whole people and the High-priest are, in their moral and religious life, organically connected, equivalent in religious importance and identical in their theocratic dignity.[1] Both the High-priest and the common priest are mediators; but the intercession of the former is required to render the intercession of the other complete; for the Israelite is no isolated unit, he is an integral part of a chosen community, and his atonement as an individual is imperfect without his atonement as a citizen of the theocratic commonwealth.[2] And as an Israelite and a priest are different only in their degrees of holiness, and not absolutely in the absence or presence of this attribute, so the priest and the High-priest are distinguished only by the degrees in which they are severally endowed with the spirit of God. People, priests, and High-priest were meant to be allied by a common bond of spiritual aspiration, like the members of one body, each performing its separate functions, but each sustained by, and sustaining, the rest.[3] Yet the theocratic status of the three component divisions was distinctly marked. The people was limited to the Court; the priests were admitted to the Holy also, while the High-priest alone was allowed to enter the Holy of Holies, and to minister before the Ark of the Covenant and the mercy-seat adorned with the Cherubim which typified the Divine presence.[4] So the priest approached nearer to God than the Israelite, and the High-priest nearer than either; by this gradation their sacerdotal character is pointedly conveyed.

15. While, therefore, the High-priest shared both many rights and duties with the common priests, he was, in either respect, distin-

---

[1] Comp. *Ebn Ezra* on Levit. IV. 14 (והנה הכהן הגדול שקול כנגד כל־ישראל), and Siphra *ibid.* (הרי משיח כצבור).

[2] Yet it is probably not quite accurate to contend, "As the whole sacrificial service, so the priesthood formed a complete unity; even when the subordinate priests officiated at the altar, they did not act as individuals merely, but by virtue of the authority vested in the whole order of priesthood, whose proper representative was the High-priest; they acted, therefore, in reality, as substitutes of the High-priest" (so *Öhler* in Herz. VI. 203): as a rule, the common priests represented the individual Israelites, the High-priest the nation.

[3] How far this object was attained by the institutions of the Pentateuch, will be pointed out below, sect. II.

[4] Lev. XVI. 13—15.

guished from them by various special enactments.[5] Though he was, of course, permitted to perform the ordinary sacrifices, he was probably not meant to do so, except on the sabbaths, the days of the new-moon, and the great festivals;[6] he certainly did not offer the regular daily holocausts;[7] although this would seem peculiarly appropriate for him as the appointed chief of the theocracy.[8] It was he especially who consulted the Urim and Thummim which he wore on his breast. He was the guardian of the Temple treasury and exercised the supervision over the entire public worship.[9] He sacrificed the sin-offerings for himself and the community of Israel.[10] But his most solemn function was on the Day of Atonement, when he, and none else, was allowed to enter the Holy of Holies, and to perform those imposing rites, by which the expiation of the people was to be wrought. At the division of the land of Canaan, he together with the chiefs of the tribes is said to have directed the arrangements.[11] He no doubt occupied a prominent position, if he did not preside, in the high tribunals mainly composed of priests.[12] It needs, therefore, hardly be observed that the High-priests were held in supreme respect and reverence. They occasionally married princesses,[13] and their daughters were demanded in marriage by the most influential in the land.[14] The High-priest was forbidden to approach the dead body even of his father and his mother; he was required to remain in constant and the most perfect purity; for, observes the Law, "he shall not go out of the Sanctuary, nor profane the Sanctuary of his God; for the crown of the anoint ing oil of his God is upon him."[15] Nor was he, in times of mourning, to go with dishevelled hair or rend his garments, in compliance with the ordinary custom; he should, on

[5] Comp. *Gell.* Noct. Att. X. 15 (caerimoniae impositae flamini Diali multae, item castus multiplices); that chapter of Gellius contains many highly interesting parallels, f. i. Dialis cotidie festatus est; sine apice sub divo esse licitum non est; farinam fermento imbutam adtingere ei fas non est; super flaminem Dialem in convivio nisi rex sacrificulus haud quisquam alius accumbit.

[6] This seems, at least, to have been the practice in the period after the exile (*Joseph.* Bell. Jud. V. v. 7).

[7] See notes on VI. 12—16, the quotation from Philo.

[8] Comp. *Mishn.* Tamid VII. 3; Hebr. VII. 27.

[9] 2 Ki. XXII. 4; 2 Chr. XXXI. 10; 2 Macc. III. 9.

[10] Lev. IV. 4—21.

[11] Num. XXXIV. 17; Josh. XIV. 1; XVII. 4; XIX. 51; XXI. 1.

[12] Deut. XVII. 8—13; comp. Num. XV. 33; XXVII. 2; see p. 570; comp. also *infra* sect. V. Philo (De Special. Legg. III. 23) observes that the High-priest "presides over and dispenses justice to all who dispute in accordance with the laws" (*πρυτανεύων μὲν τὰ δίκαια τοῖς ἀμφισβητοῦσι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους*). It is not stated whether or in what manner his revenues differed from those of common priests.

[13] 2 Ki. XI. 2; 2 Chr. XXII. 11.

[14] 1 Macc. XVI. 12; comp., however, Sect. V. 6.

[15] Lev. XXI. 11, 12.

PP 2

all occasions, preserve tranquillity of mind and comeliness of outward appearance; he was to rise above the disturbing influences of human joys and human sorrows.[1] His vestments were, like those of the common priests, to be made "for glory and distinction";[2] but they were marked both by pre-eminent splendour and symbolical significance. They tended to indicate the nature, the holiness, and the exalted importance of his office; so especially the ephod, on the two shoulders of which he was to wear, engraven on two onyx-stones, the names of the children of Israel, "for a memorial" before the Lord;[3] the breast-plate (חֹשֶׁן) with its twelve precious stones, each of which was to bear the name of one of the twelve tribes of Israel — "and Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel on the breast-plate of decision upon his heart, when he goes into the holy place, for a memorial before the Lord continually";[4] the Urim and Thummim, the oracle of God, which "shall be on Aaron's heart when he goes in before the Lord, and Aaron shall bear the decision of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually";[5] the golden bells on the hem of the robe, which "shall be upon Aaron to minister", and the sound of which, when heard on Aaron's appearance before the Lord, shall remind the Israelites of the awe and sanctity of the moment;[6] and so also the golden plate (צִיץ) on the mitre bearing the solemn words, *Holiness to the Lord*, and always preserved on Aaron's forehead "that he may bear the iniquity of the Israelites' sacred gifts," and render them acceptable before the Lord.[7] The Hight-priest's vestments, therefore, ingeniously and strikingly conveyed that he was the sole mediator between God and the entire nation, that he was designed constantly to remind the holy people of its mission and its obligations; and that he assisted them, in these noble aims, by effecting their expiation and securing their forgiveness by God.[8] But on the

---

1 Lev. XXI. 10; comp. X. 6; Ezek. XLIV. 20; *Mishn.* Sanhedr. II. 1 (where minute regulations are given); Horay. III. 5; *Talm.* Sanhedr. 19; see Comm. on X. 1—7; comp., however, Matth. XXVI. 65; 1 Macc. XI. 71; *Jos.* Bell. Jud. II. xv. 4; see *infra*.

2 לְכָבוֹד וּלְתִפְאָרֶת, Exod. XXVIII. 2.

3 Exod. XXVIII. 12.

4 Exod. XXVIII. 21, 29.

5 Exod. XXVIII. 30.

6 Exod. XXVIII. 35.

7 Exod. XXVIII. 37, 38. It is artificial to derive from the term ציץ in connection with the narrative concerning the blooming rod of Aaron (Num. XVII. 17—24) the idea that the priests are the "blooming" or "flowering" persons (*Bähr*, Symb. II. 21); for although blossom and flower are emblems of life, and true life manifests itself in holiness, it is a forced conclusion to declare blooming and holines synonymous.

8 See in general Comm. on Exod. pp. 522—549. The High-priest, of course, was clad in his sacred garments only while performing his pontifical duties; ordinarily, and even when presiding at the supreme courts, he was

Day of Atonement, when he entered the Holy of Holies, he was commanded to wear garments of plain white linen (בַּד);[9] he could not appropriately, when craving remission of his own sins and acting as the intercessor of a sinful and penitent people, appear before God arrayed in splendid attire made "for glory and distinction"; feelings of humility and contrition behoved him when approaching the presence of the omnipotent Judge; and they were best typified by a simple vesture of spotless white.

16. The Levites,[10] in relation to the priesthood, comprised all the descendants of Levi, except those of Aaron[11] — the progeny of Gershon and Merari, of Izhar and Uzziel, and of Moses.[12] They had no immediate connection with the internal and important part of the public service. Their task was not spiritual, but menial and mechanical. They were the ministers and attendants of the priests, for whom they executed all physical and subordinate work. For they were not properly *elected* by God, like the priests, but merely *separated* from among the Israelites, or set apart for certain services,[13] because they had, on some prominent occasions, evinced an ardent zeal for God's cause, even conquering and suppressing their natural instincts and human sympathies.[14] They were, in fact, mere substitutes for as many Israelites,

---

dressed in other clothes (*Joseph.* Bell. Jud. V. v. 7); thus he was not recognized by Paul in the sanhedrim (Acts XXIII. 5); and, on some occasions, he is stated to have rent his garments (Matth. XXVI. 65; 1 Macc. XI. 71).

[9] Namely כתנת בד, מכנסי בד, אבנט בד, and מצנפת בד (Lev. XVI. 4), comprehensively called "holy garments" (בִּגְדֵי קֹדֶשׁ). Jewish tradition designated them בגדי לבן, in contradistinction to בגדי זהב, his usual vestments. It is remarkable that Josephus (l. c.), on the contrary, observes that the High-priest wore his coloured garments only on the Day of Atonement; whereas in another passage, he declares that he wore them both on the Day of Atonement and on the three great festivals (Ant. XVIII. iv. 3) — an additional instance of the disagreement between the statements of that author and those of Scripture with respect to the priesthood and public worship. In *Mishn.* Yom. III. 7, double garments of linen are mentioned, which is a later development of the precept of the Pentateuch. — Plato (Legg. XII. 7, p. 956A) considered *white* as the most appropriate colour in connection with the worship of the gods (*χρώματα δὲ λευκὰ πρέποντ' ἂν θεοῖς εἴη καὶ ἄλλοθι καὶ ἐν ὑφῇ*); and with respect to the flamen Dialis, Varro quoted by Gellius (Noct. Att. X. 15) observes, Is solus album habet galerum, vel quod maximus est, vel quod Jovi immolata hostia alba fieri oporteat (comp. *supra* pp. 101, 102).

[10] לְוִיִּם, בְּנֵי לֵוִי (Exod. VI. 16, 25; etc. etc.); Sept. *Λευῖται*; comp. *Plut.* Symp. IV. vi. 2.

[11] Num. III. 9.

[12] See *supra* p. 563.

[13] Num. VIII. 14, והבדלת את־הלוים מתוך בני ישראל; XVI. 9, הבדיל אלהי ישראל אתכם מעדת ישראל.

[14] Deut. XXXIII. 8. 9; Exod. XXXII. 27—29. The Chronist, guided by his well-known principles, speaks of priests and Levites in nearly identical

according to a peculiar theory of the Pentateuch. For its doctrine is this. All the firstborn males, both of men and beasts, belong to God;[1] for when the firstborn were smitten by Him in Egypt, He saved those of the Hebrews;[2] but instead of every firstborn male Israelite, He ordered a Levite to be substituted and dedicated for His service; and the firstborn Hebrews that were at that time in excess of the Levites, and those born in future generations, were to be redeemed by five shekels each, to be given to the priests;[3] while the firstborn male animals, whether of the clean or unclean species, were the objects of special enactments.[4] Therefore, the Levites were indeed also "brought near",[5] yet not only to God,[6] but to the priests as well whom they *served*,[7] to whom they were *joined*[8] or *given*[9] as a *present*.[10] They were forbidden to approach the holy implements, especially the altar; if they did so, they were

---

terms; for in reference to the former he says וַיִּבָּדֵל אַהֲרֹן (1 Chr. XXIII. 13; comp. *supra* p. 561), and in reference to the latter, בם בחר יהוה (1 Chr. XV. 2); both priests and Levites bless the people (2 Chr. XXX. 27; comp. vers. 15, 21, 22); nay he goes occasionally so far as to place the Levites, in dignity and piety, above the priests (2 Chr. XXIX. 34; XXXVI. 14), which implies a total perversion of the laws of the Pentateuch; for even Ezekiel (XLIV. 10—14) represents the toilsome lowness of Levitical duties as a punishment for constant idolatry.

[1] Exod. XIII. 2, 12; XXXIV. 19, 20.

[2] Num. III. 12, 13; VIII. 16, 17; Exod. XIII. 14, 15. This view is supposed to have originated in the circumstance that Moses abolished, or was believed to have abolished, the sacrifices of children to which the Hebrews were attached as a result of their Sabaean idolatry (comp. *Vatke*, Theol. des A. T. I. p. 198).

[3] Num. III. 40—51. We here refrain from discussing the errors and improbabilities of the account in Numbers, which states 22,000 as the sum of the firstborn males (ver. 39), whereas the single items added together would yield the aggregate of 22,300 (viz. 7,500+8,600+6,200, vers. 22, 28, 34); and according to which one child in about 50 only would be a firstborn boy, which is against all experience. We shall return to the subject in the volume on Numbers.

[4] Exod. XIII. 13; XXXIV. 20. Num. XVIII. 15, 17; Deut. XV. 19—22; see *infra* Sect. III. 9—11.

[5] הַקְרֵב אֶת־מַטֵּה לֵוִי, Num. III. 6; comp. XVIII. 2.

[6] Comp. Num. XVI. 9, 10.

[7] Num. III. 6—9; VIII. 26; XVIII. 2.

[8] נלוו עליך, Num. XVIII. 2, 4.

[9] נְתֻנִים, Num. III. 9; VIII. 16, 19.

[10] מַתָּנָה, Num. XVIII. 6. The priests are called הַקְּרֵבִים מִבְּנֵי לֵוִי (Ezek. XL. 46); and the office of the Levites is described to be "to wait on the sons of Aaron for the service of the house of Jehovah, in the courts, and the chambers, and the purifying of all sacred things" (1 Chr. XXIII. 28, מעמדם ליד בני אהרן). Artificial is Öhler's view of the position of the Levites (in Herz. VIII. 349); he calls them first the "living *sacrifice*" by which the Israelites make *payment* to God for the existence which they owe to Him, and then the "*atonement* for the Hebrews", who, on account of their sinfulness, were unfit to come near God through their firstborn: this outsteps the concessions of the Pentateuch.

menaced with the punishment of death, together with the priests who permitted the desecration.[11] They were, like the common Hebrews, restricted to the Court, which, however, uncircumcised non-Israelites were forbidden to enter.[12] It was their office "to keep the charge of the Sanctuary", that is, "to do the service of the Tent of Meeting".[13] Therefore, when during the journeys of the Israelites, the camp was about to be removed, the *priests* carefully enveloped all the holy utensils,[14] and then only the Kohathites were permitted to approach, and to receive, for transportation, the vessels assigned to them individually; for they were sure to die, nay their whole race was certain to be extirpated, if they ventured to go into the Sanctuary "but a moment" to see it.[15] But just as the Levites were "strangers" in relation to the priests, so were the other Israelites strangers in relation to the Levites; any common Hebrew who attempted to perform even the manual services appropriated to the Levites forfeited his life; and the Law warned the people "that there be no plague among the children of Israel, when the children of Israel come near the Sanctuary."[16] The Israelites were effectually and totally to be kept away from the ministrations of the Sanctuary; they were, therefore, replaced by the Levites who, in this respect, formed the connecting link between the people and the priests, in a similar manner as the priests stood between the people and God.

17. The work of the Levites, in detail, was as follows. They had to take care of the Tabernacle and its vessels.[17] They were stationed round it during the encampments.[18] They took it down, when the journey was to be continued, and they set it up when the camp was to be pitched.[19] They carried it with its implements during the wanderings, as has just been stated;[20] and in proportion to their degree of relationship to the sacerdotal family of Aaron, they were entrusted with objects of greater or inferior holiness.[21] They had, of course, to assist in the

[11] Num. XVIII. 3, 5; XVII. 5; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 13, 14.

[12] Comp. Ezek. XLIV. 7—9.

[13] לעבד את־עבדת משכן יהוה, or אהל מועד, Num. XVI. 9; XVIII. 3, 4, 6; VIII. 19, 22; or more clearly still עשה המלאכה לעבדת בית יהוה, 1 Chr. XXIII. 24; comp. vers. 28, 32; see also Exod. XXXVIII. 21; Num. IV. 3, 30; VIII. 24—26.

[14] Num. IV. 5—14.

[15] כְּבַלַּע, vers. 15—20; comp. I. 49—51; X. 17, 21.

[16] Num. VIII. 19; I. 51, 53; III. 10, 38; XVII. 27, 28; XVIII. 22; comp. 2 Chr. XXVI. 16—21.

[17] Num. III. 8, 25—38.

[18] And later, they lodged round the Temple, 1 Chr. IX. 27.

[19] Num. I. 50, 51, 53.

[20] Comp. Deut. XXXI. 25; 1 Sam. VI. 15; 1 Chr. XV. 2, 27; XXIII. 26; 2 Chr. V. 4; comp., however, Deut. XXXI. 9; Josh. III. 3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17; IV. 9, 10, 16, 18; VI. 6, 12; VIII. 33; 1 Ki. II. 26; VIII. 3; where either "the priests" or "the priests the Levites" are stated to have carried the Ark; see *infra* Sect. IV. 1.

[21] Comp. Num. IV. 4—33, containing a minute and characteristic enumeration.

offering of the sacrifices on week-days, sabbaths, and festivals,[1] especially in receiving the blood of the victims in the appointed vessels and presenting it to the priests for sprinkling.[2] The charge with which they were entrusted over the utensils and implements of the Sanctuary, included the duty of keeping them properly cleaned. They had to prepare the holy ointment, the oblations made in pans[3] or soaked in oil, the shew-bread, and the other unleavened cakes.[4] At the Temple, they were the keepers of the entrances, courts, chambers, and porticoes, round which they resided; they were the porters at its gates, which they had to open and to close.[5] In later times, they were, together with the priests, the guardians of the treasures of the Temple,[6] with an inspector (נגיד), a vice-overseer (משנה), and subordinate officers (פְּקִידִים);[7] they were charged with the care of the stores of flour, oil, wine, frankincense, and spices kept in the chambers, and with the control over the measures and weights. They had to collect the contributions volunteered by the Israelites for the necessary repairs,[8] and to superintend the progress of the works.[9] They had to attend the morning and evening services, and to adorn them by vocal and instrumental music, while the priests generally sounded the trumpets.[10] According to the Chronist, they were, from the time of David, chosen for civil and municipal officers,[11] for attendants of the kings,[12] and, in common with the priests, for judges (שפטים), perhaps of the inferior courts,[13] and for teachers of the people;[14] and later still they had to enforce the sanctity of the sabbath.[15]

18. When thus their authority increased, they were considered too holy for many of the inferior services of the Sanctuary; and hence they were assisted by subordinates (נתינים),[16] exactly as they them-

---

1 Comp. 2 Chr. XXIX. 34; XXX. 17; XXXV. 11.

2 2 Chr. XXX. 16.

3 מעשה החבתים, see note on VI. 12—16.

4 Comp. 1 Chr. IX. 32; XXIII. 29.

5 Comp. 1 Chr. IX. 23—25, 27; *Philo*, De Praem. c. 6. According to *Mishn*. Midd. I. 1, they had, at the second Temple, to keep vigil at 21 places.

6 Neh. XIII. 13; 1 Chr. IX. 26; XXIII. 28; XXVI. 20—26; comp. *Joseph*. Ant. VII. xiv. 7.

7 2 Chr. XXXI. 12—15.

8 2 Chr. XXIV. 12.

9 2 Chr. XXXIV. 12, 13.

10 1 Chr. IX. 29; XV. 16—24; XVI. 4—8; XXIII. 5; XXV. 1—4; 2 Chr. V. 12, 13; VII. 6; VIII. 14, 15; Ezra III. 10; Neh. XII. 27; see *supra* p. 568.

11 שוטרים, 1 Chr. XXIII. 4; XXVI. 29; 2 Chr. XIX. 11.

12 1 Chr. XXVI. 30, לעבדת המלך.

13 1 Chr. XXIII. 4; XXVI. 29; 2 Chr. XIX. 11; XXXIV. 13.

14 2 Chr. XVII. 7—9; see in general 1 Chr. IX. 14—32; XXIII. 4—32; XXVI. 12—30; see also *De Wette*, Archaeol. § 227 note *c*.

15 Neh. XIII. 22.

16 Sept. *Ναθινεὶμ* (Ezr. II. 70; VII. 7, 24, 73; VIII. 20; Neh. III. 26; VII. 46; X. 29), *Ναθινὶμ* (Neh. III. 31), or *Ναθιναῖοι* (Ezr. II. 43, 58; Neh. XI. 21), also *δεδομένοι* (1 Chr. IX. 2) or

selves had before been associated (נתונים) with the priests.[17] These *nethinim* lived partly in Jerusalem,[18] and partly in the Levitical and other towns;[19] they were probably captives of war made proselytes,[20] as the Book of Joshua exemplifies with regard to the Gibeonites;[21] they were supposed to have been given up to the Sanctuary by David, Solomon, and other kings;[22] and seem to have been held in great contempt.[23]

19. In the Pentateuch, the Levites are merely subdivided into their principal houses (בֵּית אָב) and families (מִשְׁפָּחָה); each of the former was presided over by a chief (נָשִׂיא); and the degree of their consanguinity with the holy family of Aaron decided their position and functions. But the Chronist[24] attributes to David a division of the Levites, whose number he states at 38,000 men above 30 years, into four classes. 1. The *servants of the priests* or the proper *Levites*,[25] 24,000 in number;[26] 2. *Judges* and *civil officers*,[27] 6,000; 3. *Porters*,[28] 4,000; and 4. *Singers* and *Musicians*,[29] 4,000.[30] — This statement of

---

ἱερόδουλοι (1 Esdr. V. 29, 35; VIII. 5, 22, 49; *Jos.* Ant. XI. v. 1. In 1 Esdr. I. 3 the Levites themselves are called ἱερόδουλοι.

17 1 Chr. IX. 2; Ezr. II. 43; VII. 7; Neh. VII. 46.

18 Neh. III. 26, 31; XI. 21.

19 Ezr. II. 70; Neh. VII. 73; XI. 21.

20 Neh. X. 29. 21 Josh. IX. 21, 23, 27.

22 Ezr. VIII. 20; comp. II. 43—58; Neh. VII. 60; XI. 3.

23 *Mishn.* Yevam. II. 4; Horay. I. 4; III. 8; Sot. IV. 1; Kiddush. III. 12; IV. 1; *Talmud*, Yevam. 20*b*; where they are placed into the same category with the ממזרים to whom they were even inferior, since the latter were at least of Jewish descent. They correspond therefore hardly with the Roman popae and victimarii, whose position may be more properly compared with that of the Levites. —Thus rich Mohammedans present slaves to the Kaaba at Mecca or the holy grave at Medina for the discharge of menial duties; and such persons can thenceforth never be employed for any other purpose (see *Ewald*, Alterthümer, p. 300). On the character of the Greek ἱερόδουλοι as the "serfs of the gods", to whose service they were dedicated by gift or purchase, and to whom alone they were then subjected as free clients, see *Böck* and *Buttmann* in *Hirt's* Hierodulen pp. 48—64; and on the ministers of priests in general *Hermann*, Gottesdienstl. Alterth. § 36.

24 1 Chr. XXIII. 4—32; XXVI. 12—30.

25 לְנַצֵּחַ עַל־מלאכת בית יהוה, called by Josephus (Ant. VII. xiv. 7) ἐπιμεληταὶ τῆς οἰκοδομίας τοῦ ναοῦ.

26 Whereas Josephus (l. c.) fixes them at 23,000, while he puts the total at 38,050. 27 שופטים ושוטרים, κριταὶ καὶ γραμματεῖς.

28 שוערים θυρωροὶ or πυλωροί.

29 מהללים, ἱεροψάλται or ὑμνῳδοί.

30 Comp. also Ezra II. 40—42, 70; VII. 24; 1 Chr. XXV. 1—31; 2 Chr. XXIII. 2—8. Neh. VII. 43—45. According to Ezra and Nehemiah (ll. cc.) no more than 341 or 360 Levites returned altogether from Babylon with *Zerubbabel;* nor did the Levites show greater readiness to follow *Ezra* into Palestine (Ezra VIII. 15; comp., however, Neh. XI. 15—24; XII. 27—29), wherefore the Talmud (Yevam. 26*a*) asserts that Ezra deprived them of the tithes which he granted to the priests, and left it to the latter to provide for the Levites (see, however, *infra* Sect. III. 6—8).

the Chronist must be estimated and judged, in the same manner as the division of the priests mentioned by the same writer, namely, as a much later arrangement unwarrantably ascribed by him to David.[1]

20. This being the character and the office of the Levites, they were, indeed, amply provided for, so as to be able to pursue their peculiar occupations without interruption or harassing care; for though they did not obtain the territorial possessions[2] to which they were properly entitled,[3] since their portion and their inheritance were God or "the offerings of the Lord God of Israel",[4] they received, according to the most favourable ordinances, in return for their services at the Sanctuary, the tenth part of all produce of the soil and of the annual increase of cattle; of the former, however, they had to give the tenth part to the priests.[5] They were naturally exempt from military service and all taxes,[6] and yet probably received a share of the booty of war.[7] For their abodes were assigned to them 35 cities,[8] whether partially or exclusively,[9] on both sides of the Jordan, within the territories of all tribes, except Judah, Benjamin, and Simeon, which were reserved for the habitations of the *priests* (see *supra)*; and to each town was attached landed property to the extent of a thousand cubits round the wall, or two thousand from one extreme point to the other, to serve as

[1] Comp. *De Wette*, Archäol. § 240 ("this division can with safety only be supposed in the period after the exile"); *Ewald*, Geschichte, III. 57; whereas Öhler (in Herz. VIII. 356) still professes confidence in it, and complacently asks "Where in the subsequent ages can the time be found in which the re-establishment of the Levitical regulations is rationally to be supposed?" after which he proceeds, with great simplicity, to construct a history of the Levites mainly from the Books of Chronicles—a process which seems to be an anachronism at the present state of criticism.—This division was modified by Agrippa II (*Jos.* Ant. XX. viii. 6), according to Josephus (Ant. VII. xiv. 7), who divided the Levites also, like the priests, into 24 courses (*πατριαί*) or sections (*μέρη*), each serving, by lot, for one week (comp. 1 Chr. IX. 25); see also *Lightfoot*, Opp. I. 694—700.

[2] Num. XVIII. 20, 23, 24; XXVI. 62; Deut. X. 9; XII. 12; XIV. 27, 29; XVIII. 1.

[3] Num. XXXV. 2, ונתנו ללוים מנחלת אחוזתם.

[4] Num. XVIII. 20; Deut. X. 9; XVIII. 2; Josh. XIII. 14, 33; XIV. 3; XVIII. 7; Ezek. XLIV. 28; Sir. XLV. 27; comp. also Ps. XVI. 5; Lam. III. 24.

[5] Num. XVIII. 21—32; comp. *Joseph.* Ant. IV iv. 3; Neh. X. 36—40; XII. 44; XIII. 12; 2 Chr. XXXI. 4—8; see, however, *infra*, Sect. III. 6—8.

[6] Comp. Ezra VII. 24; *Joseph.* Ant. III. xii. 4; IV. iv. 3; XI. v. 1; XII. iii. 3.

[7] Num. XXXI. 26—47; see *infra*.

[8] The Kohathites 10, the Gershonites 13, and the Merarites 12 (Josh. XXI. 4—7; 1 Chr. VI. 46—48).

[9] The latter is, according to the wording of the law, more probable, though the Levites might temporarily sell their houses (Lev. XXV. 32, 33), and thus Israelites and Levites might live together in the same town; on 1 Sam. VI. 15 see *infra*, Sect. IV. 9.

pasturage for their cattle,[10] an arrangement the purpose and propriety of which will be discussed hereafter.[11]

But, in all other respects, they were, by the ordinances of the Pentateuch, marked out not only as strikingly inferior to the priests, but as endowed with a character of no peculiar significance or holiness. As regards their qualification, physical perfection was not required as a necessary condition; any member of the families of Levi, except that of Aaron, was admitted, and served from the twenty-fifth or thirtieth to the fiftieth year of his life.[12] They were initiated in their office by rites of the simplest description; they were neither clothed nor anointed, but merely "cleansed" (טהר) by purifying water, "waved" before God, and introduced by a sin-offering and a holocaust.[13] They had no distinguishing garments, in which important point, therefore, they did not differ from the common Israelites.[14]

After this sketch in which we have endeavoured to admit no features except those warranted by the Pentateuch, while scrupulously excluding or separating from them all elements derived from other sources, we may be prepared to furnish

## II. AN ESTIMATE OF THE LEGISLATIVE VALUE OF THESE ORDINANCES.

1. It is true, that the priests of the Hebrews were not, like those of other nations, the supposed depositaries of secret or exclusive wisdom and learning; they simply expounded and diffused the teaching of that Book which was the common heirloom of the whole community; for all had entered the covenant with God on the basis of that Law which Moses handed over not to the priests alone, but also to the elders of the people,[15] of which the kings were ordered to have a copy

---

[10] Num. XXXV. 4, 5; comp. *Rosenm.* in loc.; *Keil* on Josh. pp. 272, 273; *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. pp. 100*sqq.;* Archäol. II. 86*sqq.*

[11] See *infra*, Sect. III. 4.

[12] Num. IV. 3, 23, 30, 39, 43, 47; comp. 1 Chr. XXIII. 3; and Num. VIII. 23—26; see *infra* Sect. III. 5. According to the Talmud (Chull. 24*a*), the limit of 50 years was maintained in the desert only, while it was abandoned already at Shiloh, except in case of failing voice.

[13] Num. VIII. 5—22.

[14] The musicians, however, are in 2 Chr. V. 12 stated to have been "arrayed in white linen" (מְלֻבָּשִׁים בּוּץ; comp. 1 Chr. XV. 27). But in the reign of Agrippa II, the Levites who served as musicians and who seem to have enjoyed greater respect, were permitted to wear priestly dress (*Jos.* Ant. XX. ix. 6); which is entirely opposed to the spirit of the Levitical office as marked out in the Pentateuch. — On the position of the Levites according to the Deuteronomist see *infra*, Sect. III. 1.

[15] Deut. XXXI. 9.

prepared for themselves to study in it constantly,[1] and which was to be read, at regular intervals, to the assembled people.[2] Justly, therefore, might Josephus write, "There were in the Temple not any mysteries that may not be spoken of ... for what I have now said is publicly known, and supported by the testimony of the whole people, and the operations of the priests are entirely manifest."[3] Nor does that Book contain any doctrines that were not within the capacity of the humblest Israelite, for it disclosed no cosmic mysteries or intricate problems of nature, but narrated, in simple language, the origin and early history of the Hebrew race, and enforced moral and religious laws, which were either traced to incidents of that history or are derived from our common humanity. Yet, why were the priests appointed the special, if not the exclusive guardians, of the Law? The reply is, because they were supposed, by their anointment, to have been endowed with the holy spirit which enabled them to penetrate more infallibly into the depths of the revealed word. Thus a supernatural element of the most dangerous kind was introduced. It cannot be called otherwise than hierarchical. The foundation of the system seemed to be a common equality of all Israelites; but the very first layer above it was an exceptional qualification of the priests of so extraordinary a nature, that, in reality, not only all parity between priests and Israelites was destroyed, but almost all spiritual community between them became impossible. Hence the priesthood annulled, in a great measure, the benefits which the diffusion of a moral code like that of the Pentateuch was calculated to produce; for it engendered, in the minds of the people, mistrust in their own ability of fathoming the whole truth of the Law, and thus caused a deplorable feeling of spiritual dependency;[4] and since the priests were supposed to understand the precepts more profoundly than the Israelites, that unfortunate mode of Biblical interpretation was encouraged, which

---

1 Deut. XVII. 18, 19.

2 Deut. XXXI. 10—13; see p. 569; comp. also XXX. 11—14, "this law is not hidden from thee nor is it far off.... but the word is very nigh to thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart"; see *De Wette*, Vorlesungen über die Religion, pp. 423, 424; *Saalsch.* Mos. R. I. 116, 117.

3 *Joseph.* Ap. II. 8, nihil amplius neque mysteriorum aliquorum ineffabilium agitur etc. In the Mishnah (Yom. III. 11) some men are severely censured because they refused to teach others certain accomplishments in connection with the sacred service which were hereditary in their families. Comp., on the other hand, with regard to the Druids and others, *Diod. Sic.* V. 31; *Caes.* Bell. Gall. VI. 13, 14; *Mela*, III. 6, 23; *Strabo* IV. iv. 3—5, pp. 197, 198; *Porphyr.* Abst. iv. 6; see *Bähr*, Symb. II. 25—30.

4 It appears indeed that copies of the Law, by no means numerous or common, were mostly in the hands of the Levites; comp. 2 Chr. XVII. 7—9; also Deut. XXXI. 9.

discovers extraordinary and hidden meanings in the plainest texts, and which degenerated into mysticism or pharasaical playfulness.[5] For the history of all religious and philosophical systems proves that similar aberrations are unavoidable from the moment that the simple and intelligible words of the masters or founders are made the subject of speculative enquiry by a separate class of men.

2. It will, therefore, be easy to judge of the value of the declaration that the Hebrews were to form "a kingdom of priests". Great importance has been attached to this term, and lofty theories have been built upon it. But was the institution of the priesthood designed to make it a reality? The family of Aaron was represented as specially *elected* by God for a particular and holy mission. Thus it was severed from the rest of the people, and raised above it to an unapproachable distance. It monopolised all the sacred functions which, in any way, tended to connect the Israelite with his God. But this was not sufficient; the common Hebrew was not only debarred from the more significant rites of public or private worship; he was to be absolutely excluded from all participation in sacred things. Not even the menial and most subordinate labours of the Sanctuary was he permitted to perform. For this purpose, another body of men, the Levites, was interposed between him and the priests. If he dared to appropriate to himself even any of these low offices, it was a crime of death.[6] In a word, he was, by the precepts of the Pentateuch, utterly deprived of the natural privileges which he enjoyed in a simple state of society. The Hebrews were, by the Law, not *made* "a nation of priests", but they *ceased* to be one. A hierarchy was organised. We find, in the Hebrew writings, a strong and marked contrast between priests and people.[7] The apparent parallels in the designation of the one and the other (p. 561) were no more than a theory without a practical embodiment. The pretence that the Hebrews

---

[5] See pp. 143—146.

[6] We are, in this respect, almost reminded of Polybius' view of the Roman priesthood and religion; he calls the superstitious fears of the gods (*δεισιδαιμονία*) the chief pillar of the state; for wise legislators, he says, surrounded religion with "mysterious terror and similar jugglery" (*τοιαύτῃ τραγῳδίᾳ*) to check by fear the multitude which is everywhere frivolous, easily carried away by unlawful desires, blind anger, and hot passions (*Polyb.* VI. 56). The authority of the Egyptian priests extended even to the dead, since it was in their power to grant or to deny an honourable sepulture.

[7] Comp. Isai. XXIV. 2; Hos. IV. 9; Jer. I. 18. Even *Ewald* (Alterthümer, p. 282), who takes rather an ideal view of the Hebrew priesthood, admits, though but passingly and lightly, the very striking separation between priests and people; and Riehm (Stud. und Krit. 1865, p. 42) is compelled to observe, "The idea that Israel is a nation of priests, has really but a very subordinate force for the individual

themselves renounced their priestly privileges (p. 562), is illusory; for even if it be taken as historically true, it would alter nothing in our estimate of the priestly institutions. For while the resignation of the Hebrews could only have been temporary, the priestly institutions were meant to be unchangeable for all future times: if an untutored people just loosed from oppressive fetters, was disqualified for sacerdotal dignities, it need and ought not to have remained so after centuries of training through the Law.[1] How different was the voice of enlightened prophets who fervidly longed for the time when the Lord would pour out His spirit over "the house of Israel",[2] nay over "all flesh",[3] a sentiment attributed in the Pentateuch to Moses also in the memorable words, "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His spirit upon them".[4] — The expression "kingdom of priests" remained a phrase which, so far from being realised, was rendered impossible by the leading principles of the Pentateuch; it had no influence upon the development of the nation; it was a fine but fleeting idea of a gifted mind;[5] and the only notion, vague as it is, that can, from the system of the Pentateuch, be attached to it, is that the Hebrews should one day become the links between God and the heathens, just as the priests are the links between God and the Israelites; though it is very doubtful, whether this meaning was intended by the words, "You shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation."[6]

members of the community", and then alludes to the barriers which excluded them from direct communion with God.

[1] Entirely erroneous is therefore the common view of the subject, upheld by a host of writers, and thus expressed by Hengstenberg (Auth. des Pent. II. 7), "All the arts by which the priests of other nations raised themselves and their duties, did not exist among the Hebrews; these had no hierarchy; the influence of the priests depended on the goodwill of the people"; comp. *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. I. pp. XVII, 24—28, 120, 121; *Philippson* on Num. XVIII. 1, p. 763; Israel. Religionslehre, III. 201 *sqq.*; a. o.

[2] Ezek. XXXIX. 29.

[3] Joel III. 1, 2; comp. Isai. XI. 9; LIV. 13; Jer. XXXI. 34; etc.

[4] Num. XI. 9.

[5] Comp. Isai. LXI. 6.

[6] Jost (Gesch. des Judenth., I. 146) explains "The Hebrews were, like priests, to keep entirely aloof from the manners and pursuits of other nations which indulged in sensual desires and rude violence" — which negative definition is both too narrow and too indistinct. It is of very little moment that, at the initiation of the Levites, some share in the ceremonies is permitted to the Israelites, who, naturally through the elders, lay their hands upon the Levites (Num. VIII. 10; great weight is attached to this circumstance by Saalschütz, Mos. R. I. 98): however, not the Levites but the Aaronites are the priests; moreover, it is Aaron who presents to God the Levites (ver. 11), whom the Israelites merely mark as their substitutes and who then are "separated" from the body of the people (ver. 14).

3. The chasm between the priests and the people was perpetuated and widened by the principle of *hereditary* right, according to which the priesthood was for ever restricted to one family. It may be that this principle facilitated the traditionary preservation of the ritual ordinances, and that it favoured a higher degree of culture within the priestly order; but it completed the seclusion so effectually that it is idle to deny a *caste* of priests among the Hebrews, no less distinct and exclusive than that of the Hindoos or Egyptians.[7]

4. Irrespective of the separation itself between priests and people, it is necessary to refer to the manner in which the Pentateuch describes that separation to have been effected. It was *God* who singled out the family of Aaron as His ministers, His representatives, and the teachers of His Law; and it was He who confirmed this election by miraculous interference, the budding staff of Aaron and the fearful destruction of Aaron's opponents, of Korah and his associates. What is the true scope and import of these statements? They imply the artful fiction of an author or of authors, who attempted to promulgate their own devices as Divine or supernatural arrangements, and thus to awe an impressionable nation into their acceptance and reverential observance. If the laws of priesthood had been represented as the work of a human legislator, they would simply have been a human failure, because they degraded the people instead of elevating it; but as the pretended emanation of a Divine will, they are both a failure and a fraud; and to the weakness of human judgment is added the offence of human arrogance and deceit.

All this was very different among the Greeks. They had no proper order of priests who claimed to be the privileged expositors of divine things and to have the mission of serving as mediators between the gods and men. "Greece was not favourable for hierarchical aspirations, and the priests had none of the means by which a perceptible influence might be exercised upon the minds and thoughts of the poeple, such as the instruction of the young, preaching, or the cure of souls in any

[7] The remark of Bähr (Symb. II. 34), "that in cases of urgency, non-Aaronites also were permitted to perform priestly functions", is entirely erroneous; the Law admits such "cases of urgency" under no pretence whatever; and the historical instances of non-Aaronites officiating as priests, prove the non-existence of the Law at the time of their occurrence (see *infra*, Sect. IV. 10, 11). An instructive parallel to the separation between priests and people is the account of Chaeremon with respect to the Egyptian priests, *σεμνοὺς δὲ αὐτοὺς παρεῖχε καὶ τὸ δυσεπίμικτον . . . τὸν δ'ἄλλον χρόνον ἁπλούστερον μὲν τοῖς ὁμοίοις ἐπεμίγνυντο, τῶν δὲ ἐξωτικῶν τῆς θρησκείας οὐδενὶ συνεβίουν, ἐφαίνοντο δὲ ἀεὶ θεῶν ἢ ἀγαλμάτων ἐγγύς* (*Porph.* Abst. IV. 6).

sense; the priests were no preceptors of theology, as indeed religion was taught neither in schools nor in temples."[1] The priests were charged mainly with the supervision of the temple, the administration of its property (τέμενος), and the direction of its public worship. No exclusive or literary qualification or training, no theological learning, were required; those from whom a knowledge of religious information was obtainable, included poets, law-givers, philosophers, and even sculptors and painters, who were neither priests themselves nor stood under priestly authority.[2] Isocrates says distinctly, "The priestly dignity belongs to all men."[3] The chief of every house was permitted to offer sacrifices without requiring the co-operation of a priest. Anyone might perform religious rites except at a public temple where priests were indispensable.[4] Though in some cases the priesthood was hereditary in certain families, especially if the sanctuary had been founded by an individual and had then made over to the community,[5] or if the worship of a family had been raised to a state-worship, and though members of wealthy and distinguished families were naturally preferred,[6] the appointment took place, in most cases, by election or by lot,[7] or by a mode combining both, and sometimes by purchase; the priestly offices were virtually open to every free-born Greek who enjoyed the full rights of citizenship (ἐπιτιμία),[8] was honourably descended up to the third line, and not afflicted with bodily defects or infirmities;[9] strangers and men of illegal birth (νόθοι) were alone ineligible;[10] and though in many instances the office was held for life, it was often kept for a certain period only, and not seldom renewed annually, an arrangement which was also recommended by Plato in his ideal republic.[11] Thus an undue and deep-rooting influence was prevented. The same object was attained by

---

[1] *Schömann*, Griech. Alterth. II. p. 416.

[2] Comp. *Plut.* Amator. c. 18, Moral. IV. p. 496 ed. Tauchn., τῆς δ' οὖν περὶ θεῶν δόξης καὶ παντάπασιν ἡγεμόνες καὶ διδάσκαλοι γεγόνασιν ἡμῖν οἵ τε ποιηταί, καὶ οἱ νομοθέται καὶ τρίτον οἱ φιλόσοφοι; *Dion Chrysost.* Or. XII. i. 219 *sqq.* ed. Dindorf (ὡς τοῖς πρότερον ἐμπείροις καὶ σοφοῖς ποιηταῖς ἔδοξεν).

[3] Ad Nicocl. § 6, τὴν βασιλείαν ὥσπερ ἱερωσύνην παντὸς ἀνδρὸς εἶναι νομίζουσιν.

[4] Comp., however, p. 173 notes 18 and 19.

[5] Comp. *Herod.* III. 142.

[6] *Demosth.* Eubul. § 46; *Paus.* VII. xx. 1; etc.

[7] Comp. *Plat.* Legg. VI. 7, p. 759 B.

[8] *Aeschin.* Tim. §§ 21 *sqq.*; *Demosth.* Androt. § 73.

[9] *Plat.* Legg. VI. 7, p. 759 C, δοκιμάζειν δὲ τὸν ἀεὶ λαγχάνοντα πρῶτον μὲν ὁλόκληρον καὶ γνήσιον, ἔπειτα ὡς ὅ,τι μάλιστα ἐκ καθαρευουσῶν οἰκήσεων, φόνου δὲ ἁγνὸν κτλ.

[10] Comp. *Demosth.* Eubul. § 48.: yet Aristotle (Polit. VII. 8) desired to see excluded from the priesthood, as from most rights of citizenship, agriculturists and artizans.

[11] Comp. *Hermann*, Gottesdienstl. Alterth. § 34 note 15; § 35 note 24.

other means also. "The priests were not merely functionaries who might have regarded themselves as a separate order, but they were, at the same time, citizens of their state with whose interests they were closely allied. They obeyed the same authorities with the rest of the people ... and as the contrast between state and church was utterly foreign to the character of the Greeks, no hierarchy that enslaves the minds and endeavours to establish a power of its own or a state within the state, could possibly gain ground among them."[12] Not even the priests of Zeus acquired a deeper hold or influence on account of the higher dignity of their God. Nor could the priesthood obtain any important or corporate organisation, which was prevented both by the polytheistic division of the order and the political distinctions of the tribes and cities; the ministers of one deity had nothing in common with those of another; nor were the priesthoods of the different states linked together in a manner so as to become sufficiently powerful for pursuing hierarchical claims; Delphi, though in a certain sense the religious centre of Greece, in no manner controlled the priests in the various countries.[13] It would be superfluous to point out the great intellectual advantages which Greece reaped from practices so liberal and so wise.

5. We readily admit that the Levitical system of the Pentateuch is eminently logical and admirably consistent, and we have endeavoured so to arrange its individual features, as best to disclose and unfold its beauty; its main office was *atonement*,[14] and the attributes of God upon which that office was based were His *holiness* and His *mercy*. But the *priests* were the indispensable mediators between God the holy one and sinful man, and it was through them alone that the atonement could be accomplished, which was but seldom attributed directly to God.

6. It is true that the laws of the Pentateuch admit but *one* High-priest at a time who retained his office for life, whereas in Egypt, there was a High-priest for each temple or for each God; and in other countries, there was a new High-priest appointed every year.[15] This is a natural consequence of Hebrew monotheism, which admitted but one intercessor, and of the organisation of the Hebrew people, which formed a unity, and therefore required one representative. But was the High-

---

[12] *Schömann*, l. c. p. 418, and in general pp. 392—418; *Wachsmuth*, Hellen. Alterth. II. 2. § 130; *Hermann*, Gottesd. Alterth. §§. 33—36.

[13] Thus in Rome, the Pontiffs, the Salii, the Luperci, the Arval brothers, and others, were partly independent communities, filled up by election (cooptatio) of their own body. There was, at no time, in Rome a powerful organisation comprising all the members of the sacerdotal class.

[14] Lev. X. 17; 1 Chr. VI. 34; etc. comp. also Exod. XXVIII, 38.

[15] *Lucian*, Dea Syr. c. 42; comp. *Bähr*, l. c. p. 35.

priest of the Hebrews indeed no more than their representative? His chief office as mediator, like that of the common priests,[1] was indeed the expiation and sanctification of the whole people; but he did not hold this dignity as a delegate of the *nation*; he held it as the elected and anointed of *God*. His authority thus became necessarily exaggerated and dangerous. He was no longer the mouth-piece of his fellow-men only, but the messenger and special servant of the supreme Being. It was a grave aberration when he assumed a position of higher sanctity than the nation itself; when he was placed above the community, as if he were anything else but its reflex;[2] and when his sin-offering was made more solemn than that of the nation, as if his purity were of greater moment than the purity of those for whom he was supposed to act.[3] This mistake tended likewise to corrupt the theocracy into a hierarchy; it utterly destroyed the idea of a "kingdom of priests;" it was the rock upon which the fair hopes of the Hebrew patriots were ultimately wrecked. Nay, any sin which the High-priest committed caused at the same time the guilt of the whole people;[4] even as a frail and erring man, he was inseparably bound up with the community; he might save it by his piety or bring misery and destruction upon it by his iniquity: is it possible to conceive the pontifical office in a more hierarchical spirit?

7. It is generally contended that the Hebrew priests and Levites, though enabled to live in plenty, were, according to the enactments of the Pentateuch, not in a condition to obtain undue influence by their wealth and property. We will admit this at present, for argument's sake, though we shall prove later that this opinion must be essentially modified.[5] Yet thus much is certain that their territorial possessions were insignificant. In this respect, the laws of the Pentateuch contrast favourably with the arrangements of other ancient polities. In Egypt, the caste of the priests, the first in the country, possessed the third part of the arable land, free from all taxes, the remaining fields being claimed by the king and the soldiers;[6] each temple had large and hereditary domains, and every High-priest was the owner of princely territories; so that, in fact, the king and the priests were the chief proprietors of the land; moreover, the other priestly revenues and immunities were important and varied.[7] A similar state of things existed among other ancient nations.[8] The priests of Olympia and Delphi could lend money at interest to whole republics; and they in-

---

1 Lev. X. 17.
2 Comp. Lev. IV. 3—12 and 13—21.
3 Lev. XVI. 6 and 15; see p. 41.
4 Comp. notes on IV. 3—12.
5 See *infra*, Sect. III.
6 *Herod.* II. 141, 168; *Diod. Sic.* I. 73, 74; *Strab.* XVII. i. 3, p. 787; comp. Gen. XLVII. 20, 22, and Comm. on Gen. p. 704.
7 Comp. *Herod.* II. 37.
8 Comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. 53—55.

creased their income by every imaginable contrivance, and even by entrance-fees imposed upon visitors at the temples.[9] However, the Pentateuch, more decidedly perhaps than any other religious code, assigns to the priests their emoluments on a principle which again strongly reflects the hierarchical nature of the whole institution. For the priests received the imposts, such as tithes, firstfruits, the portions of the sacrifices, and other perquisites, not from the other tribes as contributions towards their support, which would only have been fair and reasonable, but they derived them from God Himself, to whom the gifts belonged by His command, and who then ceded them to the tribe of Levi; for, said God, "the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder have I taken from the children of Israel from the sacrifices of their thank-offerings, and have given them to Aaron the priest and to his sons, for an eternal statute from the children of Israel."[10] Thus the life of the Levites was, even with regard to their physical sustenance, removed from the ordinary and natural sphere of men, and placed into a region of exceptional and unjustifiable elevation.[11] Their existence was directly connected with the veneration of God Himself.[12] The readiness with which they were provided for was an act of dutiful piety tending to test the people's submission to God's behest's; while their neglect was contempt of His sovereignty. "The privations of the priests and Levites", observes Philo, "were a silent but powerful reproach of the iniquity of the Israelites deserting God through His ministers;" while their affluence was "a great proof of their common holiness and their accurate observance of all the laws."[13] Suppose even that their income was small, it obtained a higher value, and created greater authority and influence than the largest property of other men, on account of the donor who granted it.

[9] *Tertull.* Apol. 13 (dii vero qui magis tributarii magis sancti, imo qui magis sancti magis tributarii); etc.

[10] Lev. VII. 34; XXVII. 30; Num. XVIII. 21, 24; Deut. XVIII. 1, "they shall eat the offerings of the Lord made by fire and His inheritance"; comp. Num. XXXV. 2; *Talm.* Sanh. 39*a*.

[11] This idea is developed by Philo (De Praem. c. 4), "To appear to receive these things not from men, but from the great benefactor of all men, appears to be receiving a gift which has in it no alloy of sadness" (*ἀδυσώπητον δωρεάν*); and he justly observes, that "even the poorest must appear very rich" (*ibid.* c. 1). And Bähr (Symb. II. 44) remarks, "As the tribe of Levi was the special property of God, so was God the special possession of Levi; and as the other tribes were to live upon the produce of their legitimate property, so Levi upon what God offered them"; comp. ibid. p. 48.

[12] The matter was similar among the Phoenicians (comp. *Movers*, Opferwesen der Carth. p. 127), the Greeks (comp. *Hesychius* v. *θευμορία*), a. o.; indeed Movers (l. c.) contends, though perhaps too sweepingly, that the surrender of portions of sacrifices to the priests merely in return for their trouble and labours, was unknown in the ancient world.

[13] *Philo*, l. c. c. 5.

The sustenance of the priests, whether abundant or moderate, had a glory far beyond the splendour of kings and princes. It was another instrument of spiritual supremacy. The Law preserves in this point consistently its general tendency.[1] Yet the want of a proper executive power, a radical defect in the political system of the Pentateuch,[2] rendered the enforcement of the Levitical laws uncertain, and the utter destitution of the priests could not be prevented.[3]

8. The Pentateuch indeed leaves the office of priest distinct from that of prophet,[4] representing throughout the one by the High-priest Aaron and the other by the prophet Moses; and it thus acknowledges a religious influence besides its own. But if the priest taught, blessed, and judged the people; if his decisions were regarded as the infallible utterances of Divine wisdom itself; if he could, on all extraordinary emergencies, consult God, was certain of His directions, and thus secured all that fatal influence which heathen priests maintained by the alleged gift of divination; it may be well asked what scope remained for the prophet's activity? It might appear, that the mission of the latter was essentially of a political nature; but the political condition of the Hebrews was constantly traced to their religious life; national prosperity was considered the consequence of a faithful devotion to God, national calamity as the result of idolatry and impiety. Hence the prophet's work lay no less in the religious than in the political sphere. But the religious ground seems, in the Pentateuch, to be entirely occupied by the priests; they warned, exhorted, reproved, and advised the people; they narrowed the province of the prophets so much, that the latter had scarcely a special field for themselves. Thus those devoted and enlightened teachers who form the glory of Hebrew antiquity, and whose fervent utterances roused and ennobled a torpid nation, were gradually silenced. From the time of the promulgation of the Pentateuch, prophecy decayed in Israel; depraved and mercenary men, coming forward as "prophets", who flattered the prevailing and worldly principles

[1] It is artificial to contend that the Levites were left without great property in order to give them an opportunity of exercising that *faith* which it was their mission to teach and to enforce. But it may truly be said that the exclusion of the elected and favoured tribe was constantly to remind the people, that the noblest property is owned by him whose portion or inheritance is God (so *Bähr*, Symb. II. 44). The tenth part of the tithes which the Levites had to surrender to the priests, can hardly have been designed to impress upon them that they owed all their property and sustenance to God alone (*Bähr*, l. c. p. 49); but even if this were the case, that measure taught humility to the Levites, but did not tend to lessen their exalted authority in the eyes of the people.

[2] Comp. *Vatke*, Theol. I. 207, 208.

[3] See *infra* Sect. V. 6.

[4] Deut. XVIII. 18, 19; XXXIV. 10.

of government, joined depraved and mercenary priests in the oppression and corruption of the people.[5] A severe but unequal struggle ensued. The priests, generally aided by royal or secular power, gained the victory. The example of Jeremiah, though himself, like Ezekiel, of priestly descent, suffices to prove how prophets were crushed, persecuted, and massacred.[6] What greater misfortune could the Levitical ordinances of the Law bring upon the nation? The very literature degenerated, and reflected the narrowness and sterility of a system which allowed no scope to originality of research or speculation. The Books of Chronicles compared with the Books of Samuel and Kings, are like the monotonous spasms of automata compared with the free movements of a living organism. A tree without vitality, the Levitical spirit produced those withering branches of Talmudism, in which subtle casuistry took the place of creative thought, and which would have deadened the Jewish mind, had it not, consciously and unconsciously, and in spite of the Talmud, incessantly refreshed itself from the living stream of extraneous, especially pagan civilisation.

From whatever side we examine the laws of the Pentateuch, we are forced to the conclusion that they created a hierarchy spiritually separated, by strong and artfully devised barriers, from a dependent and enthralled people, and necessarily opposed to intellectual freedom and progress.[7] The Levitical system was indeed sufficiently fraught with mischief to the Jewish nation; that it did not engender more, is owing to the peculiar political condition of the people during the centuries that followed its latest development and its diffusion: but it was the cause, and in many respects the model, of that Christian hierarchy in the middle ages, which utterly enslaved the minds, banished and denounced reason, and kept for centuries the civilised world in ignominious darkness and superstitious terror.

---

[5] Hos. IX. 8—10; Mic. III. 11; Isai. XXVIII. 7; Jer. II. 8; IV. 9; V. 13, 31; VI. 13; VIII. 1, 2, 10; XIII. 13, 14; XIV. 14, 18; XXIII. 11, 14—16; XXVI. 7—11; XXVII. 9, 10; XXVIII. 15; XXIX. 31, 32; XXXII. 32; XXXIV. 18—20; Lament. IV. 13; Ezek. VII. 26; XIII. 2—12, 17—23; XXII. 25, 26; XLIV. 12; Zeph. III. 4; Mal. II. 1*sqq*, 8, 9; comp. Hos. VI. 9; Mic. III. 11; also Deut. XVIII. 20—22; 2 Chr. XXXVI. 14; 2 Macc. IV. 13, 14; 1 Sam. II. 12*sqq*, 27*sqq;* 2 Ki. XII. 5—9; *Joseph.* Ant. XX. viii. 8, IX. 2; *Talm.* Yom. 9*a*; see Sect. V.

[6] Comp. Am. VII. 10—13; 1 Ki. XVIII. 1*sqq;* XIX. 10, 14; 2 Ki. XXI. 16; Jer. II. 30; XXVI. 7—24; 2 Chr. XXIV. 20—22; *Jos.* Ant. X. iii. 1; see also Neh. IX. 26; Matth. V. 12; XXIII. 31; Acts VII. 52; 1 Thess. II. 15.

[7] We can, therefore, not accept Vatke's opinion (Relig. des A. T. I. 207), "A proper hierarchy, that is, rule of priests, was not directly established, but only prepared by the Pentateuch, as the greater part of the laws concerning the priesthood endeavour to secure the revenues of the priests rather than their power" — a view

## III. FLUCTUATIONS OF THE PENTATEUCH IN REFERENCE TO THE LAWS OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

However, it would be entirely erroneous to suppose that the arrangements of the Pentateuch with regard to the priesthood were the result of one age or the work of one man. They bear internal evidence of long fluctuations and of gradual growth. To point out that evidence, will be the next preparatory step for a history of the Hebrew priesthood; and this task, though not without difficulties, leads to results so indisputable and so important, that we trust, the reader will follow us in this enquiry without reluctance.

1. The middle Books of the Pentateuch establish that decided distinction between priests and Levites which we have above pointed out (pp. 584-587). But the Book of Deuteronomy alludes to all Levites alike as priests. The latter are never designated "sons of Aaron" as they are described in the middle Books,[1] but "the priests the Levites" (הכהנים הלוים),[2] or "the priests the sons of Levi" (הכהנים בני לוי),[3] and even "the priests the Levites, the whole tribe of Levi" (הכהנים הלוים כל־שבט לוי).[4] In the very same chapter, first the priests and then the Levites are stated to have borne the Ark,[5] as if both were identical.[6] Indeed, according to Deuteronomy, the Levites perform offices, from

which, vague in itself, is sufficiently refuted by the arguments adduced. Hengstenberg's vindication (Auth. des Pent. II. 652—663) displays the specious pleading characterising nearly all his apologetic efforts. [1] See p. 563.

[2] Deut. XVII. 9, 18; XXIV 8; XXVII. 9; comp. Josh. III. 3; VIII. 33; XXI. 1—3 (where the term לוים includes the priests); so also in Jeremiah, a contemporary of the authors of Deuteronomy, who employs synonymously הכהנים הלוים, הלוים הכהנים, and הלוים (Jer. XXXIII. 18—22), and in Deutero-Isaiah (LXVI. 21), falling within nearly the same period. Ezekiel, though clearly distinguishing the offices of priests and Levites (XL. 45, 46; XLIII. 19; XLIV. 10—16; XLVIII. 11—13), yet uses הכהנים הלוים (XLIII. 19; XLIV. 15), and so occasionally the Chronist (2 Chr. XXIII. 18; XXX. 27), following his sources, as has been supposed with probability; while in 2 Chr. V. 5 he changes הכהנים והלוים, which occurs in 1 Ki. VIII. 4, into הכהנים הלוים; see also Ezek. XLV. 5; Mal. II. 1, 4, 8; III. 3.

[3] Deut. XXI. 5; XXXI. 9.

[4] Deut. XVIII. 1; comp. X. 8, 9; XXXIII. 8—11; the English Version and other translations render arbitrarily, "The priests the Levites *and* all the tribe of Levi"; so in Josh. III. 3 the Sept., Syr., Chald., and some manuscripts, but Vulg. sacerdotes stirpis Leviticae; comp. also *Vater*, Pentat. III. 500—502. [5] Deut. XXXI. 9 and 25.

[6] It is true that on occasions of peculiar solemnity the priests and not the Levites carried the Ark (see p. 583); but in such cases the designation leaves no doubt whether the one or the others are meant, whereas in Deut. XXXI. 9 and 25 both terms seem to be used indifferently.

which they were in the other Books rigidly debarred, and which were reserved for the priests exclusively. They proclaim the curses from mount Ebal.[7] They deposit the Book of the Law at the side of the Ark of the Covenant,[8] which involves their admission even to the Holy of Holies.[9] Indeed their functions are comprehensively stated thus, "At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi, to bear the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister to Him, and to bless in His name, to this day"[10] — terms which exactly apply to the priestly ministrations in the middle Books. And as the offices, so are the privileges common to all Levites, "The priests the Levites, the whole tribe of Levi, shall ... eat the offerings of the Lord made by fire, and His inheritance;"[11] whereas the portions of certain sacrifices were in the other Books strictly limited to the male members of Aaron's family.[12] The Levite Korah is not branded as an audacious usurper of the priestly dignity, like the Reubenites Dathan and Abiram,[13] because his claim was by the author of Deuteronomy not regarded as impious or even illegitimate; whereas it is, in the other Books, denounced at least as equally criminal with the arrogance of the firstborn tribe and punished with the same awful destruction.[14] It is, therefore, impossible to doubt that at the time of the Deuteronomist, other members of the tribe of Levi, besides the Aaronites, were admitted to the priesthood. This is conceded even by many of those who consider the Deuteronomist as the "youngest legislator".[15] The arguments brought forward by apologists[16] in support of the opposite opinion, are all inconclusive; none of

---

7 Deut. XXVII. 14.

8 Probably in the chest (אַרְגָּז) mentioned in 1 Sam. VI. 8, 11, 15.

9 Deut. XXXI. 25, 26.

10 Deut. X. 8, לעמד לפני יהוה לשרתו ולברך בשמו; and similarly XVIII. 6, 7; verses 3—5 speak indeed of the "priests" (משפט כהנים), yet not as distinct from Levites, but in so far as these officiate as priests, as the whole context, and especially vers. 6 and 7, prove; hence Ranke's refutation of George's view is untenable (Untersuch. II. 365, 366), although George indeed weakened his arguments by basing them upon ver. 5, and not upon the following verses; comp. also Josh. XVIII. 7.

11 Deut. XVIII. 1; comp. X. 9; and so in the Book of Joshua, which stands in the closest literary connection with Deuteronomy, as Josh. XIII. 14, and especially XVIII. 7, "But the Levites have no part among you; for the priesthood of the Lord is their inheritance", כְּהֻנַּת יְהוָה נַחֲלָתוֹ; XIII. 33.

12 See p. 209.

13 Deut. XI. 6.

14 Comp. Num. XVI. 1—32; XXVI. 9—11. Gramberg (Rel. Id. I. 238) believes that the author perhaps knew of the Korahites, famous as a family of singers after David's time, and traced their descent to this Korah as their ancestor; which opinion has little probability.

15 So, for instance, *Knobel*, Levit. p. 419.

16 As *Hengstenberg*, Auth. des Pent. II. 401—404; *Riehm*, Gesetzgeb. Mos. im Lande Moab, pp. 35, 36; *Saalschütz*,

the passages generally quoted[1] prove a clear distinction between priests and Levites. The Book of Joshua follows the phraseology of Deuteronomy. The latter, though attempting to secure for the priests an honoured place, cannot forget the precariousness of their actual condition, and therefore invokes on their behalf the charity of the Israelites.[2] And it is a hazardous assertion that "there is in the whole history of the Hebrews no period when the distinction between priests and Levites was either not yet existing or already removed" — as will appear from the subjoined sketch.[3] On the other hand, it has been affirmed that the Deuteronomist nowhere clearly places the priests and Levites on an equal footing; and that "no single passage can be found in which priestly functions are entrusted to the Levites;"[4] remarks which are effectually invalidated by the arguments adduced. The indigence of most Levites, as manifest in Deuteronomy, shows merely that not all of them were sufficiently engaged in profitable priestly functions;[5] it does not prove that many were excluded from them. Nor is there any foundation for the opinion that, according to Deuteronomy, the whole tribe of Levi was *entitled* but not *obliged* to accept the priesthood, and that those only served at the Sanctuary who felt a vocation for the office, so that any Levite *could* be a priest but every priest *must* be a Levite, whereas, according to the middle Books, all Levites were *bound* to perform ecclesiastical functions, with well-defined privileges and duties,[6] — for which peculiar distinction the Law affords no support whatever. It is difficult to see how the synonymous use of "priest" and "Levite" can be explained by the gradual diminution of the Aaronic family;[7] and, in fact, it has on the other hand been contended, that the middle Books have in view a priestly *family* only, that of Aaron, while Deuteronomy speaks of a priestly *order*, and therefore identifies it even with the *tribe*.[8]

2. The case is quite similar with regard to judicial qualifications. While in the preceding Books we find only one instance of the *High-*

Mos. R. I. 106, 109 (who even asserts that הכהנים הלוים is employed to describe with distinctness priestly functionaries, because הכהנים alone might mean any state officers (see p. 559!); *Öhler*, in Herz. VII. 350, 351 (who contends that the conceptions of the middle Books and of Deuteronomy "are not opposed to each other, but form their mutual complements") etc.

[1] Deut. X. 6, 9; XVIII. 1, 3—8.

[2] See *infra*.

[3] Sect. V.

[4] *Bähr*, Symb. II. 9, 10.

[5] Comp. 1 Sam. II. 36.

[6] *George*, Die älteren jüd. Feste, pp. 47, 48, 51, 52, 66.

[7] *Stanley*, Jewish Church, II. p. 424; see also *infra* Sect. V fin.

[8] *Hengstenberg*, l. c. De Wette (Einleit. § 156*b* note d) sees in the designation הכהנים הלוים "a proof of the enhanced authority of the tribe of Levi", which is correct in reference to a large portion of the historical Books, but not to the middle Books of the Pentateuch.

*priest* acting as judge in a social difficulty,[9] the precepts of Deuteronomy confide the administration of the law to "the priests the Levites", that is, to the whole tribe of Levi, and grant them unlimited power to enforce their decisions;[10] but they suppose the seat of the chief tribunal to be in the town of the national Sanctuary, whether at Jerusalem or elsewhere.[11] And so, according to Numbers, the High-priest only seems to have consulted God by means of the Ark or the Urim and Thummim;[12] whereas we find, in other parts of the Old Testament, that privilege extended to the whole order of priests.[13]

3. On the one hand, the entire tribe of Levi was elected and sanctified by God for His service; while, on the other hand, the Levites were substitutes for the firstborn who properly belonged to God.[14] But if the Levites were holy by election, why was it necessary to give up, for their acquisition, the firstborn who were no less holy to God? We can understand the surrender of a consecrated class for a profane one, which thereby shall become consecrated. But the surrender of one consecrated class for another is gratuitous. The firstborn could never cease to be God's property, if they were replaced by a body of men as holy as themselves, and therefore not requiring to be substitutes of others in order to become holy. The difficulty is simply solved by the circumstance that the election of the whole tribe is set forth in Deuteronomy,[15] the substitution of the Levites, in the more restricted sense, in Numbers; the difference of the authors accounts for a discrepancy which may historically be thus explained. At first, the chiefs of every family, that is, the firstborn, performed the worship for the household, and were thus *naturally* holy to God. Gradually and by a process traced elsewhere,[16] they were replaced by the Levites, who hence were represented as consecrated to God *by election*, since they had no natural claim to the priesthood, not being the eldest tribe. In this light, the Levites were regarded for a considerable period; and so they appear in Deuteronomy. But imperceptibly, the family of Aaron was distinguished from the other branches of the tribe, and placed at an immeasurable distance above them. Then the election was restricted to that family alone, while the Levites were simply regarded as substitutes for common Israelites, and could, therefore, be handed over

---

9 Num. XXVII. 2, 19; comp. Josh. XXII. 30*sqq*.

10 Deut. XVII. 8—13; XXI. 5; comp. XIX. 17; 1 Chr. XXIII. 4; XXVI. 29; 2 Chr. XIX. 8—11; see also Ezek. XLIV. 24.

11 Deut. XVII. 8, 12.

12 Num. XXVII. 21; comp. Judg. XX. 27, 28.

13 Comp. Ezr. II. 63; Neh. VII. 65.

14 Num. III. 12, 13, 41, 45; VIII. 16—18; see p. 582.

15 See *supra* No 2.

16 See Comm. on Gen. pp. 735, 736; comp. *infra* Sect. V.

(נְתִינִים) to the priests for the most subordinate tasks,[1] but be excluded from all higher or sacred offices; and so they appear in the middle Books of the Pentateuch.

4. With this subject another point of interest is connected. It is in the middle Books that the 35 cities are assigned to the Levites in all parts of the country, both east and west of the Jordan (see p. 586); and it is in the middle Books that the line of demarcation between the Levites and the priests is rigidly drawn, the former being nothing but the menial assistants of the latter in the offices of the Sanctuary. Now, what purpose did the dispersion of the Levites through the land serve? How is it reconcilable with their necessary attendance at the Tabernacle or Temple? It is usually averred that it was designed to qualify them for their mission as teachers and religious guides of the whole nation; but these functions are, in Leviticus and Numbers, exclusively reserved to the priests, and entirely denied to the Levites, whose sole occupation was connected with the public worship. But nothing could obviously be more inappropriate than an arrangement which, on the one hand, scattered the Levites through the length and breadth of Palestine, and on the other hand, tied them to one central spot. Moreover, if the priests were indeed to be the instructors and spiritual advisers of the people, they ought not to have been confined even to a certain number of cities, but allowed to settle wherever there was a town or village that required their counsels and ministrations. One solution only is possible. The arrangement was not *made* by the legislators but partly *found* by them in existence. The dispersion of the Levites into all provinces was a fact, and a fact which, in the consciousness of the nation, was owing to their wanton cruelty and ungovernable recklessness.[2] The authors of the Pentateuch, anxious for the honour of a tribe which, in their time, had gained considerable spiritual influence, represented that dispersion as having been ordained by the wisdom of God, and then they regulated it so far as to restrict it to a certain number of cities, which the Levites inhabited together with the population of other tribes. This expedient appeared, under the circumstances, the most acceptable, although it ceased to be entirely satisfactory, when the duties of the Levites were strictly limited to the Temple.

5. In some passages, the age of the active service of the Levites is fixed from the 30th to the 50th year of their lives,[3] but in others

---

[1] Num. VIII. 19; etc.

[2] Comp. Gen. XLIX. 5—7; see *infra*, Sect. V.

[3] Num. IV. 3, 23, 30, 35, 39, 43, 47; comp. 1 Chr. XXIII. 3 (they were numbered from the age of thirty years).

from the 25th to the 50th year.[4] The texts are in both cases equally plain and unmistakeable; on the one hand, "Take the sum of the sons of Kohath from among the sons of Levi ... from thirty years old and upward until fifty years old, all that come forward to do duty, to do the work at the Tent of Meeting";[5] and on the other hand, "From five and twenty years old and upward they (the Levites) shall go in to do duty in the service of the Tent of Meeting; and from the age of fifty years they shall cease from the duty of the service, and shall serve no more".[6] To harmonise the two precepts is clearly out of the question; the devices that have been proposed are equally forced and ineffectual. For instance, it has been asserted, that the five years from the twenty-fifth to the thirtieth were spent in preparation for the service or in apprenticeship,[7] or in the exercise of the lighter duties which require less strength,[8] or in aiding the older Levites in their ministrations, just as the more advanced years after 50 were employed for similar assistance;[9] or the one law (in chapter IV.) refers to the time of the wanderings, the other (in chapter VIII.) to later periods,[10] when on account of the distribution of the Levites through the whole territory of Israel, a greater number was required. But all these opinions are mere guesses unsupported by the slightest allusion of the Hebrew text. Or it has been maintained that the one relates merely to the transport of the Sanctuary, which demanded a more robust age, the other to the general service in the Tabernacle or Temple;[11] whereas the terms in chapter VIII. are so comprehensive that they include the transport of the Sanctuary also; and this transport was, in several cases, effected by means of vehicles drawn by oxen,[12] so that the respective Levites had merely the supervision of the safe conveyance of the implements. Ewald[13] supposes that though both are taken from the "Book of *Origines*", the number 25 is evidently meant to be the more accurate one: it is difficult to see the "evidence". The Septuagint translators considered the discrepancy so manifest and so objectionable

---

4 Num. VIII. 23—26.

5 Num. IV. 3, and in exactly the same terms with reference to the other families of the tribe of Levi.

6 Num. VIII. 24, 25.

7 *Maimon.* Kele Hamikd. III. 9; *Rashi;* a. o.

8 *Ebn Ezra; Abarbanel* on Num. VIII. *fin.; Chaskuni; Lightfoot,* Opp. II. 691; *Reland,* Ant. II. vi. 3; *Othon.* Lex. Rabb. p. 613; *Outram,* De Sacrif. I. vii. 3, pp. 78, 79; *Rosenmüller* on Num. IV. 3.

9 Num. VIII. 26; *Ranke,* Untersuch. II. 159.

10 *Kanne,* Untersuch. I. 101; *Bähr,* Symb. II. 41; *Saalschütz,* Mos. R. I. 99; comp. *Siphri,* on Num. VIII.

11 *Hengstenberg,* Auth. II. 391—394; *Hävernick,* Einleit. ed. Keil, I. 2, p. 432; *Keil* on Num. VIII. 23—26; *Öhler* in Herz. VIII. 350; see also *Bauer,* Gottesd. Verf. II. 378; comp. 1 Chr. XXIII. 3, 25—27.

12 Num. VII. 6—8.

13 Alterthümer, p. 293.

that, in chapter IV., they simply changed the number 30, wherever it occurs, into 25, against the authority of the Samaritan text and all other ancient versions. It is indeed probable that the compilers and revisers of the Pentateuch supposed some reconciliation between the two statements possible, or else they would not have allowed them to stand as they do; yet whatever it may have been, it is necessarily unavailing. It is impossible to resist the conclusion that the two figures proceeded from two different authors,[1] either of them basing his law upon the usage and requirements of his time, which varied in successive epochs;[2] and indeed, according to the Chronist, the age fixed for the active service of the Levites was up to David's reign 30 years,[3] but after this time, when the Tabernacle and its vessels were no more to be carried and the duties were less onerous, it was lowered to 20 years,[4] as seems to have remained customary in later times.[5]

But the fluctuations of the Pentateuch are most palpable and most remarkable in the laws regarding the revenues of the priests and Levites; and we propose to treat of them here with some completeness, because they form an important link in the chain of our enquiries.

### Revenues of the Priests and Levites.

We begin with the regulations concerning the *Tithes*.

6. According to the middle Books of the Pentateuch, the Levites were to receive, as part of the compensation due to them for their services at the common Sanctuary,[6] the tenth part of all annual produce of the soil and of all trees, especially of corn, wine, and oil,[7] and the tenth part of the annual increase of the herds and flocks,[8] of cows,

[1] So also *Vater*, Pent. III. 453; *De Wette*, Beiträge, II. 336; *Hartmann*, Pentat. p. 231; *Knobel* on Num. IV. 23—26; and others.

[2] See *infra* chapt. IV.

[3] 1 Chr. XXIII. 3. [4] Vers. 25—27.

[5] 2 Chr. XXXI. 17; Ezra III. 8; though Jewish tradition admits even children (*Mishn.* Erach. II. 6; *Talm.* Erach. 13*b*; comp. 2 Chr. XXXI. 16). Plato (Legg. VI. 7, p. 759) recommends the age of 60 years for the priesthood, although this rule was by no means acted upon in Greece.

[6] חלף עבדתם אשר הם עבדים וכ׳, Num. XVIII. 21—24, 31; according to Jewish tradition, fifteen days before each of the three great agricultural festivals, Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles (*Mishn.* Bechor. IX. 5; comp. *Maimon.* De Primit. Animant. VII. 8).

[7] Comp. Num. XVIII. 27; Deut. XIV. 22, 23; also Nehem. XIII. 5, 12; but hardly of the small herbs and garden stuffs, as mint and rue, anise and cummin (Matth. XXIII. 23; Luke XI. 42; XVIII. 12) or leguminous fruits (*Mishn.* Maasroth I. 1—4, 6; IV. 5, 6), to which the Talmudical law extended the precept; comp. *Talm.* Yom. 83*b*; *Yalkut Shimeoni* fol. 200 *b*, § 680; see, however, *Maimonides*, Hilch. Maasr. II. 6.

[8] Born between the first of Elul of the same year and of the preceding

lambs, and goats, that is, of the clean sacrificial quadrupeds,[9] to be surrendered without selection or substitution,[10] just "as they pass under the rod",[11] which the shepherd generally carried,[12] and by which he daily counted his cattle;[13] if an animal was changed for another, *both* belonged unalterably to the Levites, without the choice of redemption; but the owner had the option of redeeming the vegetable tithes by paying their value with the addition of the fifth part of it.[14] The tithes could be eaten by the Levites and their families in any town in which they resided.[15]

However, the Levites were bound to give the tenth part of the tithes[16] to the priests, the direct descendants of Aaron; and compliance with this command was accounted to them as if they had devoted to God tithes out of their own produce.[17]

7. From these regulations the Deuteronomist differs in several important points. He demands the tithes of the agricultural produce only, not of the flocks and herds. Nor does he allow even the agricultural tithes to the Levites for their exclusive use; he merely directs that these should be invited as guests at the repasts to be held by the Israelites, whether the meals consist of the produce itself or of the pro-

---

one, according to *Mishn.* Rosh. Hash. I. 1; Bechor. IX. 5.

9 But not of animals not born in the Israelite's own herds and flocks, but bought by him or received as presents (*Mishn.* Bechor. IX. 3, הלקוח או שניתן לו מתנה פטור ממעשר בהמה), unless these were not yet seven days old, before which time they could, by the original proprietor, not legally have been included in the decimation.

10 And without permission of selling, according to *Mishn.* Maas. Scheni I. 2.

11 כל־אשר יעבר תחת השבט, Lev. XXVII. 32.

12 Mic. VII. 14; Zech. XI. 7.

13 Comp. Jer. XXXIII. 23; Ezek. XX. 37; *Mishn.* Bechoroth IX. 7; *Theocr.* VIII. 16; *Virg.* Georg. IV. 436; Ecl. III. 34. — This is evidently the meaning of the phrase (Sept. correctly, *πᾶν ὃ ἂν διέλθῃ ἐν τῷ ἀριθμῷ ὑπὸ τὴν ῥάβδον*), which does not imply that tithes were to be given of large flocks or herds only, such as require to be counted, but not of a small number which can easily be surveyed (Knobel); this would not only be extremely indistinct as a law, but would be opposed to the very spirit of the Levitical injunction, which is designed to mark all property of the Israelites as subject to the sovereignty of God, who therefore requires the tithes no less than the firstlings and firstfruits. Futile is the Rabbinical explanation that the animals were, for the purpose of decimation, to come forth from their folds singly and spontaneously without being forced out by human hands, or that they were marked with a red line (שבט) as they were let out; comp. *Mishn.* Bechor. IX. 7, and in general cc. 1—8; *Maimon.* l. c. VII. 1; *Bochart*, Hieroz. II. 44, p. 459.

14 Lev. XXVII. 30—33.

15 Num. XVIII. 31; comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. VI. 8.

16 מַעֲשֵׂר מִן־הַמַּעֲשֵׂר (Num. XVIII. 26), or מַעֲשַׂר הַמַּעֲשֵׂר (Neh. XVIII. 26).

17 Num. XVIII. 26—30; comp. Neh. X. 39, 40; *Joseph.* Vit. c. 12.

visions bought for its value.[1] He can, therefore, neither make allusion to the redemption of tithes by Israelites, to whom they virtually belong; nor can he command the Levites to give the tenth part of the tithes to the Aaronites. He, moreover, prescribes that the repasts are to take place exclusively in the town of the central Sanctuary "before the Lord". But in order to fix a wavering custom,[2] he institutes a separate "year of the tithes" (שְׁנַת הַמַּעֲשֵׂר), to be observed every third year, when all the tithes collected from every town were to be handed over partly to the Levites, and partly to the strangers, the orphans, and the widows; but though they were eaten at any place of residence, they were of course, on account of their sacred character, to be carefully protected from impure use, and after their due delivery, the owner had to make a solemn confession regarding his conscientious observance of the tithes' laws, concluding with an invocation of the Divine blessing.[3]

6. Following the principles of criticism hitherto adopted, it will not be difficult to account for these discrepancies. It was a primitive custom among many ancient nations to devote to the deity the tenth part of the production of the soil,[4] of the booty of war,[5] and of all gains of commerce and industry,[6] especially for the purposes of public worship or national enterprise,[7] and sometimes as a fine or tribute

---

1 Among the Hindoos, the poor Brahmans and mendicant priests were admitted to the fourth part of the sacrificial meals reserved for the indigent (comp. *Rhode*, Relig. Bildung der Hindus, II. 435).

2 Comp. Am. IV. 4.

3 Deut. XII. 6, 11, 17—19; XIV. 22—29; XXVI. 12—15; comp. XVI. 11, 14; XXVI. 11. The Rabbinical development of these laws, partly judicious, partly trivial and microscopic, may be seen in *Maimonides*, De Primit. Anim. cc. VI—VIII. The "confession" (ודוי המעשר) was, according to Jewish tradition, to be spoken, on the last day of Passover, at the gate of Nicanor, but was abolished by the High-priest Jochanan, the successor of Simon the Just (*Mishn.* Maas. Sheni V. 10—15; Sot. IX. 10).

4 *Herod.* I. 89; *Callimach.* Del. 278; *Xen.* Anab. V. iii. 9, 13; *Diod. Sic.* XX. 14; *Dion. Hal.* I. 19, 23, 24; *Appian*, Bell. Civ. I. 7; *Plin.* XII. 14 or 32.

5 *Herod.* I. 89; V. 77; VIII. 27, 121; IX. 81; *Pind.* Ol. II. 4; *Xen.* Anab. V. iii. 4; *Strabo* XV. i. 51, p. 708; *Diod. Sic.* V. 9; XI. 33, 65; *Pausan.* I. xxviii. 2; III. xviii. 5; V. x. 2; X. x. 1; *Plut.* Ages. c. 19; *Plaut.* Trucul. II. vii. 11; *Liv.* V. 21; *Justin.* XVIII. 7; XX. 3; comp. Gen. XIV. 20; Hebr. VII. 2, 6. Apollo himself was called *Δεκατηφόρος* (*Paus.* I. xlii. 5; comp. *Callim.* Del. 278).

6 *Herod.* III. 57; IV. 152; *Pausan.* X. xi. 2; *Diod. Sic.* IV. 21; *Macrob.* Saturn. III. 6; it was, in fact, among the Greeks a general rule *τὰς δεκάτας τῶν περιγινομένων τοῖς θεοῖς καθιεροῦν* (*Harpocrat.* sub *δεκατεύειν*); and so among the Italic tribes, "Decima quaeque veteres diis suis offerebant" (*Festus* sub decima; comp. *Macrob.* Saturn. III. 12; *Dougtaei* Anal. I. p. 15, Exc. 8; *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. III. x. 1, pp. 720—723.

7 *Diog. Laert.* II. 53 (Xenoph. 8); comp. *Herod.* II. cc.; etc.

imposed upon disloyal or unpatriotic citizens;[8] and it was a common practice to pay to kings or rulers the tenth part of the income as a civil tax.[9] It is more than probable that the same custom was, from early times, adopted by the Hebrews; it is, in the Pentateuch, appropriately attributed to the patriarchs;[10] and it recommended itself to the leading minds of the nation especially on account of the spiritual significance of the number ten, which they understood to typify perfection[11] and Divine revelation, and which they connected with some of the profoundest ideas of their religion.[12] Therefore, the tithes, limited to vegetable produce, were originally employed by the proprietors for religious repasts, to which the Levites as well as other needy and helpless persons were piously and charitably invited. But at a later time, when hierarchical ideas took deeper root, they were entirely withdrawn from the control of the owners, and, extended to animal increase, they were fixed as an ordinary and legal impost, to be scrupulously paid to the Levites every year, when of course the "triennial tithes" were discontinued.[13] Hence the laws of Deuteronomy manifestly exhibit an earlier phase in the history of Levitical power; they prove how the priests gradually and prudently enlarged their influence and ameliorated their temporal welfare, and what stages they had to pass, before they could venture upon a system so favourable to their order as that propounded in Leviticus and Numbers.[14]

This is clearly the historical relation between the enactments of Deuteronomy and those of the middle Books. Many attempts at harmonising them have been made; but they have absolutely and neces-

---

[8] *Herod.* VII. 132; *Xenoph.* Hellen. I. vii. 10; *Polyb.* IX. 39; *Diod. Sic.* XI. 3.

[9] Comp. 1 Sam. VIII. 15, 17; 1 Macc. XI. 35; *Aristot.* Oecon. c. 35; *Cic.* In Verr. Act. II. L. III. 43, 44; *Diod. Sic.* V. 42.

[10] Gen. XXVIII. 22; the tithes belong to God, Lev. XXVII. 30; Num. XVIII. 24.

[11] Because 1+2+3+4=10, which was hence called "the all-comprising number" (המספר הכולל), beyond which there is no new one, since what follows after it returns to the units.

[12] See p. 519; comp. *Philo*, De Opif. Mund. c. 15; *Bähr*, Symb. I. pp. 179—183; *Kliefoth*, Ursprüngliche Gottesdienstordnung, I. 95 *sqq.*; and in his Zeitschr. 1862, pp. 555, 556, 573.

[13] Aptly observes George (Jüd. Feste, p. 67), "Now the proper feeling of gratitude, which had taken a concrete shape in the common sacrificial meals, and was nourished by the common meetings and the good-will inseparable from them, was now entirely lost, and was dissolved into an abstract idea."

[14] See *infra* Sect. V. Talmudical authorities put a very lenient interpretation on the laws of the tithes, more in the interest of the Israelites than the Levites, often even in opposition to the plain spirit of the ordinances of the Pentateuch (comp. *Maimon.* De Primit. c. VI); Josephus also (Antiq. IV. iv. 3) speaks only of the tithes of "the annual fruits of the earth" (τῶν ἐπετείων καρπῶν).

sarily failed.[1] It has been asserted that the triennial tithes were no new impost; but merely the tenth part of that produce which might have ripened after the Feast of Tabernacles in the three preceding years, and had therefore not been included in the regular decimation;[2] or that they were the ordinary or annual tithes to be employed, every third year, for charitable gifts, to compensate the Levites for the loss of the tithes and other revenues guaranteed to them before in the earlier Books of the Pentateuch:[3] but the former view is without any foundation or probability;[4] while the latter rests on an erroneous estimate of the relative age of the Levitical ordinances in the different parts of the Pentateuch; it destroys, like all opinions based on the same premises, the insight into the natural and gradual growth of hierarchical influence; and in most cases entirely reverses the sequence of events and the development of institutions.[5] Moreover, in the instance under discussion, the compensation would have been very inadequate,

---

[1] *Comp. Reland*, Antiqq. lib. III. c. 9; *Selden*, De Decimis, Appendix to Clericus' Pentateuch, pp. 548—564; *J. C. Hottinger*, De Decimis Judaeorum, Lugd. Batav. 1713; *Carpzov*, Appar. pp. 619—625; *Michael.* Mosaisch. R. IV. pp. 67—71, § 192; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. I. 261—278; *Rosenmüller*, Schol. on Deut. XII. 7; *Ranke*, Untersuch. II. 285—287; *Hengstenb.* Auth. des Pent. II. 407—414; *Gramberg*, Relig. Id. I. 155; *Lengerke*, Kenaan, p. 528; *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. I. pp. 353, 354—358 (who however honestly confesses that the current explanations leave "much obscurity" in the laws of tithes, p. 357); *Leyrer*, in Herz. Real-Enc. XVIII. 416 *sqq.*; *Winer*, Real-Wört. II. 723; comp. however, *George*, Jüd. Feste p. 68.

[2] So *Michaelis*, note on Deut. XXVI. 12; *Bauer*, l. c. pp. 276, 277; comp. also *Hottinger*, *Carpzov*, a. o. ll. cc.

[3] *Riehm*, Gesetzgebung Moses im Lande Moab, p. 45; comp. *Öhler* in Herzog VIII. 352.

[4] The term כי תכלה in Deut. XXVI. 12 furnishes no argument, nor is it correct to contend that Josephus (Ant. IV. viii. 22) conceives the matter in that light, for *εἰς διανέμησιν τῶν σπανιζόντων* is not "for the distribution of what was wanting" (Bauer), but "for distribution among the needy."

[5] So remarks Ewald (Alterthümer p. 315), "These arrangements (of the middle Books) appear to have lapsed into desuetude after the time of Solomon — especially in consequence of the new burdens of the monarchy"; and Knobel (on Levit. p. 590), "Towards the end of the empire of Judah the old law (viz. that of Leviticus and Numbers) had already proved impracticable"; and he contents himself with vaguely remarking, "These alterations were caused by the changed position of the priests and Levites" (p. 591), referring to a previous exposition hardly more definite or satisfactory (see *infra*). Justly, therefore, could Hengstenberg (Auth. des Pent. II. 411) object, "Modern criticism is here involved in a strange contradiction with itself: Deuteronomy is contended to belong to the time of the perfect development of the hierarchy; and yet it is just that Book which is supposed to be ignorant of the Levitical tithes" — which, however, Hengstenberg with his usual ingenuity professes to find in some allusions of Deuteronomy.

as the triennial tithes were not only to be shared by all the needy of the land,[6] but did not, like the tithes ordained in Leviticus,[7] include the *animal* increase; and they differed from the annual tithes merely in this that they could be eaten not only in Jerusalem but in any other town. It is not surprising that the traditional interpretation, starting from the unity and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, supposed the three different sorts of tithes mentioned in the Law and above pointed out, to be alike obligatory — namely, the annual tithes both of cattle and of vegetable produce to be eaten by the Levites in their respective towns;[8] the annual vegetable tithes, taken from the remainder and to be consumed by the proprietors and the Levites in Jerusalem; and the triennial vegetable tithes to be shared, in any town, by the Levites, the poor, and the helpless.[9] And, in later periods, all the three tithes were indeed faithfully given up by the pious, as the first, second, and third tenth,[10] the one for the Levites, the other for the feasts and festivals at Jerusalem,[11] and the third for the indigent.[12]

9. We now proceed to the laws in respect of the *Firstborn* (קָרְבַּן בְּכֹרוֹת), which involve another and strikingly obvious proof of the gradual growth of Levitical institutions.

It will be necessary to premise a short sketch of the origin of these laws. It would be superfluous to remind the reader of the idea prevailing among primitive nations that the deity could claim both the firstborn of men and of animals, and that consequently both the one and the others were to be sacrificed as burnt-offerings.[13] The ancient Hebrews shared these notions. "Sanctify to Me", commanded God,

---

6 Deut. XIV. 29. 7 XXVII. 30—33.

8 Lev. XXVII. 30—33; comp. Num. XVIII. 31.

9 Comp. *Mishn.* Peah, Maasroth, Maaser Sheni; *Ebn Ezra* on Deut. XIV. 22; *Abarbanel* on Num. I. 26 and on Deut. XIV. 28. Yet according to some Talmudical teachers, the second tithes were omitted every third year, when the triennial tithes were given (which are hence themselves termed δεύτερον ἐπιδέκατον by the Sept. in Deut. XXVI. 12); while others declared the first and second tithes to be identical and thereby drew upon themselves the stigma of heresy.

10 מעשר ראשון, מ' שני, מ' שלישי; Tobit I. 7, 8, ἡ δεκάτη, ἡ δευτέρα δεκάτη, ἡ τρίτη δεκάτη.

11 Comp. *Mishn.* Maaser Sheni; Chagig. I. 3; etc. Tobit says (l. c.) "The first tenth part of all increase I gave to the sons of Aaron who ministered at Jerusalem; a second tenth part I sold and went and spent it every year at Jerusalem; and the third I gave to those to whom it was proper."

12 מעשר עני, πτωχοδεκάται (Hieron.); comp. *Mishn.* Peah VIII. 3*sqq.*; Demai IV. 3*sqq.*; Maas. Sheni V. 6; *Talm.* Rosh Hash. 12*b*; *Maimon.* Maas. Shen. I. 3; *Joseph.* Ant. IV. viii. 8, 22; *Hottinger*, De Decimis Judaeorum, pp. 116*sqq.*, 146*sqq.*, 182*sqq.*, 194, 201; *Creizenach*, Schulchan Aruch, I. 167, 168; comp. *infra* sect. V.

13 Comp. p. 339.

"all the firstborn whatever opens the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and beast".[1] But when, in the lapse of ages, their religious education advanced, the spiritual leaders apprehended lest this principle encourage the same cosmic views regarding the powers of nature, to which it owed its first adoption, and which it helped to strengthen among pagan nations. Therefore, they attributed to it a new and very different origin. They connected it with the miraculous deliverance of the firstborn Hebrews supposed to have been effected at the tenth plague in Egypt, "All the firstborn are Mine", says God, "for on the day that I smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, I hallowed to Myself all the firstborn in Israel, both man and beast; Mine shall they be; I am the Lord".[2] Therefore, the following ordinances were fixed. Every firstborn boy, when one month old, was to be redeemed for five holy shekels.[3] Every firstborn male and unclean animal unfit for sacrifice, like the ass, was either to be killed or to be replaced by a clean beast, as a lamb, or redeemed for five shekels.[4] Every faulty firstborn animal of the clean species[5] belonged unreservedly to the proprietor, and might be eaten[6] by anyone, whether clean or unclean "like the roebuck and like the hart".[7] But every firstborn male and faultless beast of the clean species, particulary the sacrificial animals, of bulls, sheep, and goats, was to be sanctified to God within the first year,[8] so that, for instance, the ox should not be employed for work, nor the sheep be shorn, but should be sacrificed on the altar by

---

[1] Exod. XIII. 2, 12; XXII. 28; XXXIV. 19, 20.

[2] Num. III. 13, 41—51; VIII. 17; Exod. XIII. 14, 15; see Comm. on Exod. p. 220. Hence it became a custom still observed by orthodox Judaism, that the first-born men should fast on the day before Passover (see *Orach Chayim* § 470, הבכורות מתענים בערב פסח בין בכור מאב בין בכור מאם).

[3] Exod. XIII. 15; XXXIV. 20; Num. XVIII. 16; comp. Neh. X. 37.

[4] Exod. XIII. 13; XXXIV. 20; Num. XVIII. 15; comp. Levit. XXVII. 26, 27.

[5] Whether it was faulty from its birth or in consequence of some accident (comp. *Maimon*: De Primit. I. II., where the various disqualifications are enumerated and discussed).

[6] Within the first year (see *Maimon.* l. c. I. 7).

[7] Deut. XV. 21—23. It is difficult to understand how Rabbinical writers could so misinterpret the unmistakable words of Deuteronomy as to apply them not to the Israelite but to the *priest*, who, according to their opinion, received the whole animal (*Mishn.* Chall. IV. 9; Bechor. IV. 1; *Talm.* Bechor. 28*a*; *Maimon.* l. c. I. 3); yet they have been followed by later writers, as Outram (De Sacrif. I. xi. 6), Reland (Ant. III. vi. 7), Saalschütz (Mos. R. I. p. 348, comp. p. 125), a. o. The conclusion of the fifteenth chapter is, like the other parts of it, addressed not to the priests but to the Israelites.

[8] The *lunar* year, according to tradition (*Maimon.* De Prim. Anim. I. 11), but beasts of the flock not before they were 30, and beasts of the herd not before they were 50 days old, because the owner

sprinkling its blood and burning its fat, yet not as a *burnt-offering,* but as a *thank-offering* — a noteworthy distinction; for the former would have befitted the pagan origin of firstling-sacrifices, the latter was in harmony with the new meaning which the legislator had attached to those victims, and in grateful reminiscence of a marvellous rescue at a memorable epoch of Hebrew history.[9]

10. Now we have arrived at the point which enables us to notice a fluctuation in the precepts of the Pentateuch similar to that manifest with regard to the laws of tithes.

For, according to Deuteronomy, the priests received of those firstling thank-offerings no more than the portions which fell to their share in all sacrifices of the same class, namely the breast and right shoulder, while the Israelites consumed the remainder of the meat: "Thou shalt eat the firstling males that come of thy herd and of thy flock, before the Lord thy God year by year, in the place which the Lord shall choose, thou and thy household."[10] Yet the Book of Numbers assigns to the priests not the breast and right shoulder only, but the whole animal, of course with the exception of the fat and fat parts which were burnt on the altar: "But the firstling of a cow, or the firstling of a sheep, or the firstling of a goat, thou shalt not redeem; they are holy, thou

---

was to bestow care and attention upon them before sanctifying them (*Mishn.* Bechor. IV. 1).

[9] Num. XVIII. 17, 18; Deut. XV. 19, 20; Neh. X. 37. — At present, as the Jews can offer no sacrifices, it is their custom, either to sell, or to give away, or to allow in partnership to a non-Israelite, any part, however insignificant, of the dams or the young (comp. *Mishn.* Bechor. I. 1; II. 1), or to feed the firstborn males of clean animals till perchance they get a fault or defect (ירעו עד שיסתאבו), when they may be slaughtered and eaten, a custom derived from the practice which prevailed in the time of the Temple with regard to animals of which it was doubtful whether they were firstborn or not; but the unclean animals, which, however, are limited to the ass alone (with reference to Exod. XIII. 13), are redeemed for a lamb (*Mishn.* Maas. Shen. I. 2; Kerith. VI. 1, 6; Zevach. VI. 1—3; *Maimon.* De Primit. Animant. V. 3; and in general *Mishn.* Bechoroth, and *Yoreh Deah* §§ 306—321). The firstborn boys, except those of Aaronites and Levites or of their daughters, even if these are married to Israelites, are on the thirty-first day after their birth, or if this be a sabbath on the thirty-second, redeemed from the priests for a small sum of money representing five shekels (comp. Num. XVIII. 16) or five סלעים; one סלע, supposed to have originally weighed 320 grains of barley, was, from the time of the second Temple, fixed at the weight of 384 grains, so that 5 סלעים are the weight of 1920 barley-grains in silver, or between six and seven shillings; see *Mishn.* Bechor. VIII. 7, 8. The ceremony (פדיון הבן) is described in *Yoreh-Deah* § 305; comp. Luke II. 22; Comm. on Exod. p. 220; see also *Buxtorf,* Synagog. Jud. pp. 95—97; *Bauer,* Gottesd. Verf. I. 289; a. o.

[10] Deut. XV. 19, 20; comp. XII. 17, 18; XIV. 23.

shalt sprinkle their blood upon the altar, and shalt burn their fat for an offering made by fire, for a sweet odour to the Lord. And the flesh of them shall belong to thee (Aaron), like the wave-breast and like the right shoulder it shall belong to thee."[1]

11. It is clearly impossible, in the face of these unmistakable texts, to harmonize the various precepts of the Pentateuch, and to attempt the proof that they belong to the same time or legislative system; the efforts that have been made to effect this agreement and to combine what is absolutely contradictory, are partly inefficient and partly fanciful;[2] and we are compelled to admit the existence of three distinct laws with regard to the firstborn, in the following succession:

a. The oldest regulation is that of Exodus;[3] it verges on the stage of the natural or cosmic views of primitive religions; for it ordains that *all* the firstborn males of men and beasts shall belong to God; the firstborn boys are to be redeemed; the firstborn of clean animals to be sacrificed, evidently as *burnt-offerings;* the firstborn of unclean animals either to be redeemed by clean beasts, or to be killed.

b. The next step is embodied in the ordinances of Deuteronomy,[4] which exhibit a decided advance of hierarchical power, and at the same time efface the traces of the pagan origin of the law: all the firstborn of clean animals are to be sanctified to God, to be killed as *thank-offerings* at the national Sanctuary, and to be eaten by the Israelites; while the breast and the right shoulder fall to the share of the priests, as was the case with all thank-offerings.

c. The last and boldest measure is enjoined in Leviticus and Numbers,[5] and was evidently promulgated at a time when the priests could venture, at least theoretically, to set forth their principles with rigorous consistency. The firstborn boys are to be redeemed, as before. Every firstborn unclean animal is either to be redeemed by its value *increased by one fifth* of it, or to be sold at an estimated price, and the money is in either case to be given over to the priests. Every firstborn clean animal belongs to God, that is, entirely to the priests, who are indeed to kill it as a thank-offering, with the usual rites, sprinkling the blood and burning the fat, but are then to receive not

---

[1] Num. XVIII. 17, 18.

[2] As the supposition of a *second* or of a *female* firstborn (comp. ver. 19); see Comm. on Exod. pp. 220, 221 (the explanation there given cannot be upheld on philological and historical grounds); *Leyrer* in Herz. IV. 145; *Öhler* ibid. XIII. 181 (the precept in Deuteronomy is a "modification of the preceding one" designed to promote the pilgrimages of the people to the Sanctuary); etc.

[3] XIII. 2, 12, 13.

[4] XV. 19—22.

[5] Lev. XXVII. 26, 27; Num. XVIII. 15—18; III. 3; comp. *De Wette*, Einleit. § 152 note d; *Kuenen*, Hist. Crit. I. 49.

the breast and right shoulder alone, but all that remains of the animal, in accordance with the historical reason then distinctly urged, of the destruction of the firstborn Egyptians and the deliverance of the firstborn Hebrews at the time of the exodus:[6] such a deviation might have appeared desirable in order to distinguish the remarkable thank-offerings of the firstborn from the ordinary sacrifices of the same class; it made them analogous to *public* thank-offerings,[7] and, in some respect, brought them nearer to the nature of holocausts, and thus helped to recall their original character.

12. No less significant are the disagreements in the laws concerning the *Firstfruits*.[8] In Numbers, all the firstfruits are unreservedly and exclusively assigned to the priests; but in Deuteronomy it is ordained that every Israelite shall "take of the first of all the fruit of the earth",[9] and putting them into a basket, repair to the town of the common Sanctuary; here the priest shall place the basket "before the altar of the Lord",[10] while the Israelite pronounces an address of praise and thanks-giving; after which "he shall rejoice in every good thing which the Lord has given to him and his house, he, and the Levite, and the stranger".[11] Whether the firstfruits here treated of formed, or did not form, a part of the "good things" in which the Israelite was to rejoice at the succeeding repast in common with the Levite and the stranger, is of little importance; they were certainly insignificant as an impost and a source of revenue; they were carried even from distant parts in a "basket"; they were evidently a symbol of the acknowledgment of God as the Bestower of all agricultural blessings, rather than a material gift; the whole command centred in the placing of the basket

6 Exod. XIII. 14, 15; though, therefore, the *law* in Exod. XIII. 12 is probably very old, the *reason* or the *explanation* assigned to it is evidently a later addition of the revisers of the Pentateuch, in harmony with the spirit of the law of Leviticus.

7 Lev. XXIII. 20.

8 ראשית, בכורים; the meaning and difference of these terms will be explained later; comp. *Knobel* on Num. p. 93; *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. I. pp. 344, 345.

9 מראשית כל־פרי האדמה. According to Jewish tradition, but manifestly against the spirit of the Law (comp. Exod. XXII. 28; XXIII. 19; XXXIV. 26; Num. XVIII. 13; Deut. XXVI. 2; see also Ezek. XLIV. 30; Prov. III. 9; Neh. X. 36, 38; 2 Chr. XXXI. 5), the firstfruits were only offered of the seven species by which the promised land was distinguished, viz. wheat, barley, wine, figs, pomegranates, olives, and dates (Deut. VIII. 8), nor were they, according to the same authorities, offered of olives unless these were very choice, and hence not of the dates of hills nor of the fruits of trees growing in valleys (comp. *Mishn.* Bikkur. I. 3; Kelim. I. 6; *Talm.* Berach. 35*a*; *Maimon.* Hilch. Bikkur. II. 2; see, however, *Mishn.* Chall. I. 4, and in general *Maimonides*, Hilchoth Bikkurim, *passim*).

10 לפני מזבח יהוה.

11 Deut. XXVI. 1—11.

"before the Lord",[1] and in the pious address of the Israelite. But very different is the corresponding command in Numbers.[2] It assigns all the firstfruits unrestrictedly and exclusively to the priests: "All the best of the oil, and all the best of the wine, and of the wheat, their first-fruits (ראשיתם), which the Israelites shall offer to the Lord, these I have given to thee (Aaron); whatsoever is first ripe (בכורים) in the land, which they shall bring to the Lord, shall be thine."[3] It admits no Israelite or "stranger" to any share; "every one that is clean *in the priest's house* shall eat of them."[4] It mentions no common meals in connection with them at the place of the national Sanctuary; and it is evidently meant to provide for the priestly order another and very considerable source of income. These striking differences in reference to the same subject have induced ancient and modern interpreters to suppose that two distinct laws are meant, and to take the precept in Deuteronomy as relating to firstfruits, while already the Mishnah and Jewish tradition understood the injunction in Numbers to mean "a great gift" (תרומה גדולה) or a part of the vegetable produce, which the Israelites, immediately after the conclusion of their labours with respect to it, and even before setting apart the tithes, appointed to the priests under the name of תרומה.[5] We need hardly observe that the Pentateuch warrants no such division, which is analogous to the equally unfounded distinction between first, second, and third tithes, and has been prompted by kindred difficulties.[6]

Now taking a larger scope, we proceed to survey the *general Revenues and Resources of the Priests and Levites,* excluding the tithes, the firstborn, and the firstfruits, and this review will inevitably lead to results analogous to those arrived at in the preceding sections.

13. It has not unfrequently been averred that it was the main object of the sacrificial system of the Pentateuch to provide for the comfortable sustenance of the priests and Levites. But nothing can be more erroneous. This view is overthrown by the fact alone that both the holocausts and the most solemn kinds of expiatory offerings, were burnt entirely; therefore, a large number of sacrifices served ob-

1 Vers. 4, 10.

2 Num. XVIII. 12, 13.

3 Comp. ver. 8, forming a comprehensive introduction to all the taxes levied upon the "hallowed things", which shall belong as a portion "to Aaron and his sons by an ordinance for ever." 4 Ver. 13.

5 Comp. the minute deductions in Mishnah Terumoth.

6 See p. 609. The reference to the Jewish practice as derived from the discussions in Mishnah Bikkurim and Terumoth involves therefore no "indisputable proof" of the difference of the Biblical precepts, as Saalschütz (l. c. p. 346) and many others contend. — The term תרומה *gift* is a generic designation, meaning properly all that is "taken off" for sacred purposes (comp.

viously no other than purely religious ends. However, it is equally certain that many of the sacrificial ordinances aimed, collaterally, at providing a competence for a tribe which owned no territorial property, and was to be shielded from want or care because it might derogate from the efficiency of its spiritual functions (see p. 574). We may easily judge whether the portions assigned to them were in excess of their wants, and whether they were likely to have been given up from early times.

The priests received

a. Of *burnt-offerings*, the hide (עור),[7] an impost of very considerable value, since holocausts were probably the most frequent of all the sacrifices; and Philo observes distinctly,[8] "the skins of burnt-offerings amount to an unspeakable number" (ἀμύθητα). However, it appears that originally the hide of holocausts was burnt among the Hebrews,[9] as was the case among other nations, but that it was later assigned to the priests who were to have a share in all classes of offering, and especially in one so important and so common as the holocausts.[10]

b. With regard to the *private thank-offerings*, the priests were, according to Deuteronomy, to receive the *fore-shoulder*, the *two cheeks*, and the *maw*,[11] portions comparatively small in value; but, according to the middle Books, the *right shoulder* and the *breast*,[12] considered as the choicest and most palatable parts,[13] and generally reserved for distinguished persons or honoured guests.[14] Various expedients of re-

Num. XVIII. 8, 11, 26, 27; Neh. X. 38; etc.; see pp. 202, 203 notes 8—10.

[7] Lev. VII. 8.

[8] De Praem. c. 4.

[9] Lev. I. 9.

[10] See notes on VII. 8—10. Bähr (Symb. II. 365) believes that the skin was selected because, on the one hand, it leaves the animal intact as a whole, while yet, on the other hand, it might well represent the entire animal; a view the first part of which is more probable, because more simple, than the second. Jewish tradition fixed that the hides of all "most holy sacrifices" (עורות קדשים), that is, of holocausts, of sin- and trespass-offerings, were given up to the priests (*Talm.* Chull. 133 *b*, and *Rashi* in loc.; comp. *Maim.* Hilch. Bikkur. I. 8; *Reland*, Antiqq. III. i. 28; *Lightfoot*, Opp. I. 703), but such extension of the law is not warranted by the Biblical text (Lev. VII. 8; comp. ver. 6). On the hides granted to the priests in Greece, see *Hermann*, Gottesd. Alterth. § 35 note 12.

[11] הזרע והלחיים והקבה, Deut. XVIII. 3.

[12] השוק הימין והחזה, Lev. VII. 30—32; X. 14, 15; Num. VI. 20; XVIII. 18; comp. Exod. XXIX. 26, 27; Lev. VII. 28—34.

[13] Comp. Ezek. XXIV. 4, מבחר עצמים כל־נתח טוב.

[14] 1 Sam. IX. 24; comp. *Joseph.* Ant. III. ix. 2. According to Philo and Origen, the priests received the breast, because it is a symbol of wisdom; and the shoulder, because it is a type of courage and vivacity — of which virtues the priests were to be constantly reminded: this is a fair specimen of the value of allegorising interpretation; and Clericus observes justly (on Lev. VII. 32), si quaevis alia membra dixisset deus dari sacerdotibus oportere, similes rationes non defuissent. Scarcely more acceptable is the view that the breast

conciling a contradiction so apparent and so fatal to the defenders of the unity of the Pentateuch, have been proposed; some contend that the ordinance in Deuteronomy is "an addition to the previous commands, in order to show how the people might manifest their special esteem and affection for the Levites"(!)[1], a conjecture in no manner countenanced by the context and indeed implying an unwarranted increase of imposts sufficiently considerable in themselves. Others again assert that it was designed as a compensation for the loss occasioned to the Levites by the abolition of the old precept enjoining the killing of *all* animals, even those intended for food, as thank-offerings at the Sanctuary,[2] which is an objectionable attempt at accounting for one difficulty by reference to another no less striking. Or it has been urged that the זרוע is identical with שוק, an assertion at best removing only a part of the discrepancy, and disproved by a passage in which both occur together,[3] and which seems to imply a certain amalgamation of the old and the new law. Others maintain that the precept of Deuteronomy refers to animals killed for private use, and not for sacrifices;[4] but, on the one hand, this view is utterly excluded by the context of the passage which treats of "offerings of the Lord made by fire";[5] and on the other, the Deuteronomist permits the slaughtering of animals for the first-named purpose at any place in which the Israelites may reside;[6] it would, therefore, have been impossible to carry out or to enforce a law involving a novel and very vexatious principle of interference with private rights.[7]

given to the priests corresponds with the fat burnt to God; and that the leg (for as such שוק is understood) corresponds to the blood which, being the seat of life, is devoted to God, since thigh and leg from which the children issue (Gen. XXXV. 11; XLVI. 26; etc.) are the special seats of vitality; so Knobel (p. 412), who attempts to support this opinion by the analogy of the ἱερὰ μῆρα of the Greeks, and by a Latin etymology (femur, femen, fetus, fecundus, femina); and similarly Kurtz (Opferc. p. 236), who calls the breast "half-fat", and the leg the best "muscle-flesh." But it is hardly necessary to seek recondite or artificial reasons for a very natural arrangement.

1 *F. W. Schultz*, Das Deuteronomium erklärt, pp. 58, 59, 502, 504; *Öhler* in Herz. Real-Enc. XII. 181.

2 Comp. Lev. XVII. 1—9 and Deut. XII. 20—22; see p. 39; *Ranke*, Untersuch. II. 295; *Öhler*, l. c.

3 Num. VI. 19, 20.

4 So Jewish tradition, according to which the precept is valid for all times and all countries (*Mishn.* Chull. X. 1; though it fell later into disuse, *Yoreh Deah*, § LXI. 21); and so Josephus (Ant. IV. iv. 4), Philo (De Praem. Sacerd. c. 3), and many modern interpreters; comp. *Ranke*, Untersuch. II. 293—300; *Öhler* in Herz. Real-Enc. XII. 181, 182; *Kurtz*, Opferc. pp. 224, 225, whose arguments, whether advanced by himself or adopted from predecessors, are hardly more than evasions.

5 אשי יהוה, Deut. XVIII. 1; comp. ver. 3, זבחי הזבח; see 1 Sam. II. 13.

6 XII. 15.

7 Even Saalschütz (Mos. R. I. 123)

Of the *public animal thank-offerings,* which seem to have been of later introduction, the priests could claim all the flesh.[8]

c. Of all the *trespass-offerings*, and of those *sin-offerings* the blood of which was not sprinkled in the Holy, the priests appropriated to themselves the whole of the victims, with the exception of the fat and fat parts, which were to be burnt on the altar; and the flesh was to be eaten by the males, in the Court of the Sanctuary.[9] As the blood of the sin-offerings of the High-priest and the whole nation only, not of the chiefs or common Israelites, was brought into the Holy,[10] the priests received those portions in the vast majority of cases; and it could, therefore, be said, without great inaccuracy, that they had a share in "all the sin-offerings and all the trespass-offerings of the Israelites".[11]

It may be interesting to compare herewith the corresponding laws or customs of the Carthaginians as recently disclosed by discovered inscriptions. According to the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles, the honorary portion of the priests or *Mas'et* (משאת) consisted only of a small quantity of meat of about one and a half pound in weight (150 *zuz* or drachmas);[12] while the hide, the legs, and all the remaining meat were left to the worshipper,[13] although occasionally the hide was allotted to the priests.[14] Equally moderate was the tariff to be paid by the offerer to the priest instead of the various sacrifices, namely, for a bullock, whether to be presented as an offering of purification or thanksgiving, 10 shekels; for an ox or a ram to be killed for the same sacrifices, 5 shekels; for a he-goat or she-goat in the same cases, "one foreign shekel" (שקל זר); for a lamb or a kid of the goats, for a sheep that has born no young, or a stag, three-fourths of a foreign shekel; for a young marsh-bird (צפר אגנן), likewike three-fourths of a shekel; and for any other bird,

is forced to admit, "it is difficult to understand how it was feasible to deliver up to the priests those small portions from all parts of the country"; and he is therefore "almost" inclined to suppose that this law was only meant to be binding during the time of the Hebrew wanderings in the desert, which is an unwarranted assumption not borne out by the wording of the command.

8 Lev. XXIII. 20; comp. p. 243.

9 Among the early Romans, the flesh of the victims was carried to the quaestors who sold it for the advantage of the public treasury; though, in later times, the priests, popae and victimarii, divided it among themselves; the flesh of private sacrifices (polluctum) belonged to the offerers who consumed it at home; comp. *Plaut.* Rud. V. iii. 63; Mil. Glor. III. i. 117; see pp. 214, 215. Among the Persians, the Magus divided the flesh among those who attended the sacrifice (comp. p. 214).

10 Lev. VI. 18—23; VII. 6, 7; XIV. 13; see p. 210.

11 Num. XVIII. 9; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 28.

12 Line 6, comp. lines 3, 10.

13 Lines 4, 6, 8, 10; comp. Carth. Inscr. 90 of Davis, lines 2, 3.

14 Carth. Inscript. 90, lines 4, 5.

if it is a firstling-sacrifice, or one to be presented with flour or oil, one shekel.[1] But persons "poor in cattle" were, by public decrees, expressly exempted from all sacrificial imposts payable to the priests.[2] According to the celebrated document of Halicarnassus, the priestess received, besides a salary, certain fees, and the produce of an annual collection,[3] at all public sacrifices, the legs, the fourth part of the intestines, and the hides; at all private offerings, the same portions with the exception of the hides. And similar regulations obtained in Attica;[4] the offered fruits and pastry fell commonly to the share of the priests.[5]

d. Of the bloodless offerings (מִנְחָה), whether merely consisting of flour or in any way prepared by fire, and whether presented alone or as an accompaniment of animal sacrifices, the male priests were entitled to eat, in the Court of the Sanctuary, the whole except the "memorial" (אַזְכָּרָה), consisting of a handful together with the frank-incense, which was burnt on the altar.[6] The same was the case with the *first-fruit-offering* (מִנְחַת בִּכּוּרִים) of roasted ears of corn,[7] and the *firstfruit-sheaf* (מִנְחַת הָעֹמֶר) presented on the second day of Passover.[8] But the *shew-bread* of twelve cakes, renewed every week, belonged to them entirely;[9] and so did the two *firstfruit-loaves* (לֶחֶם בִּכּוּרִים) offered on Pentecost, of which nothing could be burnt on the altar, because they were leavened.[10] Of the bloodless oblation presented in connection with the praise-offering, and composed of four kinds of cereal gifts, the officiating priest claimed one cake of each kind.[11] And hence again it could be summarily said that the priests received "all the bloodless offerings of the Hebrews."[12]

e. Besides, a cake (חַלָּה) as *the first of the dough* (רֵאשִׁית עֲרִיסָה),[13] an impost or gift (תְּרוּמָה) akin to the tithes, and like them originating in the

---

[1] Tabl. of Mars. lines 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12; comp. Carth. Inscr. 90, line 7.

[2] Carth. Inscr. 90, line 6 דל מקנא בל יכן לכהן מנם, "he who is poor in cattle, does not prepare portions to the priest"; see also Tabl. of Mars. l. 15; comp. herewith the prices fixed by the Mishnah, Menach. XIII. 8; namely, for a bullock with its drink-offering a mine or 50 shekels, for a calf 5 shekels, a ram 2, a lamb 1, all including the drink-offering; see in general *Movers*, Opferwesen der Karth. pp. 74—91.

[3] Comp. *Tertull.* Apolog. c. 13, circuit cauponas religio mendicans, exigitis mercedem pro solo templi etc.

[4] Comp. *Böckh*, Prooemium zum Lectionskatalog 1835/1836, and Staatsh. II. 121; *Schömann*, Gr. Alterth. II. 414; *Hermann*, Gottesd. Alterth. § 35 notes 11—14.

[5] *Schömann*, l. c. and p. 219.

[6] Lev. II. 3, 10; VI. 9, 11; VII. 9, 10.

[7] Lev. II. 14—16. [8] Lev. XXIII. 10.

[9] Lev. XXIV. 9; Matth. XII. 4; comp. *Mishn.* Succ. V. 8.

[10] Lev. XXIII. 16—18, 20; comp. II. 11, 12; Exod. XXXIV. 22; Num. XXVIII. 26.

[11] Lev. VII. 12—14; see notes *in loc.*

[12] Num. XVIII. 9; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 29; see pp. 217 *sqq.*

[13] Num. XV. 18—21; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 30; Neh. X. 38; also Rom. XI. 6; according to the Mishnah (Challah

desire of acknowledging God as the Bestower of every blessing.[14] With these demands may be classed *the fruits* of every young tree *in the fourth year* after it was planted, those of the first three years being thrown away as useless;[15] and the *first of the wool of sheep* required by the Deuteronomist,[16] but not mentioned in any other part of the legislation. The quantity of the gifts is, in none of these cases, fixed by the Law, but was left to the pious impulses of the people.[17]

f. The priests, moreover, received every thing that was *devoted* (חֵרֶם), whether animals, landed or other property, which, when "devoted," was considered so irrevocably sacred that it could on no account be redeemed.[18]

g. They could claim the *fifth part* of the value of *sacred property* that had unawares been appropriated by an Israelite,[19] and *any property*, increased by the fifth part of its value, which had been *acquired by fraud*, if there was no legal representative of the defrauded person.[20] It appears, moreover, that, for some periods, a *pecuniary fine* was attached to *sin-offerings*, as it was generally connected with trespass-offerings; for we read, "The money of the trespass-offering and the money of the sin-offering[21] shall not be brought into the house of the Lord; it shall belong to the priests;"[22] but this fine was later abolished evidently because incompatible with the spiritual nature of the sin-offerings, and unduly checking their free performance.[23] According to Talmudical deductions, the Levites received twenty-four presents or gratuities. Of these they were obliged to consume eight within the precincts of the Temple, viz. 1. the flesh of the sin-offering, whether this were a quadruped or a bird; 2. the flesh of the trespass-offering, whether this were presented for an indisputable or a doubtful guilt;[24] 3. the flesh of

---

H. 7), in the proportion of one to twenty-four, or by the baker or others who prepare bread for sale, of one to forty-eight; comp. *Mishn*. Menach. X. 7; and the חלה is to be given whenever the quantity of flour exceeds one, or according to others two קב (*Mishn*. Edeyoth I. 2; see in general *Orach Chayim* §§ 322—330).

14 Jewish tradition limited the application of the law to the dough of wheat, barley, spelt, oats, and rye (*Mishn*. Chall. I. 1, comp. 3, 4), and ordained that, out of the holy land, the חלה is to be thrown into the fire (ibid. IV. 8), which custom is still observed by Jewish women.

15 Lev. XIX. 23, 24; see notes *in loc*.

16 XVIII. 4.

17 The Mishnah (Terumoth IV. 3) observes, "A liberal man gives one fortieth or one thirtieth, an average man one fiftieth, and a stingy man one sixtieth part"; comp. also *Mishn*. Peah I. 1 (אלה דברים שאין להם שיעור הפאה והבכורים וכ׳); *Talm*. Kethuv. 50*a* (אל יבזבז יותר מחומש שמא יצטרך לבריות).

18 Lev. XXVII. 28; Num. XVIII. 14; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 29; see also p. 409.

19 Lev. V. 16; XXII. 14.

20 Num. V. 6—8; comp. vers. 9, 10.

21 כסף אשם וכסף חטאת.

22 2 Ki. XII. 17.

23 See p. 274.

24 אשם תלוי or אשם ודאי, see p. 266.

the public thank-offerings; 4. the firstfruit-sheaf (עמר); 5. the remainder of the other bloodless offerings, after the prescribed part (אזכרה) had been burnt on the altar; 6. the two firstfruit-loaves presented on Pentecost; 7. the shew-bread; and 8. the remaining portions of the log of oil presented with the offering of the leper:[1] these were "most holy" (קדשי קדשים), and were allowed to the male priests alone. Five they had to eat within the walls of Jerusalem, viz. 1. the breast and right shoulder of private thank-offerings; 2. the priestly portions of the praise-offering (the breast, right shoulder, and part of the cereal offering); 3. of the ram of the thank-offering of the Nazarite;[2] 4. the male first-born of clean animals; and 5. the firstfruits of the soil;[3] these were of "minor sanctity" (קדשים קלים), and could be eaten both by the males and the females of sacerdotal families. Five were permitted to be eaten, likewise both by males and females, throughout the holy land, viz. 1. the tithes; 2. the tenth part of the tithes (תרומת מעשר) given by the Levites to the Aaronites; 3. the cake (חלה) taken off from the dough of the bread; 4. the produce of firstlings of the wool of sheep; and 5. the produce of a consecrated field inherited from parents or near relatives.[4] Five could be eaten either in the holy land or elsewhere, viz. 1. the portions supposed to be allotted to the priests at private slaughterings, the fore-shoulder, the two cheeks, and the maw;[5] 2. the redemption money of the firstborn sons; and 3. that of the firstborn unclean animals; 4. the unjustly acquired property restored, with an addition, by persons who had no legal heir; and 5. the "devoted" property (חֵרֶם). And one, lastly, was received in the Sanctuary and carried away, viz. the hide of the "most holy" offerings, viz. holocausts and expiatory sacrifices.[6]

h. It seems to have been the intention of the legislators, to allow to the priests and the Levites, though exempt from military service, a share in the *booty of war*. This is the obvious inference to be drawn from the arrangements said to have been made after the expedition against the Midianites.[7] The entire spoil, with the exception of trinkets and precious metals, was divided into two halves, the one intended for the soldiers who had fought, the other for the people that had remained in the camp; of the former the priests received, by lot, one head of cattle and

[1] Lev. XIV. 10, 15.

[2] Num. VI. 14.

[3] See, however, *infra*.

[4] שדה אחוזה, Lev. XXVII. 16—21.

[5] Deut. XVIII. 3; comp., however, *infra*.

[6] According to another division or mode of counting, ten could be consumed within the precincts of the Sanctuary, four within the walls of Jerusalem, and ten throughout the holy land. See *Talm.* Chull. 133*b;* Bab. Kam. 110*b;* comp. *Maimonides*, Hilchoth Bikkurim I. 1—15; see also pp. 76, 77.

[7] Num. XXXI. 26—47.

one captive of every 500; of the latter the Levites received one of every 50;[8] of the gold and silver the soldiers offered gifts spontaneously for the sacred service "to make an atonement for their souls" and as a "memorial for the children of Israel before the Lord."[9] This narrative with its accurate numerical details has evidently been inserted by the author as a hint for imitation, although he makes no allusion to the custom observed in the matter at his time.[10]

i. According to the enactments of the third and fourth Books of the Pentateuch, the priests and Levites were to live in 48 cities assigned to them, at least principally,[11] as a part of the territory due to them as one of the tribes of Israel,[12] and were to receive, besides, a district of land (מִגְרָשׁ) comprising 2000 yards round each town in every direction[13] as pasturage for their cattle,[14] and deemed sufficient for their abodes and their sustenance.[15] These cities, as far as they belonged to members of the tribe of Levi, were even to enjoy special privileges; for the houses and the fields could never be forfeited when sold, and were, without compensation, to be restored in the year of jubilee.[16] However, in Deuteronomy, the Levites appear as living scattered throughout the land; they are constantly alluded to as being "within the gates" of the Israelites;[17] and they are expressly permitted to settle wherever they might deem fit, "And if a Levite come from any of thy gates out of all Israel where he sojourned[18] and come with all the desire of his mind to the place which the Lord shall choose, then he shall minister in the name of the Lord his God, as all his brethren the Levites do who stand there before the Lord"[19] — a passage which proves that the Levites, scantily cared for in the towns of the Israelites, had a tendency to congregate in the place of the central Sanctuary, where they were promised equal portions with those who had served there before, without losing whatever they might have real-

[8] Comp. Gen. XIV. 20.

[9] Num. l. c. vers. 50—54; comp. Josh. VI. 19, 24; 2 Sam. VIII. 11; 1 Chr. XXVI. 27, 28.

[10] Comp., however, Josh. XXII. 8; 1 Sam. XXX. 24, 25; 2 Macc. VIII. 28, 30.

[11] Comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. 50.

[12] Num. XXXV. 2.

[13] Num. XXXV. 4, 5; Sept. *προάστεια, ἀφορίσματα, τὰ συγκυροῦντα*; sec Comm. in loc.; *Mishn*. Sot. V. 3; *Rosenmüller*, Excurs. ad Num. pp. 447*sqq.*; *Creizenach*, Schulch. Aruch, III. 182, 183; esp. *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. I. 100—104.

[14] Num. XXXV. 1—8; comp. Josh. XIV. 4; XXI. 2—42; 1 Chr. VI. 46—66; see *supra* pp. 574, 586.

[15] Comp. *Joseph*. Ant. IV. iv. 3, *ὀκτὼ καὶ τεσσαράκοντα πόλεις ἀγαθὰς καὶ καλὰς τῆς τε πρὸ αὐτῶν γῆς . . . εἰς δισχιλίους πήχεις κτλ.*

[16] Lev. XXV. 32—34.

[17] Deut. XII. 12, 18; XIV. 27, 29; XVI. 11.

[18] מאחד שעריך מכל־ישראל אשר הוא גר שם.

[19] Deut. XVIII. 6, 7; comp. Judg. XVII. 7—11; XIX. 1; 1 Sam. I. 1; see *infra* Sect. V.

ised by the sale of their patrimony.[1] In fact, the very idea of Levitical towns with territorial domains, contradicts the fundamental notion that the Levites were to have no property, because God was their inheritance and their wealth.[2] The Book of Joshua (XIV. 4) endeavours indeed to remove the contradictions; for it makes a distinction between "a share in the land" and "cities to dwell in with their suburbs for their cattle and their substance;" but this distinction, prompted as it is by apologetic reasons, is artificial and untenable; for 48 towns with a territorial addition to each, is nothing else but "a share in the land" or "an inheritance" (נַחֲלָה). Moreover, the Pentateuch itself is at variance with its own statements on the subject. The Levitical towns are already incidentally mentioned in the laws promulgated at Mount Sinai, and made the object of legislative arrangements;[3] and yet they are formally assigned to the Levites only about forty years later, "in the plains of Moab," and are there treated of as if they had never before been alluded to:[4] those arrangements, so favourable to the Levites, must, therefore, fall *after* the encampment in Moab, that is, beyond the lifetime of Moses.[5]

14. Now, if the Levites, free from all taxes and burdens,[6] indeed received all the emoluments and gifts bestowed upon them in the middle Books of the Pentateuch, they could be certain of a life of ease and almost luxury. Even those members of the tribe who, for any reason, were unable to officiate in the Sanctuary, and especially to perform the sacrificial rites, for instance, those disqualified by some bodily defect,[7] were considerately provided for. For it was ordained that, while in most cases the appurtenances fell to the share of the acting priest,[8] they formed, in others, a common stock to be equally divided among all priests.[9] The position of the Levites was, therefore, well-established

---

1 Deut. XVIII. 8, לְבַד מִמְכָּרָיו עַל־הָאָבוֹת. Ewald (Alterthümer, p. 323) translates these words "besides his hospitable reception in the priestly families" — a rendering which has very little probability.

2 See *supra* p. 586. Gramberg (Rel. Id. I. 209) observes therefore, "Wahrscheinlich rührt das neue Gesetz (in Num. XXXV. 1—8) von einem andern Dichter her, welcher durch die kurze Andeutung von den Städten der Leviten (Lev. XXV. 32—34) veranlasst wurde, darüber etwas bestimmteres auszusprechen."

3 Lev. XXV. 32—34; comp. XXVI. 46; XXVII. 34. 4 Num. XXXV. 1—8.

5 Comp. *De Wette*, Beiträge II. 276.

6 See p. 574; comp. Ezra VII. 24.

7 Lev. XXI. 17—23; *Jos.* Bell. Jud. V. v. 7; *Talm.* Zevach. 102.

8 As the right shoulder in thank-offerings (Lev. VII. 33), or the cereal oblations baked in the oven, or dressed in a pan or pot (VII. 9); see p. 482, and notes on VII. 8—10.

9 As the breast in thank-offerings (Lev. VII. 31), the shew-bread (Lev. XXIV. 9), and the cereal offerings presented dry or merely mingled with oil

and commanding. They were indeed, as Philo observed, "invested by the Law with the dignity and honour that belongs to kings."[10] Yet we find, in Deuteronomy, repeated and almost pitiful appeals made to the Israelites in their behalf. "Take heed that thou forsake not the Levite as long as thou livest upon the earth;"[11] and "the Levite that is within thy gate, thou shalt not forsake him; for he has no part nor inheritance with thee."[12] They appear helpless like the poor, the stranger, the widow, and the orphan, and are generally included in the same recommendation to private charity;[13] and their sustenance is derived not from a regular or legally defined income but from occasional relief.[14] It is, therefore, evident, that the advantages of the Levites were but gradually gained; they could be secured with precaution only and by imperceptible steps. It was no easy task, requiring no ordinary amount of shrewdness and firmness, to deprive the Israelites of their natural rights in matters of religion; but it is probable that the privileges demanded in Leviticus and Numbers remained, on the whole, not much more than a priestly theory, and were seldom, if ever, actually granted to the Levites. In the historical Books of the Old Testament, it is only under the theocratic king Hezekiah and the zealous leader Nehemiah that the firstfruits and tithes, the firstborn animals and other gifts, are reported to have been collected for the priests;[15] in earlier periods,

(VII. 10). According to tradition, the distribution took place every evening (see *Targ. Jerus.* on Gen. XLIX. 27).

10 *Philo*, De Praemiis Sacerd. c. 2, ἐξ ὧν ἁπάντων ἐστὶ δῆλον, ὅτι βασιλέων σεμνότητα καὶ τιμὴν περιάπτει τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ὁ νόμος.

11 Deut. XII. 19.

12 XIV. 27, 29; X. 9; XII. 12, 18.

13 Deut. XII. 18; XIV. 29; XVI. 11, 14; XXVI. 11—13; comp. 1 Sam. II. 36; see *supra* p. 600.

14 Comp. *George*, Jüd. Feste, pp. 47—50. A curious evasion is attempted by *F. W. Schultz* (Das Deuteronomium erklärt, p. 58), who contends that the Deuteronomist represents the Levites as poor and helpless "in order to describe them above all as needful of friendship"; and similarly it has been observed, "as if to provide for the contingency of failing crops or the like . . . the Levite was commended to the special kindness of the people" (*Plumptre* l. c. II. 102).

15 2 Chr. XXXI. 4—8; Neh. X. 36—40; XII. 44; XIII. 5, 12, 31; Judith XI. 13; Tobit I. 7, 8; comp., however, Neh. XIII. 10; Mal. III. 8, 10. The term שדי תרומות (2 Sam. I. 21), occurring in the elegy of David, that is, fields yielding produce worthy of firstfruit-offerings, is too indistinct for historical deduction; equally inconclusive is the לחם בכורים which a man of Baal-Shalishah brought to Elisha in a time of famine (2 Ki. IV. 42). That the testimony of the Book of Chronicles with respect to Levitical reforms must be cautiously received, needs scarcely to be observed (see pp. 31—33); the store-rooms for the reception of the plentiful gifts mentioned by the Chronist (2 Chr. XXXI. 11) are not alluded to in the Books of Kings, and have probably been added by him because they existed in the *second* Temple (Neh. XIII. 4*sqq.*; comp. *Gramb.* Rel. Id. I. 91).

they are never mentioned nor alluded to. It is as improbable in itself as it is opposed to the general laws of Levitical development, that the precepts of the Pentateuch represent the priests as having *lost* again a great part of the privileges once acquired. This unhistorical conclusion is forced upon those who place Leviticus chronologically before Deuteronomy. But it is simply a perversion of facts to contend that the Levites were more amply provided for by the laws of Deuteronomy than by those of the middle Books.[1]

15. Though, therefore, the question whether the Levitical income, as fixed in the middle Books of the Pentateuch, was excessive or not, is of little practical moment; it is yet of considerable historical interest, as it is calculated to illustrate the character of an important part of the legislation. It is utterly inappropriate to found the claims of the Levites upon the plea that they had a legal right to the twelfth or thirteenth part of the territory of Canaan, which they ceded to the other tribes, and for which they could demand ample sustenance. It is true that the Book of Numbers represents the matter in this light; for it ordains that the towns should be given to the Levites "from the inheritance of their possession."[2] But it requires, after the preceding observations, no further arguments to prove that this is nothing but a Levitical view or rather pretence. The tribe of Levi had, by its own daring and recklessness, forfeited the territorial possessions which it might have owned; and, scattered through the land, it was compelled to seek subsistence by whatever means it could devise. In reality, the priests and Levites could fairly demand compensation for their ministerial and other services; and so their income is indeed regarded in some passages.[3] But if tithes, firstfruits, and firstborn animals, their shares in holocausts and thank-offerings, in expiatory and bloodless oblations, the devoted property, the booty of war, the forty-eight towns with their surrounding districts, and the manifold minor privileges, are surveyed and computed, it will be found that the Levites received infinitely more than their due proportion. According to the double census, recorded in the Book of Numbers,[4] the Israelites over twenty years of age amounted, in round figures, to 600,000, the Levites over one month to 22,000, which, at a very moderate calculation, would be about 17,000 over twenty years; the proportion of Levites to Israelites was, therefore, as 17,000 to 600,000; that is, the Levites formed about the *thirty-*

[1] So *De Wette*, Opusc. Theol. p. 163, "Plura quae habet — auctor Deuteronomii — nova et addititia, ad hierarchiam augendam et Levitarum auctoritatem sanciendam spectant;" see, on the other hand, *George*, Jüd. Feste, pp. 45—69.

[2] Num. XXXV. 2, מנחלת אחוזתם.

[3] Num. XVIII. 21, 31.

[4] Chapters I and XXVI.

*fifth* part of the Israelites.[5] But by the tithes alone they received the *tenth* part of the whole agricultural produce of the soil and of the annual increase of cattle; one Levite had, therefore, from this source only, an income equivalent to that of three or four Israelites. If the other revenues are added, they must indeed be regarded as exorbitant;[6] and it has been observed that if all the enactments of the Pentateuch had been carried out, the priests would soon, without working, have acquired all the property of the land.[7] Though the Levites increased, their income grew proportionately; for industry and agriculture, and therefore the Levitical revenues, kept pace with the growth of the population; and in some periods, the territory or arable land of the Hebrews was considerably enlarged. It is irrelevant to enquire whether all the prescribed imposts were burdensome to the Israelites or not in a land of remarkable fertility; the question is, whether they were fairly required for the sustenance of Levites. If wealth was obtained through the fruitfulness of the soil, it belonged more justly to those who produced it by their exertions.[8] And it is against the spirit of the Pentateuch to suppose that the Levites were required to bear the expen-

---

[5] It is, therefore, incorrect to say that the proportion was as 1 to 13; the tribes were very different in numerical strength, and Levi was the least numerous of all; for while Judah, the largest, counted 74,600 men over twenty years, Manasseh, the smallest of the other tribes, had 32,000, or nearly double the number of Levi (comp. Num. I. 27, 35).

[6] So also judges Michaelis (Mos. R. § 52), who takes the proportion of Levites to Israelites as 1 to 50, and calls the income of the former "extravagant" (ausschweifend), though he attempts to justify it by asserting that the Levites were not merely clerical functionaries but also scholars and men of science; but even if they were the latter, they received their revenues merely because they were the former. Bauer (Gottesd. Verf. I. 278) describes that income as "large and almost excessive", though he echoes Michaelis' exculpatory arguments (pp. 280—284). According to a computation in the Hebrew work שלטי גבורים, the imposts amounted to one-fifth of the produce of the soil, besides the dues in cattle (comp. *Creizenach*, Schulchan Aruch, IV. 37).

[7] *Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. 198, 199; comp. pp. 7—230; *von Cölln*, Bibl. Theol. I. 66, 279, 280; comp. also *De Wette*, Beiträge, II. 334, 335. It is difficult to comprehend how, in the face of the facts adduced, it is possible to venture the assertion, "by the regulations of the Pentateuch the priests were sufficiently but not liberally provided for" (*Öhler* in Herz. XII. 182; comp. VIII. 352; similarly also *Leyrer* ibid. XVIII. 419; *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. I. 105 ("die Leviten waren durchaus nicht glänzend versorgt"), 122.

[8] These remarks meet the apologetic efforts of Winer (Real-Wört. I. 442; II. 22, 273), Bähr (Symb. II. 48, 49), and others; some curiously base a mitigating argument on the irregular or imperfect payment of the imposts foreseen and taken into account by the legislator (e. g. *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. I. 93); see also *Rosenmüller*, Schol.

diture for the costly worship of the Sanctuary;[1] for all offerings were indispensably to be the gift and property of those in whose name they were presented;[2] the *public* offerings, therefore, must have been provided by the *people*.[3] Hence it will be admitted that the ordinances of the middle Books regarding the Levitical income, were suggested not by expediency or the actual requirements of the case, but by those principles of theocratic rule which the Pentateuch saw fit to enforce by every possible device. The tithes, the firstfruits, the firstborn, and the 48 cities were to be given to God's ministers, because they were looked upon as properly belonging to Him as the true owner of the land and its produce. Portions of the sacrifices and the whole of the devoted property were allowed to the priests, because all offerings and hallowed objects were regarded in the same light. All these laws were the consistent results of a peculiar theory; they were the ideal claims of a priesthood founded upon an ideal political organisation; and they hence inevitably overlooked or disregarded the considerations of equity and justice.[4]

## IV. DEVIATIONS FROM THE LEVITICAL LAWS FOUND IN THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Our views of the origin, date, and gradual development of Levitical institutions are very significantly confirmed by a comparison between the regulations of the Pentateuch and the independent, because incidental, statements scattered in other parts of the Hebrew canon, which comparison will afford us another welcome clue to the chronology of the Law.

1. It is true that the historical Books mention various facts in harmony with the precepts of the Pentateuch. To a certain extent, the High-priests, in the first times after the settlement in Canaan, are in accordance with the Levitical directions. Aaron is succeeded by Eleazar,

---

on Num. XVIII. 21, who reproduces Michaelis' arguments, a strange compound of judiciousness and specious sophistry.

[1] *Ewald*, Alterthümer, pp. 314, 315.

[2] See p. 101.

[3] This principle is clearly acknowledged in *Mishn.* Shekal. IV. 1, 2. No proof can be deduced from the uncertain passage Num. III. 45, ואת בהמת הלוים תחת בהמתם; so *Saalschütz*, l. c. p. 348; comp. p. 122.

[4] The view of *Hüllmann* (Staatsverfassung der Israeliten, pp. 158—162) that "the priests were the lords of the entire soil", and the 12 "lay-tribes, therefore, were vassals of the priests", and hence had to pay to them the tithes; this view is utterly against the statements of Scripture; not even the Pentateuch could venture theoretically to set forth principles so absolutely at variance with reality, experience, and historic truth.

the eldest of his surviving sons, the two first, Nadab and Abihu, having died before him.[5] Eleazar is followed by his son Phinehas, whom we find in office in the early periods of the Judges.[6] When, in the time of Joshua, the transjordanic population erected an altar on the eastern side of the river, and the other tribes, incensed at their supposed revolt against God, were bent upon a war of extermination, the High-priest Phinehas was at the head of the tribunal, which amicably settled the threatening rupture;[7] and in the war between Benjamin and the other tribes, he consulted the Ark of the Covenant in the name of the people,[8] as, later, the priests are stated to have sought oracles by the Urim and Thummim.[9] It is likely that Phinehas was in his dignity succeeded by some of his direct descendants; for the High-priesthood was supposed to have been promised "to him and to his seed after him,"[10] because he had evinced ardent and pious zeal.[11] Towards the end of that epoch, Eli, believed to be descended from Ithamar,[12] and certainly belonging to the stock of Aaron or the oldest priestly family,[13] was both High-priest and Judge.[14] In the reign of the three first kings, are mentioned as High-priests two sons of Ahitub, the grandson of Eli, through Phinehas, namely Abiah[15] and his brother Ahimelech,[16] and Abiathar, the son of Ahimelech.[17] The numerous priests likewise who served at

---

5 Josh. XIV. 1; XVII. 4; XIX. 51; XXI. 1; XXIV. 33; comp. Num. III. 32; XX. 28; Deut. X. 6.

6 Josh. XXII. 30—32; Judg. XX. 27, 28; there is no reason to declare the latter passage spurious, or to attribute it to the reviser of the Book, and not to his written sources (so *Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. 181).

7 Josh. XXII. 30 *sqq.*; comp. XVII. 4.

8 Judg. XX. 27, 28.

9 Ezra II. 63; Neh. VII. 65.

10 לו ולזרעו אחריו.

11 Num. XXV. 11—13. And, in harmony with this promise, Josephus (Ant. V. xi. 5), and others, espec. Samaritans (*Reland*, Diss. I. 152 *sqq.*) mention as Phinehas' successors his direct issue through several generations, namely Abiezer, Bukki, and Uzzi; after whom the succession passed, with Eli, into the line of Ithamar (comp. also *Joseph.* Ant. XX. x. 1): but this tradition rests on no other basis than the untrustworthy genealogies of Levi in the first Book of Chronicles, where the following pedigree is given, without allusion to the High-priesthood — Eleazar, Phinehas, Abishua (אֲבִישׁוּעַ, the Ἀβιεζέρης of Josephus, i. e. אֲבִי עֶזֶר, equivalent in meaning to אבישוע), Bukki, Uzzi, Zerahiah, Meraioth, Amariah, Ahitub, Zadok, Ahimaaz, Azariah, Johanan, etc. (1 Chr. V. 29—40; VI. 35—38). In Ezra VII. 1—5, Azariah is placed between Meraioth and Amariah (ver. 3). On the suspicious character of these lists see *Bohlen*, Genes. Introduct. p. CXXVII.

12 *Jos.* Ant. V. xi. 5; VIII. i. 3; see the preceding note.

13 1 Sam. II. 27—30.

14 1 Sam. I. 9; IV. 18.

15 1 Sam. XIV. 3.

16 1 Sam. XXII. 11, 12.

17 1 Sam. XXII. 20. Vatke (l. c. p. 344) believes Abiah to be the same person with Ahimelech. — On Zadok the son of Ahitub see *infra*. On the succession of the High-priests see also *Herzfeld*,

Nob, seem to have been relatives.[1] In fact, "a man of God" is reported to have said to Eli, "Thus says the Lord, did I plainly appear to the house of thy father, when they were in Egypt in Pharaoh's house? And did I choose him out of all the tribes of Israel to be My priest, to offer upon My altar, to burn incense, to wear an ephod before Me? and did I give to the house of thy father all the offerings made by fire of the children of Israel?"[2] — which words not only imply an uninterrupted priesthood, hereditary in Aaron's family, from the time of the exodus, but also a regular sacrificial service with appointed functionaries. Levites were employed as priests for public worship,[3] and were preferred as ministers for private or domestic devotions, as is evident from the instance of Micah.[4] When, in the time of Samuel, the Ark was returned by the Philistines to Beth-shemesh, the Levites took charge of it and carried it;[5] for although that town was meant to be a priestly city,[6] the text distinguishes strictly between "Levites" and "inhabitants of Beth-shemesh."[7] The Levites took the Ark from the vehicle which the people broke into pieces for the sacrifice;[8] and though, at the subsequent removal of the Ark, the Levites are not again mentioned, they were usually entrusted with its transport by David[9] and Solomon;[10] yet, on extraordinary occasions, that office was confided to the *priests*, as at the passage of the Israelites over the Jordan under Joshua,[11] or at the siege and capture of Jericho,[12] or when the blessing and the curse were recited before Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim,[13] and of course at the completion of the Temple, when the Ark was finally deposited in the Holy of Holies, while the Levites carried the other implements of the Tabernacle.[14] It is probably too sceptical to suppose that these statements prove nothing else but that "in the age of David and Solomon, there was, besides the priests, a number of subordinate servants of the Sanctuary, whom the narrators designate with the name

l. c. pp. 368*sqq.*; *Wieseler*, Chronol. Synopse der Evangelien, p. 188; *Öhler*, in Herz. VI. 204—206; a. o.

1 1 Sam. XXII. 11, 16, 18.

2 1 Sam. II. 27, 28.

3 Joel I. 9, 13; II. 17; etc.

4 Judg. XVII. 13; comp. also 1 Ki. XII. 31; XIII. 33, 34.

5 1 Sam. VI. 15; comp., however, *infra*. The mention of the Levites has justly been pronounced a later and unskilful interpolation derived from a different relation or tradition (*De Wette*, Beiträge, I. 235; *Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. 187, 188); whatever Hengstenberg (Auth. des Pent. II. 70—72) brings forward to prove the consistency of the narrative.

6 Josh. XXI. 16; 1 Chr. VI. 44.

7 Ver. 15.

8 Ibid.

9 2 Sam. XV. 24; 1 Chr. XV. 2, 12, 14, 15, 27; comp. XXIII. 26.

10 2 Chr. V. 4.

11 Josh. III. 3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17; IV. 9, 10, 16, 18.

12 Josh. VI. 6, 12.

13 Josh. VIII. 33.

14 1 Ki. VIII. 3, 4, 6—11; 2 Chr. V. 5—7; comp. 1 Ki. II. 26.

of Levites," without thereby alluding to their descent:[15] it can hardly be doubted that the Levites mentioned in the history of the early kings, are the same who were later traced to Levi as their ancestor. David availed himself of the services of the priests Abiathar and Zadok in appealing to the elders of Judah.[16] Priests anointed kings, and were, on various occasions, prominently employed in political matters of importance.[17] Under David, 6,000 Levites were civil officers and judges.[18] When Jeroboam appointed priests from all sections of the people "that were not of the sons of Levi,"[19] the Levites emigrated from his dominions, and settled in the rival empire of Judah.[20] The king Jehoshaphat instituted a court of law composed of Levites, priests, and heads of families, and presided over by the High-priest; he appointed Levites to places in the public service,[21] and he sent priests and Levites to all the towns of Judah to instruct the people in the Law.[22] King Hezekiah availed himself of Levites for the execution of his reforms.[23] In the time of Shalmanassar priests taught the Assyrians who had settled in the territory of Israel.[24] The High-priest Hilkiah, in the reign of Josiah, had the control over the treasures of the Temple.[25] The priests were accustomed, during the period of their official duties, to abstain from sexual intercourse.[26] Tithes, firstlings, and other gifts were abundantly offered in the reign of the theocratic king Hezekiah and in the time of Nehemiah.[27]

2. But all these facts are very far from establishing the existence of a Levitical organisation like that described in the Pentateuch. They show indeed a growing influence of priests and Levites, and render their ultimate power intelligible; but it must be urged, that many of these facts and incidents belong to a very late period of Hebrew history, and that the greatest part of them is derived from the Books of Chronicles, an unreliable source compiled at a time when the Levites had attained their highest hierarchical authority, and written with the purpose of strengthening and glorifying it. It is this source alone which attributes to David the division of the priests into 24, and of the Levites into 4 classes, and which mentions, under Hezekiah, a complete distribution of offices and duties among the whole tribe.[28] We should not be justified in accepting these statements as historical, unless they

---

15 *Vatke* l. c. pp. 348, 349.

16 2 Sam. XIX. 12.

17 1 Ki. I. 7, 39; etc.

18 1 Chr. XXIII. 4; comp. XXVI. 29; 2 Chr. XXXIV. 13.

19 1 Ki. XII. 31; comp. XIII. 33.

20 2 Chr. XI. 13, 14; see *infra*.

21 2 Chr. XIX. 8—11.

22 2 Chr. XVII. 7—9; comp. XXXV. 3, 15; Neh. VIII. 9—11.

23 2 Chr. XXX. 22.

24 2 Ki. XVII. 27, 28; comp. Jer. XVIII. 18; Ezek. XLIV. 23, 24; Mal. II. 7.

25 2 Ki. XXII. 4.

26 1 Sam. XXI. 5.

27 See *supra* p. 623.

28 2 Chr. XXXI. 12—17.

**be confirmed or rendered probable by other and more reliable testimonies. But such confirmation is furnished from no source; on the contrary, we are able to point out, in the historical Books, many serious deviations from the Levitical Law. We do not lay much stress, for this purpose, upon discrepancies described and censured as unlawful by the historians themselves, as the reckless conduct of the sons of Eli, who took of the sacrifices cooked instead of raw meat, and demanded their portions before the fat and the fat parts had been burnt on the altar;[1] or upon the facts that David, the layman, partook of the shew-bread in a time of necessity and distress,[2] or that the Ark was, in exceptional cases, carried by the priests and not the Levites,[3] or that the rebellious Jeroboam appointed priests "of any class of the people who were not of the sons of Levi;"[4] nor do we attach much importance to the circumstance that thirteen priestly towns seem to be out of all proportion to the requirements of the priests, the sons of Eleazar and Ithamar, who at the time of the occupation of Canaan, could have hardly numbered more than a dozen souls,[5] since the priestly towns are introduced as a prospective arrangement, designed to meet the wants of a future age.[6] And it may be accidental that the long white linen robe, a chief garment of the common priests, which in the historical Books is always called *ephod* (אֵפוֹד בָּד),[7] is in Exodus described by the name of כְּתֹנֶת or *tunic*,[8] though if the former was indeed entirely identical with the latter, it might surprise us to find no allusion whatever to its peculiar "tesselated" workmanship.[9]**

---

1 1 Sam. II. 12—17; see p. 36; comp. *Michaelis*, Mos. R. §52, I. p. 193.

2 1 Sam. XXI. 4—7.

3 Josh. III. 3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 17, etc.; see *supra* p. 628 note 11.

4 1 Ki. XII. 31; 2 Chr. XI. 13, 14.

5 Comp. *Kurtz*, Opferc. p. 20.

6 It is hardly compatible with the spirit of the injunction to suppose that *one* priestly family only was intended to live in each priestly town (*Kurtz*, l. c.); if so, it would have been impossible to assign for it the whole district of 1,000 cubits all around the city, which would have been a measure of the greatest injustice to the other inhabitants. Though, therefore, Israelites also lived in those towns, the priests were supposed to form a considerable, if not the chief, portion of the population. The same remarks apply to the Levitical towns, although, in this respect, the territorial provision is more in harmony with the numbers of the tribe. In order to explain how the single family of Aaron could perform all priestly functions for the whole nation, it has been supposed in ancient and modern times that many men were *adopted* as the sons of Aaron and thus rendered or deemed qualified — which is absolutely against the spirit of the Law.

7 1 Sam. II. 18; XXII. 18; 2 Sam. VI. 14.

8 Exod. XXVIII. 4; XXXIX. 27; comp. מדו בד Lev. VI. 3.

9 תשבץ; see Comm. on Exod. p. 526. The אפוד בד of the common priests is accurately distinguished from the אפד

3. But irrespective of these doubtful yet remarkable and questionable disagreements, there are others of an indisputable and more decided character.

The office of the *High-priest*, its peculiar nature and significance, belong to the most remarkable and specific features of the system of the Pentateuch. But in many respects, no trace of it is found elsewhere. For a long time, it was even without a special name; the High-priest was simply called "the priest" (הַכֹּהֵן);[10] the appellations "the anointed priest" or "the great" or "chief priest" were adopted at later epochs when the hierarchy was systematically regulated, and the various functions distinctly fixed. The elder prophets never mention the term High-priest. Jehoiadah who saved and concealed Joash, and secured for him the throne, was certainly a priest of particular and exceptional authority, though he is never called High-priest;[11] mentioned as such (הכהן הגדול) is first that Hilkiah who became so famous by the discovery of the Book of the Law.[12] In several periods, we find two chief priests, evidently endowed with equal authority; so in the time of David and Solomon, Zadok and Abiathar,[13] or Zadok and Ahimelech,[14] one of the line of Eleazar and one of that of Ithamar;[15] whereas, according to the very nature of the dignity, the High-priesthood could be held by *one* individual only at a time; and one only was ordained and is invariably alluded to in the Pentateuch.[16]

of the High-priest (1 Sam. II. 28; XIV. 3; XXIII. 9; XXX. 7), which seems to have been, from early times, a characteristic vestment of the chief priest, though we have no means of ascertaining whether it corresponded entirely with the אפוד so carefully described in Exodus (XXVIII. 6—12). In the time of Agrippa II, those Levites who officiated as musicians, prevailed upon the king to allow them also to wear linen garments, like the priests, which innovation, as Josephus (Antiqq. XX. ix. 6) correctly observes, was contrary to the laws of the country, and which he considered as one of the transgressions certain to call down Divine punishment (see *supra* p. 587). — On the other hand, Judas called Aristobulus, who was also king, was the first High-priest who wore a diadem, on which account, as Josephus observes, "he died of a sore disorder" (*Jos.* Ant. XX. x. 1).

10 Exod. XXIX. 30; Lev. XXI. 21; Josh. XIV. 1; etc.

11 Comp. 2 Ki. XII. 8, "king Joash called ליהוידע הכהן ולכהנים."

12 2 Ki. XXII. 4. See p. 35. Hence we must accede to Vatke's remark, "It is improbable and almost positively disproved by historical analogies, that a High-priest with his ephod for oracles existed already in the period of the Judges" (Rel. des A. T. I. 267; comp. p. 269).

13 2 Sam. XV. 24—29, 35; XVII. 15; XIX. 12; XX. 25; 1 Chr. XV. 11; 1 Ki. IV. 4.

14 2 Sam. VIII. 17; 1 Chr. XXIV. 3, 6, 31. In 1 Chr. XVIII. 16, *Abimelech* occurs for *Ahimelech*. Nearly all these passages prove, that they were the chief *public* priests, not private or domestic priests of the two kings.

15 1 Chr. XXIV. 3, 6.

16 Exod. XXIX. 30; Lev. IV. 3, 5,

4. In a similar manner, the High-priesthood as instituted in the Pentateuch, was necessarily held for life, and could be lost by death alone;[1] for the spirit of God had, by the sacred anointment, been poured out upon the holy representative of the people.[2] But we find that, for a long time, the High-priest was under the control of the secular, and especially royal power; he could be removed if disliked or objected to, and especially if his political views were opposed to the king's party. Ahimelech, though animated by the most scrupulous loyalty towards Saul, was with his whole house mercilessly massacred, because he had assisted David in his flight.[3] Solomon deposed the High-priest Abiathar, and appointed Zadok in his stead.[4]

5. It was evidently the intention of the Law that the father should be followed in the High-priesthood, if not by his firstborn son,[5] at least by one of his sons, in regular succession. It is observed, in reference to Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, "He and his seed after him shall have the covenant of an everlasting priesthood."[6] But supposed even that the office was preserved in the line of Eleazar up to the time of Eli,[7] it is admitted on all hands that, with Eli, it passed into the branch of Ithamar. Now follow indeed some of Eli's descendants, Ahiah, Ahimelech and Abiathar;[8] but then the line breaks off and begins anew with Zadok the son of Ahitub,[9] the ancestor of the chief priesthood in the Temple.[10] That Ahitub, the father of Zadok, is not identical with Ahitub, the father of Ahiah and Ahimelech, is unquestionable from historical statements. The whole family of Eli was for ever to be excluded from the chief priesthood on account of the iniquity of his sons, though some were, to their own vexation, always to be employed for poor and paltry offices.[11] This prediction was realised first by the death of Eli's sons Hophni and Phinehas;[12] then by the slaughter of

---

16; VI. 15; VIII. 7—9; XXI. 10; Num. XXXV. 25, 28; see *supra* pp. 574-576.

[1] Comp. Num. XXXV. 25, 28; as was the case in Rome and elsewhere, though the slightest oversight in the ritual observances caused the forfeiture of the office; in other places, as at Hierapolis, a new High-priest was appointed every year (*Lucian*, Syr. Dea c. 42; comp. *Plat.* Legg. VI. 7, p. 759 D.).

[2] See p. 577.

[3] 1 Sam. XXII. 9—19.

[4] 1 Ki. II. 26, 35. That the dignity was annual, cannot be concluded from the passage of the Talmud (Yom. 9*a*) above adverted to (p. 576), as this speaks of shortlived High-priests dying early on account of their wickedness (צא וחשוב כל אחד ואחד לא הוציא שנתו); see also *Othon*. Lex. Rabb. pp. 618, 619.

[5] *Talm*. Yom. 72*b*.

[6] ברית כהנת עולם, Num. XXV. 13; comp. 1 Sam. II. 35.

[7] See *supra* p. 628.

[8] See *supra* p. 627.

[9] 2 Sam. VIII. 17; XV. 24, 29, 35, 36; XVII. 15; XIX. 12; 1 Chr. XXIV. 3, 6; comp. Ezra VII. 1—5.

[10] Ezek. XL. 46; XLIII. 19; XLIV. 15.

[11] 1 Sam. II. 31—33, 36.

[12] Ver. 34; IV. 11.

the whole house of Ahimelech, the son of Ahitub, numbering eighty-five persons, when Abiathar alone, a son of Ahimelech, escaped, but no Zadok;[13] and lastly by the degrading removal of Abiathar, that last scion of Eli's house, when, as the historian expressly remarks, "the word was fulfilled which the Lord had spoken concerning the house of Eli in Shiloh,"[14] and when, in Abiathar's place, Zadok was installed,[15] who was, therefore, manifestly that "faithful priest" (כהן נאמן), whom, according to the same prophecy, God selected irrespectively of birth and succession, solely from merit, for ever to perpetuate the holy dignity during the reign of His anointed kings, because he acted in obedience to His will.[16] Therefore, the chief priests of the Temple occupied their offices not by right of uninterrupted or hereditary succession: and they did not accord with the requirements ordained by the Pentateuch.[17]

6. The Levites did not, during the whole of the historical time, live exclusively in the towns assigned to them in the Pentateuch, but in any part of the country. A Levite had, in the period of the Judges, resided in Beth-lehem in Judah; but desirous of change, evidently on account of poverty and want, he "departed out of the city from Beth-lehem Judah to sojourn wherever he could find a place;"[18] he settled, for a time, in mount Ephraim, till he was happy to follow the Danites northward, and to remain with them in the ancient town Laish.[19] Another Levite is related to have lived "on the side of mount Ephraim."[20]

[13] 1 Sam. XXII. 11—20.

[14] 1 Ki. II. 26, 27.

[15] Ver. 35.

[16] 1 Sam. II. 30, 35. This "faithful priest" is therefore not Samuel, as many infer from passages like 1 Sam. VII. 3, 4; IX. 12, 13; the sons of Zadok were by Ezekiel also appointed as priests (see p. 632 note 10; comp. Ezra VII. 2). Vatke (l. c. I. 344, 345, 349), who has developed this subject with great acumen (comp. also *Selden*, De Success. in Pontif. Lib. I. c. 4), justly remarks, "If Zadok had been one of Eli's descendants, the prophecy (in 1 Sam. II. 27—36) could not possibly have been framed"; though he probably goes too far in asserting that, as the Books of Samuel know of no other descendants of Aaron but the house of Eli, and Zadok belonged to neither, the line of priests that served at the Temple were not of the progeny of Aaron: that Eli's house is meant to be identical with Aaron's house, cannot with safety be inferred from a poetical and rhetorical passage (1 Sam. II. 27, 28, 30); the terms "thy house and the house of thy father" (ver. 30) well admit the existence of a lateral line of Aaron's race, after the exclusion or extirpation of Eli's progeny, just as Eli himself was probably not the direct descendant of Aaron through Eleazar. For how could else the supreme claims of Aaron's house to the priesthood have been raised in later times? But the tracing of Zadok to Eleazar by the Chronist (1 Chr. VI. 35—38) is fictitious (see *supra*).

[17] *Jos.* Ant. V. xi. 5.

[18] לגור באשר ימצא, Judg. XVII. 7, 8.

[19] Judg. XVIII. 20, 30, 31.

[20] Judg. XIX. 1.

Elkanah, the Levite,[1] resided in Ramathaim-Zophim, in Ephraim;[2] and priests settled in Nob which was hence called "a town of priests" (עיר הכהנים), and where they established a regular worship.[3] Some have indeed attempted to prove that, down to the time of Rehoboam and Jeroboam, the "majority" of the Levites lived in the towns set apart for them;[4] but the arguments are unsafe, being derived from statements of the Chronist.[5] The same source has supplied equally untenable pleas for explaining the helplessness of the tribe; for it contends that the Levites who, in Jeroboam's time, resided in the empire of Ephraim, in order to escape from that king's idolatrous measures, emigrated and repaired to Judah;[6] but as they could not be accommodated in the thirteen priestly towns of the kingdom, they were compelled to wander about homeless in search of abodes, and were, therefore, recommended to the charity and pity of the pious.[7] We will not even urge that the older account relates nothing of such an emigration;[8] that, on the contrary, it speaks of god-fearing and learned priests of Jehovah in the empire of Ephraim.[9] If the law in Numbers with regard to the Levitical towns and their surrounding districts had existed, it would have been a sacred duty of the government and the people, adequately to provide for the holy representatives of God, to assign to them fixed dwellings, and to secure to them in their new homes those privileges which, from devotion to the true faith, they had so magnanimously abandoned. There is, moreover, no trace of Levitical towns after the exile, in the arrangements of Ezra and Nehemiah; it is, on the contrary, stated, that Jews, priests, Levites, and servants of the Temple lived together in Jerusalem and the other cities of Judah, "every one in his inheritance."[10]

7. Again, the list of the priestly and Levitical towns contained in the Book of Joshua differs materially from that furnished by the Chronist.[11] The latter, though correctly stating the aggregate number of towns assigned to each branch of the tribe,[12] enumerates only 42 out

1 1 Chr. VI. 12, 13, 18, 19; see *infra*.

2 Comp. also 1 Sam. VI. 15, where *Levites* are mentioned as dwelling in the *priestly* town Beth-shemesh.

3 1 Sam. XXI. 1—10; XXII. 19.

4 *Riehm*, Gesetzgeb. Mos. etc. p. 93; the traditional and questionable view is also repeated by *Ewald*, Gesch. II. 305—307; Alterth. p. 299.

5 1 Chr. XIII. 2; 2 Chr. XI. 14; XIII. 9*sqq*.

6 2 Chr. XI. 13—15.

7 Comp. *De Wette*, Archäol. § 227.

8 1 Ki. XII. 31; XIII. 33.

9 2 Ki. XVII. 27, 28.

10 Neh. XI. 3, 10—14, 18, 20, 22, 36; 1 Chr. IX. 10—13; comp. Deut. XVIII. 6—8. From Ezra II. 70; Neh. VII. 73; XI. 3, it cannot be concluded that the priests and Levites lived in the towns assigned to them in the Pentateuch; so, f. i., *De Wette*, Archäol. § 240.

11 Josh. XXI. 2—42; 1 Chr. VI. 40—66.

12 Viz. 13 to the Aaronites in Judah and Benjamin; 10 to the other Kohath-

of the 48 cities, evidently because he was unable to supply a complete list; but if the towns had really been set apart for so specific a purpose from early times, it would have been an easy matter for any writer to obtain the necessary information. Again, the two lists have but 26 names in common, that is, little more than one half of the whole;[13] 5 are slightly different, and may be accounted for by a deviating orthography or by provincial and dialectic shades;[14] the rest are utterly discrepant;[15] this is the more surprising as the list in the Book of Chronicles does not, as might perhaps be conjectured, refer to a later time or a second distribution, but to the very same early period of Hebrew history related in the Book of Joshua:[16] circumstances which must prove to every unbiassed critic that, as we have above shown from other arguments, the injunction regarding the Levitical towns was never carried out and remained a pious wish of the priestly order.[17] Indeed even Ezekiel in his freely created institutions introduces no priestly towns; according to his arrangements, all the priests live round the Sanctuary, as their functions indeed demanded; he there assigns to

---

ites in Ephraim, Dan, and western Manasseh; 13 to the Gershonites in eastern Manasseh, Issachar, Asher, and Naphtali; and 12 to the Merarites in Zebulun, Reuben, and Gad.

13 Viz. Hebron, Libnah, Jattir, Eshtemoa, Debir, and Beth-shemesh in Judah; Geba and Anathoth in Benjamin; Shechem, Gezer, and Beth-horon in Ephraim; Aijalon and Gath-rimmon in Dan; Golan in eastern Manasseh; Dobrath in Issachar; Abdon in Asher; Kedesh in Naphtali; Bezer, Jahazah, Kedemoth, and Mephaath in Reuben; Ramoth Gilead, Mahanaim, Heshbon and Jazer in Gad; and Jokneam, which the Chronist, however, writing Jokmeam places in Ephraim, while the Book of Joshua mentions it in Zebulun.

14 The Chronist has חִילֵן for חֹלֹן in Judah; עָלֶמֶת for עַלְמוֹן in Benjamin; עַשְׁתָּרוֹת for בְּעֶשְׁתְּרָה in eastern Manasseh; מִשְׁאָל for מִשְׁל in Asher; חַמּוֹן for חַמֹּת, and קִרְיָתַיִם for קַרְתָּן in Naphtali.

15 So the Chronist has Ashon instead of Ain and Jutlah in Judah; Jokmeam for Kibzaim in Ephraim; Aner and Bileam for Tanach and Gath-rimmon in western Manasseh; Kedesh, Ramoth, and Anem for Kishon, Jarmuth, and En-gannim in Issachar; Hukok for Helkath and Rahob in Asher; Rimmon and Tabor for Jokneam, Kartah, Dimnah, and Nahalal in Zebulun: it omits, besides, Gibeon in Benjamin, and Eltekeh and Gibbethon in Dan.

16 Comp. 1 Chr. VI. 39—41. "The reason that Ezra, the presumed author of the Books of Chronicles, states the greatest part of the Levitical towns differently from Joshua, is that he found deviating documents" (*Spinoza*, Tract. Theol.-pol. X. 40).

17 Not unjustly, therefore, has it been called by Bohlen (Genes. p. 457) "merely a hierarchical demand"; by George (Jüd. Feste, p. 57) "a demand which perhaps was never realised"; and by Vatke (l. c. 217, 222) "a later fiction" which "the Book of Joshua endeavours to introduce into history, and which did not arise before the Babylonian exile"; and Gramberg (Rel. Id. I. 238) observes, "In the aerial and unreal sphere of fancy we believe we are entitled to place the account regarding the Levitical towns,

them a space of 25,000 yards in length and 10,000 yards in breadth, and there orders their houses to be built.[1]

8. The Levites were, according to the regulations of the Pentateuch, to serve from the 30th or 25th to the 50th year of their lives;[2] but David is related to have fixed the time of admission at 20 years;[3] the same rule obtained in the time of Hezekiah[4] and after the return from exile under Zerubbabel[5] — a disagreement which places the fluctuations on the same subject within the Pentateuch itself into a still stronger light. The Chronist[6] accounts for the modification under David by urging that, from his time, the Levites had no longer to carry the Tabernacle and its vessels, and this has, by apologetic writers, been described as a "spiritual" interpretation of the Law, since "a longer but easier service is equivalent to a shorter but heavier one."[7] But it is impossible to see why men of 20 years were not as well qualified to bear the utensils as men of 25.[8] There evidently existed no decided and uniform practice at all; and legislators and historians stated the age either in accordance with the general custom of their time, or they attempted to fix one in harmony with their particular views regarding the character and functions of the Levites.

9. Among minor discrepancies we shall only advert to the following. When the Philistines brought back the Ark of the Covenant to Beth-shemesh, we are told, that the people of this town "lifted up their eyes, and saw the Ark and rejoiced to see it";[9] this sacred implement was, therefore, exposed to view, and not wrapped up, as is commanded in Numbers;[10] and for this reason, the town was visited by a fearful plague which carried off upwards of 50,000 souls, "because they had looked upon the Ark of the Lord."[11] Now, it is further related, "The *Levites* took down the Ark of the Lord";[12] they could, therefore, not help seeing it; but this is plainly against the law of the Pentateuch, which, for such offence, threatens quick and inevitable destruction not only to the Levites, but also to the priests whose duty it was to watch jealously over their sacred privileges.[13] But the narrative alludes to no such punishment. The people suffered, but the Levites escaped. Thus

and we have not the confidence to speak of them seriously as of real things."

[1] Ezek. XLV. 3—5; XLVIII. 10—14.

[2] See p. 602. [3] 1 Chr. XXIII. 24, 27.

[4] 2 Chr. XXXI. 17. [5] Ezra III. 8.

[6] 1 Chr. XXIII. 26.

[7] *Hengstenb.* Auth. II. 394.

[8] Comp. *supra* p. 603.

[9] 1 Sam. VI. 13. [10] Num. IV. 5, 6.

[11] Ver. 19. כי ראו בארון יהוה; it is incorrect to translate, as the Engl. Vers. does, "because they had looked *into* the Ark"; for the verb ראה is construed with the accusative and with בְּ alike; compare l. c. ver. 13, ויראו את־הארון; see Gen. XXXIV. 1; Judg. XVI. 27; etc. [12] Ver. 15, הלוים.

[13] Num. IV. 15, 20; see p. 583.

another proof confirms the view that, in earlier times, the strict distinction between priests and Levites established by the Pentateuch did not exist.[14]

When king Hezekiah was severely pressed by Sennacherib, he sent to Isaiah, besides other high officials, also the "elders of the priests" (זקני הכהנים) in mourning attire, "covered with sackcloth", with the request that he should pray for the welfare of the land;[15] but all marks of mourning were by the Pentateuch forbidden to the priests except for the nearest relatives, and to the High-priest even for these.[16] — The same king went himself into the Temple with the menacing letter he had received from the king of Assyria, and "spread it before the Lord", and there prayed "before the Lord."[17]

10. The historical Books offer a very considerable number of instances of non-Levites performing the functions rigidly reserved for Levites or priests, and not to be undertaken by others under penalty of excision. The following are some of the principal incidents.

Gideon, of the tribe of Manasseh, offered sacrifices at Ophrah;[18] Manoah, of the tribe of Dan, at Zareah.[19] Micah, a man of mount Ephraim, appointed one of his sons as priest for his domestic sanctuary, evidently without any particular solemnity.[20] The inhabitants of Kirjath-jearim "sanctified" (קדשו) Eleazar, the son of Abinadab, the Israelite, to keep the Ark of the Covenant which remained under similar charge "a long time", at least twenty years.[21] Samuel, the Levite, and not one of the priests who were supposed to have accompanied the army, offered the sacrifice before the encounter of the Hebrews with the Philistines;[22] and on a later occasion, Saul performed the same rite, though on this account severely reprimanded by Samuel.[23] The latter, according to the laws of the Pentateuch equally disqualified,

---

14 The older prophets mention indeed priests only and not Levites (Joel I. 9, 13; II. 17; Isai. XXVIII. 7; Mic. III. 11); and the former terms refer chiefly to the dignity and the office, the latter to descent; both might, therefore, be applied to the same class of men.

15 2 Ki. XIX. 2. 16 See *supra*, p. 574.

17 2 Ki. XIX. 14, 15; comp., however, XXIII. 2, 3. 18 Judg. VI. 26.

19 Judg. XIII. 19, 20.

20 Judg. XVII. 5. — Jonathan whom Micah hired afterwards for his priest, is indeed in one account represented as Levite (Judg. XVII. 7, 9, 13), but in another, as an Israelite, "Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Manasseh" (XVIII. 30).

21 1 Sam. VII. 1, 2; see pp. 29, 30. It has indeed been contended that Abinadab was a Levite, but there is no proof or foundation whatever for such assertion; moreover an *Aaronite* would have been required for attending to the Ark. On the contrary, Kirjath-jearim seems to have been an old centre of the worship of Baal, as is proved by its ancient names בַּעֲלָה and קִרְיַת בַּעַל (Josh. XV. 9, 60).

22 1 Sam. VII. 9, 10.

23 1 Sam. XIII. 9—14.

since he was certainly no Aaronite,[1] supposed even that his duties at the Sanctuary in Shiloh under the direction of Eli did not exceed the strictly Levitical functions,[2] built an altar at Ramah, his ordinary residence;[3] he "blessed the sacrifices" presented by the people;[4] and he offered a heifer in the house of Jesse.[5] Saul and David consulted the Ark[6] and the Urim and Thummim,[7] though possibly under the direction of a priest.[8] When transferring the Ark from the house of Obed-Edom in Gath to Jerusalem, David, dressed in the linen ephod, presented holocausts and thank-offerings, and blessed the people in the name of God;[9] and he sacrificed again, at the time of the pestilence, on the threshing-floor of Araunah.[10] David's sons, and Zabud the son of the prophet Nathan, were priests (כֹּהֲנִים).[11] Ahitophel performed

---

1 See Comm. on Genes. p. 737 note 23. 2 Comp., however, 1 Sam. III. 3.

3 1 Sam. VII. 17. 4 1 Sam. IX. 12, 13.

5 1 Sam. XVI. 2, 5. — But the term *priest* (כֹּהֵן) in 1 Sam. II. 35, does not refer to Samuel, but to Zadok the son of Ahitub (see *supra*). Even Öhler (in Herz. VIII. 354) repeats the long exploded pleas derived from "the extraordinary character of that time, when by the removal of the Ark the legal sacrificial order was destroyed, and from the prophetic avocation of Samuel"; and similarly *Plumptre* (l. c. II. 922) "his training under Eli, his Nazarite life, his prophetic office, were regarded apparently as a special consecration" (comp. l. c. p. 104). The view of Thenius (Exeget. Handb., on 1 Sam. VII. 5, p. 26) that Samuel intended to introduce a more liberal worship of Jehovah, and therefore designedly made opposition to the traditional priesthood, is an unwarranted conjecture.

6 1 Sam. XIV. 37; XXIII. 2.

7 1 Sam. XXVIII 6.

8 1 Sam. XIV. 36; comp. 1 Sam. XXIII. 9; XXX. 7.

9 2 Sam. VI. 14, 17, 18.

10 2 Sam. XXIV. 25.

11 2 Sam. VIII. 18; 1 Ki. IV. 5; but 1 Chr. XVIII. 17 has instead of כהנים the words הראשנים ליד המלך *the first at the king's hand* (Engl. Vers. *chief about the king*), see also 2 Sam. XX. 26; comp. *Gesen.* Thes. pp. 663, 664; *De Wette*, Einleit. p. 273. The Vulgate and Luther have in both passages correctly *sacerdotes*, Targ. רברבין, Kimchi גדולים, Sept. in one passage evasively αὐλάρχαι, in the other ἱερεύς, and the English Vers. in the one *chief rulers*, in the other *principal officer*. It is needless to adduce the unsuccessful apologetic attempts of Keil (Über die Chron. p. 346), Movers (Über die Chron. p. 302), Saalschütz (Mos. R. I. 108, who seriously quotes the Chronist as a trustworthy and decisive witness), Öhler (in Herz. VIII. 15, who believes that the state officials were invested with a character kindred to the priesthood); Ewald (Alterth. p. 276, who observes that the ordinary law was suspended in favour of members of the royal house), Plumptre (l. c. II. 915, "David and his sons were admitted not to distinctively priestly acts . . . but to an honorary, titular priesthood", and "the house and lineage of David had a kind of quasi-sacerdotal character"), and others. Vatke (l. c. p. 346) remarks, "These priests are, on the rolls of the royal officers, separated from the proper priests, and Zabud is called the friend, that is, the adviser of the king (1 Ki.

the sacrifices in his native town Giloh.[12] Solomon offered a thousand holocausts on the great height at Gibeon;[13] later he presented holocausts and thank-offerings before the Ark at Jerusalem;[14] he himself, though priests were present and assisted him,[15] consecrated the Temple, sacrificed, blessed the people, and prayed in their name;[16] and then three times every year he offered sacrifices and burnt incense in the Temple.[17] The pious king Uzziah (B. C. 811 to 759) did not hesitate to do the same.[18] Ahaz offered sacrifices and libations on the new altar which he caused to be constructed on a model sent from Damascus.[19] But on the other hand, we find priests employed in warfare. Abiathar was one of David's zealous followers at the time of his earlier adventures. More than 8,000 armed Levites and priests were, according to the Chronist, among his supporters in his war for the royalty over Israel.[20] Zadok was in his youth a valiant hero.[21] His son Ahimaaz, who took an active interest in the struggles of his time, was chiefly distinguished by swiftness and resolute action.[22] Benaiah, the son of the priest Jehoiada, was a captain of the royal guard and a general in the reign of David and Solomon.[23] Azariah, the son of the chief priest Zadok, was, by the latter sovereign, appointed to a political office.[24] The priest Jehoiada directed the revolt which caused the downfall and death of Athaliah, and the elevation and accession of Joash.[25] The same military spirit and genius were preserved in the tribe of Levi, shone with greatest lustre in the later periods of Hebrew history, and were rendered famous by the patriotic and brilliant exploits of the priestly Maccabees and the adroit manoeuvres of the priest Josephus.[26]

---

IV. 5), whence we may infer that upon them chiefly devolved the duty of consulting the oracle": which is not impossible, but does not follow from Judg. XVII. 5.

12 2 Sam. XV. 12.

13 1 Ki. III. 2—4; comp., however, 2 Chr. I. 3, 13; see Comm. on Gen. p. 740.

14 1 Ki. III. 15.

15 1 Ki. VIII. 3—6, 10, 11.

16 1 Ki. VIII. 5—66.

17 1 Ki. IX. 25; comp. XIX. 21. That these sacrifices took place on the three great *Mosaic* festivals, is an addition of the Chronist (2 Chr. VIII. 12, 13). The remark of George (Jüd. Feste p. 58), that the allusion to kings who sacrificed means only that they presented the offerings, while the religious functions were performed by priests, is hardly worthy of his usual clearness and decision of interpretation.

18 2 Chr. XXVI. 16—21.

19 2 Ki. XVI. 12, 13; see pp. 34, 35.

20 1 Chr. XII. 26—28; comp. 2 Chr. XX. 21, 22; see also XIII. 12.

21 1 Chr. XII. 28, גבור חיל; comp. 1 Chr. XXVI. 6—8; 2 Chr. XXVI. 17.

22 2 Sam. XVIII. 19 *sqq.*

23 1 Chr. XXVII. 5; 1 Ki. II. 25, 35; IV. 4; comp. 2 Sam. VIII. 18; XX. 23.

24 1 Ki. IV. 2, 4; comp. II. 35.

25 2 Ki. XI; 2 Chr. XXIII; comp. also XIII. 12, 14.

26 Comp. 2 Macc. VIII. 1. See, in general, Comm. on Gen. pp. 735, 737—740. Some of the facts here adduced are represented in a different light by Stanley (Lectures on the History of

In fact, all the Levitical ordinances of the Pentateuch are so continually contravened, almost during the whole period from Joshua down to the completion of the Temple and considerably beyond it, that their existence during this time cannot be admitted.[1] The discrepancies prove irrefutably that the priesthood was then freely permitted to all Israelites, especially such as were distinguished by birth or social position.

We now proceed, lastly, to attempt

## V. A HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF THE ORDER OF PRIESTHOOD AMONG THE HEBREWS.

1. At first, and as long as primitive customs prevailed among the Hebrews, the head of each family performed the sacerdotal functions. This was the more easily feasible because religious acts and rituals were then of the simplest and plainest nature.[2] Such practice is recorded in the history of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who, wherever an occasion required it, built altars, offered sacrifices, and directed purifications for themselves and their households.[3] It is related in the narrative of the exodus of their descendants from Egypt, when the chief of every house performed all the rites connected with the paschal sacrifice.[4] It is stated with regard to the "young men of the children of Israel",[5] who assisted Moses in the ceremonies of the covenant concluded between God and the people after the proclamation of the fundamental laws,[6] whether they were the firstborn[7] or any of

---

the Jewish Church, II. 407—410), based on Ewald (Alterthümer, pp. 292*sqq.*), who, for instance, remarks that "the priestly exclusiveness of the tribe of Levi was, in earlier centuries, by no means so decided as not to be broken through at the extreme points" (p. 276), and he calls these exceptions "minor fluctuations" (p. 277). On the deviations of the later times, after the promulgation of the Pentateuch, see infra Sect. V.

[1] It must, therefore, be disputed that "the practice of the post-Mosaic times coincides, in many respects, with the younger regulations of the Law" (*Knobel*, Levit. p. 422); exact coincidences are rare and exceptional.

[2] It needs hardly to be observed that the chiefs were not regular priests in the proper sense of the word; nor does this follow from Num. VIII. 14—18 (comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. 3).

[3] Gen. XII. 7, 8; XIII. 18; XXI. 33; XXVI. 25; XXXI. 54; XXXIII. 20; XXXV. 1—4; XLVI. 1; comp. IV. 3, 4; VIII. 20; see pp. 15—17.

[4] Exod. XII. 7, 22; comp. also III. 13; V. 3; X. 25.

[5] נערי בני ישראל.

[6] Exod. XXIV. 5, 6.

[7] Targ. Onk. and Jonath., Saad., Rashi, Pers. in loc.; comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. XIV. 4 (עד שלא הוקם המשכן היו הבמות מותרות ועבודה בבכורות), Targ. Onk., Jonath., and Jerus. in Genes. XLIX. 3 (Reuben ought to have received the rights of primogeniture, the priesthood, and the rulership); *Hieron.* Quaest. in Gen. XVIII; Epist. 126 ad

**the sons deemed most fit for the task and appointed by the father.[8] It is recorded with regard to Jesse,[9] Ahitophel,[10] and others.[11] Long before the installation of the Levites into their clerical offices we find mention of "priests who come near the Lord",[12] who manifestly belonged to all tribes of Israel alike, and were probably not all firstborn.[13] Thus the Ephraimite Joshua remained constantly in the tent of Moses which served as the "Tent of Meeting" (אהל מועד), ministered to him,[14] and accompanied him even on Mount Sinai,[15] while Aaron stayed in the camp with the Israelites.[16] Even the services of women were permitted.[17] Moreover, the priestly dignity was combined with that of military leadership and royalty, and generals and kings were commonly also supreme judges, as Gideon and Samuel, Saul, David, and Solomon.[18] The Hebrews shared these practices with most of the other ancient nations. Thus Melchizedek, king of Salem, was High-priest,[19] and was, therefore, later regarded by the Jews as the type of the Messiah, by the Christians as the type of Christ.[20] Jethro, the Midianite, was both emir and priest.[21]**

---

Evagr.; comp. Exod. XXII. 28, בכור בניך תתן לי.

[8] Comp. Judg. XVII. 5; also Exod. XXIV. 11, אצילי בני ישראל, see Comm. on Exod. p. 472. Ewald (Alterth. p. 272) understands, without probability, "younger and innocent boys", a meaning which is certainly not required by the word נער, see Comm. on Genes. p. 436.

[9] 1 Sam. XX. 6.

[10] 2 Sam. XV. 12.

[11] Comp. Job I. 5; XLII. 8 (for the Book of Job, though composed at a late period, describes patriarchal life and manners); Gen. VIII. 20; etc.; see p. 28.

[12] הכהנים הנגשים אל־יהוה, Exod. XIX. 22, 24.

[13] Jewish expositors consider them as such (comp. *Talm.* Zevach. 115; Rashi and Ebn Ezra on Exod. l. c.). See Comm. on Exod. p. 338. Ewald (l. c.) says justly, "Not all feel themselves equally fit, nor are all equally worthy to perform the sacrifices properly; therefore there were priests long before the Levites" (comp. also *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. ii. 50, pp. 575, 576; *Vitringa*, Obs. sacr. L. II. c. 2, pp. 268—283; *Outram*, De Sacrif. pp. 42—47; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. II. 284, 285, 302—304; *Gramberg*, Relig. Id. I. 6; *Bohlen*, Genes. Einleit. § 16). That the firstborn were originally indeed the priests follows not only from the statement that they belonged to God, but that they were replaced by the Levites (p. 582).

[14] Exod. XXXIII. 7, 11.

[15] Exod. XXIV. 13.

[16] Comp., however, Exod. XIX. 24; XXIV. 1.

[17] See *supra* p. 573.

[18] See p. 639. Hence the truth and value of the following remark will be estimated: "In the reigns of David and Solomon the priestly order broke its strict hereditary bounds; some of its highest functions, those of sacrifice and benediction, were performed by two powerful kings, who united in their persons to a degree unknown before, the royal and sacerdotal offices"! (*Stanley*, Jewish Church, II. 422), which is virtually a reversal of historic facts.

[19] Gen. XIV. 18; Ps. CX. 4.

[20] Hebr. VI. 20; VII. 1—3; see pp. 150—153.

[21] Exod. II. 16; III. 1; XVIII. 1, 12, where Targ. Onkel. renders כהן מדין by רבא דמדין; see Comm. on Exod. p. 319.

In the heroic times, the Greek kings were at once military leaders, judges, and pontiffs.[1] The same was the case with the Italic and Roman princes and kings, and later with the emperors.[2] In the time of the Republic, the functions that had been discharged by the king, passed to the *rex sacrorum*: the name was designed to recall the primitive arrangement, although the "rex" was wholly stripped of political power, excluded from all offices of state, and elected by the colleges of pontiffs and augurs.[3]

2. These customs were, on the whole, preserved up to the early period of the Hebrew monarchy.[4] But there lived, scattered throughout the territory of the commonwealth, the tribe of Levi, weakened by temerity and execrated for cruelty, without social influence and territorial possession, unsettled, roaming, and helpless. This was still the position of the Levites not only in the later part of the period of the Judges, when, unable to punish the Benjamites for a brutal crime, they were obliged to invoke the aid of all the other tribes;[5] but it was their condition in the earlier time of the divided empire as depicted in the last address of Jacob, "Simeon and Levi are brethren; an instrument of violence is their burning rage, into their council my soul shall not come; in their assembly my glory shall not join: for in their anger they slew men, and in their self-will they hamstrung oxen. Cursed be their anger, for it is fierce, and their wrath, for it is cruel: I will disperse them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel."[6]

---

[1] *Aristot.* Polit. III. 10, *στρατηγὸς γὰρ ἦν καὶ δικαστὴς ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ τῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κύριος*; comp. VI. 5; etc.; see *Schömann*, Griech. Alterth. II. 392*sqq.*; *Hermann*, Gottesd. Alterth. § 33, esp. note 8; and on domestic whorship in general, *Schömann*, l. c. pp. 525—539.

[2] *Virg.* Aen. III. 80, Rex Anius, rex idem hominum Phoebique sacerdos; to which Servius remarks, Sane majorum haec erat consuetudo, ut rex etiam esset sacerdos vel pontifex, unde hodieque imperatores pontifices dicimus.

[3] In Greece also, those officials, to whom, after the abolition of monarchical government, the religious functions that had devolved upon the kings, were entrusted, were called *βασιλεῖς* (as the *ἄρχων βασιλεύς* in Athens); and in some cases the wife of such functionary bore the name *βασίλισσα* or *βασίλιννα* (comp. *Schömann*, l. c. pp. 394—396, 400).

[4] That the Hebrew kings officiated as priests must appear the more natural if the Hebrew monarchy is considered as a theocratic institution, according to which the kings act as representatives of God: but this conception was formed and took root only in the course of time; in this respect, it is sufficient to compare the older account of the establishment of the monarchy (1 Sam. IX. 1—X. 16) with the later one (VIII. 10, 17—XII. 25). Correct and questionable statements are mixed by *Riehm* in Stud. und Krit. 1865, pp. 67, 68.

[5] Judg. XIX. 29 *sqq.*

[6] Gen. XLIX. 5—7; see Comm. on Gen. pp. 724—726. Severe as these

Yet a portion of this tribe, represented by the glorious names of Moses and Aaron, had, at some early period of Hebrew history, distinguished itself by ardent and pious zeal in the cause of religion.[7] Levites were therefore even in the time of the Judges not only admitted but preferred for priestly offices, both in the pure worship of Jehovah and that of pagan deities.[8] It was they who chiefly carried the Ark of the Covenant.[9] They taught and judged the people, obtained influence as advisers of the kings, and acquired the control of the treasures of the Temple. Gradually they devoted themselves entirely to priestly pursuits, which at once secured subsistence to themselves and relieved the chiefs of families from duties often burdensome and inconveniently interfering with their general occupations.[10] They were at first not numerous, and they acted without connection, organisation, or systematic distribution. The Danites had at one time no more than one priest;[11] in Shiloh, Eli officiated with his two sons, assisted by Samuel,[12] and later Ahiah.[13] But they gradually increased, since at Nob there were at one time at least 85;[14] and they were then divided into various classes according to the different branches of the service.[15] Nor

---

denunciations are, they tend to prove that Levi had, at some earlier period, formed an independent tribe with martial and political pretensions, and it is therefore, no doubt, unjustifiable to strike out Levi from the list of the tribes; this is proposed by Vatke (l. c. pp. 221, 222) who contends (l. c. p. 350) that the Levites had originally been no more than a family which enjoyed higher authority in the Mosaic age, and was later also chosen for the priesthood with preference, because Moses had belonged to it; and he believes that that family could not have been raised to a tribe, in the usual sense, before the Babylonian exile, when the disproportionate number of priests and Levites who returned from the captivity favoured such a claim.

7 Deut. XXXIII. 8, 9; Ex. XXXII. 27—29; Num. XXV. 6—13; comp. XVII. 11—13.

8 See Judg. XVII. 10, 13 (אב and כהן); XVIII. 19; 1 Ki. XII. 31, 32; XIII. 33; comp. also pp. 354, 355; *Vatke*, l. c. pp. 196, 198.

9 1 Ki. II. 26; see *supra* p. 88.

10 From the tenour of these remarks, it is obviously questionable to assert, that the appointment of the Levites as a priestly tribe "dates back to the oldest times, and is connected with the division into tribes, at which they received no territorial property" (*George*, Jüd. Feste, p. 58).

11 Judg. XVIII. 19, 30.

12 1 Sam. II. 18.

13 1 Sam. XIV. 3, 18.

14 1 Sam. XXII. 18; but the Sept. states the number at 305, while Josephus (Ant. VI. xii. 6) increases it to 385.

15 The Chronist states that 8,333 priests and Levites joined David at Hebron when he aspired to the sovereignty over the whole land (1 Chr. XII. 26—28); and according to the Talmud, not fewer then 24,000 were permanently stationed at Jerusalem, and 12,000 at Jericho, in addition to those scattered through the land; comp. *Mishn.* Yom. II. 3, 5—7 (in offering a bullock as a public sacrifice 24 priests

was their power at first considerable, for Saul could venture to command the massacre of large numbers without meeting with any opposition.[1] Their services were particularly in requisition at the national Sanctuary, first at the Tabernacle, where we find them officiating in Shiloh,[2] at Nob,[3] and elsewhere;[4] but more exclusively still they served at the Temple; and it may be that, from the time of Solomon, after the establishment of a magnificent worship in Jerusalem, Levites were there employed in such large numbers that the whole tribe, at least gradually, could be looked upon as dedicated to the priestly service, which circumstance must have appeared the less surprising because not a few ancient nations had a separate sacerdotal tribe or caste.[5] Thus the Levites assumed, in the course of time, the rights of spiritual primogeniture, and boldly represented themselves, in religious matters, as substitutes for the Israelites.[6] But this was, not unjustly, regarded as pretentious arrogance by the Reubenites, the oldest of the Hebrew tribes, which naturally claimed their religious prerogatives.[7] A struggle ensued from which the Levites came forth victorious.[8] David still was anointed as king by the *prophet* Samuel,[9] but Solomon, although the prophet Nathan was present who took a subordinate part in the transaction, by the *priest* Zadok, whose sanction was necessary to render the authority of the new prince legitimate.[10] Priestly influence had, therefore, in the interval perceptibly advanced. But the dignity was, even at Solomon's time, not yet hereditary; for Azariah, the son of the priest Zadok, was a scribe of the king (סופר),[11] while, on the other hand, Zabud, the son of the prophet Nathan, was a priest.[12] Indeed, from the time of David, priests occupied high and responsible civil offices and even military posts, which secured to them considerable influence upon important matters of state;[13] nay they gained the confidence both of the kings and the people in a manner that they could act as mediators when both stood opposed to each other in hostility.[14] They were so highly honoured, in the time of Joel, that this prophet expected from their intercession with God certain rescue from the locust plague;[15] they were revered in the time of Hosea, who branded the opposition of the people to

---

were engaged); see also Acts. VI. 7 (πολύς τε ὄχλος τῶν ἱερέων).

1 1 Sam. XXII. 18.

2 1 Sam. I. 3; II. 12 *sqq.*; etc.

3 1 Sam. XXI. 1—10.

4 See pp. 27—29.

5 Ewald (Alterth. p. 276) observes aptly, Erblichkeit der Lebensbeschäftigung schleicht sich überall leicht ein, wo das alte Geschlechts- und Stammesleben noch vorherrscht.

6 See *supra*, p. 582. 7 Deut. XI. 6.

8 Num. XVI. 1 *sqq.*

9 1 Sam. XVI. 12, 13.

10 1 Ki. I. 34, 39, 45. 11 1 Ki. IV. 2.

12 1 Ki. IV. 5; see p. 639.

13 1 Ki. I. 7, 8, 39; see *supra* ibid.

14 2 Sam. XIX. 11. 15 Joel II. 17.

their guidance as a punishable crime,[16] and no less so in the time of Isaiah or of king Ahaz over whom the priest Uriah had considerable influence.[17] They were frequently consulted, employed as teachers, and requested to decide on religious doctrines and rites.[18] Their authority was indeed not uniform; thus the priest Amaziah was entirely subject to the power of the idolatrous king Jeroboam II, acted in the spirit of the latter, and thereby called forth the vehement indignation of the prophet Amos.[19] Moreover, both priests and Levites were often intensely hated by the people on account of moral depravity, time-serving selfishness, and greedy avarice; they thus merited the severest denunciations and threats of indignant prophets. They were described by them as venal, mercenary, and fraudulent, as capable of every act of baseness and violence, and allowing the people to live in ignorance and vice; they were taxed with betraying their allegiance to God, and indulging in their iniquity even in the Temple.[20] While they persecuted and massacred such pure-minded teachers, who held up the mirror to their perverseness, they frequently made common cause with false seers and leaders. Nor did they display fearless and death-despising courage, as many prophets did, when idolatrous kings like Manasseh introduced heathen abominations and undermined the very elements of the theocracy.

3. Now, having gained the foundation of power, they could attempt measures for further aggrandisement. Their efforts were equally directed towards securing an easy competence and establishing spiritual authority. Their first demands in the former respect were comparatively reasonable; and when they began to fix them in writing, in the Book of Deuteronomy or about the end of the seventh century (B. C. 620), they seem still to have felt the expediency or necessity of caution and moderation. They received the money of all expiatory offerings.[21] Under theocratic kings such as Hezekiah, they were supplied with tithes and firstfruits in abundance, and thus began to see their claims recognised. But they were bolder in their pretensions with regard to the latter or spiritual point. They demanded unconditional obedience to their judicial decisions under penalty of death,[22] and they rose against all opponents with conscious defiance; for in the so-called blessing of Moses they are mentioned in the following terms, "Let Thy Thummim and Thy Urim be with Thy holy one, whom Thou didst prove at Massah, and with whom Thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah; who said to his father and to his mother, I have not seen him, neither did he

16 Hos. IV. 10.

17 Isai. VIII. 2; comp. 2 Ki. XVI. 10—16.

18 Mic. III. 11, יורו. 19 Am. VII. 9, 17.

20 Comp. the passages quoted above p. 597, note 5; see also *Jost*, l. c. p. 148; *Plumptre* l. c. II. 923—725.

21 2 Ki. XII. 17; see p. 274.

22 Deut. XVII. 8—13.

acknowledge his brethren, nor know his own children; for they have observed Thy word and kept Thy covenant; they shall teach Jacob Thy judgments, and Israel Thy Law; they shall put incense before Thee, and whole burnt-sacrifice upon Thy altar: bless, o Lord, his substance, and accept the work of his hands; smite through the loins of those that rise against him, and of those that hate him, that they rise no more."[1] They perseveringly and dexterously aimed at the establishment of a hierarchy. So much had their pretensions increased within the period that intervened between the date of Jacob's and of Moses' last address.[2] But it is more than doubtful whether they had even then any chance of seeing their demands really acceded to. For on the one hand, they were classed together with the poor and the helpless, and like them recommended to the compassionate regard of the prosperous.[3] And on the other hand, even the pious king Uzziah (B. C. 800) deemed it feasible to enter the Holy of the Temple and to burn incense on the golden altar, although this was later represented as nefarious audacity;[4] king Ahaz (743—728) directed new arrangements to be made in the Temple service, to which the priests submitted without resistance;[5] the reforms introduced after the discovery of the "Book of the Law" were exclusively superintended by king Josiah, upon whom alone the Hebrew historian bestows praise for the execution of the important measures;[6] and the second Isaiah, writing in the latter part of the Babylonian exile, could venture to describe that time as supremely happy and glorious, when non-Levites, returning from their dispersion into foreign lands, would be freely admitted to the priesthood.[7] The priestly claims were the theories of gifted and ambitious men of the tribe of Levi, and were by them consistently based upon its pretended election by God for exercising spiritual supremacy in Israel. The progress of their influence was retarded by the innumerable forms of idolatry

---

1 Deut. XXXIII. 8—11.

2 Or between about 950 and 800; for the blessing of Moses was written before the abduction of the ten tribes, since it speaks of Joseph as a royal and ruling chief (Deut. XXXIII. 13—17). It is therefore impossible to suppose that the Levites came forward as the elected class at so early a time as that of David; so Vatke (l. c. p. 348) leaning upon Jeremiah XXXIII. 24, where שתי משפחות, namely hereditary theocratic kings and priests, are mentioned together. But quite unhistorical, according to our deductions, is the opinion that the statements of Deuteronomy with respect to the Levites agree with the time of Joshua (so *Stähelin*, Geschichte der Verhältnisse des Stammes Levi, in Deutsch. Morgenl. Zeitschr. 1855, pp. 708*sqq.*; *Öhler*, in Herz. VIII. 351; and many others).

3 See *supra* p. 600.

4 2 Chr. XXVI. 16—21.

5 2 Ki. XVI. 10—16; comp. also XXIII. 4.

6 2 Ki. XXIII. 1 *sqq.*, 25.

7 Isai. LXVI. 21.

to which the whole nation, including many of their own tribe,[8] clung with incredible tenacity, from the comparatively venial aberration of the worship of Jehovah through images of the ephod and of teraphim, to the ruthless iniquities of the rites of Moloch. Yet, undaunted by the opposition they had to encounter, especially on the part of liberal and intrepid prophets, they pursued their schemes with wonderful pertinacity and firmness.

4. For a long time, all the members of the tribe of Levi had, on the whole, performed the same priestly functions and enjoyed the same worldly privileges.[9] But the various ministrations were so widely different in their nature and importance, that it was deemed advisable to mark them by decided distinctions, and to entrust them to different divisions of the tribe. It was considered inappropriate that the chief office of the priesthood, that of mediation between God and the Israelites, should be exercised by the same class of men who performed the less significant and the menial services of the Sanctuary. Now, Aaron, the elder brother of the great deliverer, leader, and legislator Moses, was by national tradition believed to have been the first High-priest appointed already in Moses' time; and indeed some of his descendants are, in the historical Books, mentioned as having filled the same dignity for several generations, to have consulted the will of God by means of the Ark,[10] and to have acted as supreme judges. All these circumstances tended to secure to his family distinction and reverence. Therefore, the priesthood in the stricter sense, with all its high prerogatives, was reserved to Aaron's lineal issue, while the other branches of the tribe of Levi, or the Levites more properly so called, were charged with the lower duties of the sacred service.[11] The desire of the non-Aaronites, as Korah, to participate in the priestly office, was then deemed a presumption as iniquitous as formerly the analogous claim of the Reubenites,

---

8 Ezek. XLIV. 10—13; XLVIII. 11.

9 See *supra* p. 598 10 See *supra* p. 30.

11 The middle Books of the Pentateuch seem desirous to represent the process in this light, that at first Aaron and his family were appointed as priests, and then only the other branches of the tribe, or the Levites; this is expressed with some distinctness in Num. XVIII. 1, 2, "And thy brethren also of the tribe of Levi, the tribe of thy father, bring thou with thee, that they may be joined to thee"; but it can be proved that for a long time all the Levites were priests, but not that a portion of the tribe was superior to the rest in dignity or privileges. Ezekiel (XLVIII. 11) accounts for the difference in the position of priests and Levites by the circumstance that the former remained faithful to Jehovah, while the latter went astray with the bulk of the Israelites; and the Levitical duties are described as almost degrading in relation to the priestly functions; but this theory does not explain the first and original distinction established between both.

and therefore deemed worthy of the same awful punishment.[1] And now, the Aaronites or priests alone were represented as elected by God,[2] and were by anointment supposed to be filled with the Divine spirit, which enabled them to bless and to judge, to advise and to teach; whereas the Levites, acting as their subordinate assistants, were merely considered as substitutes for the firstborn Israelites, who could properly be claimed by God.[3] While, therefore, in reality, the members of the tribe of Levi officiated in the name and by permission of the *Israelites*, they now presumed to hold their office from *God*, who was said to have singled them out and sanctified them. Thus the ideal hierarchy was completed. At the general census of the people, the Levites were not numbered,[4] partly in order to separate the holy ministers of God from the vulgar mass, and partly because they did not stand in need of that gift of atonement which was required of every Israelite at each census.[5] Now, as the priests were chiefly required at the common Sanctuary in Jerusalem, those members of the tribe who lived in its vicinity, or in the towns of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin, were traced to the line of Aaron and declared to be priests, while the other portions remained distributed over the other provinces.[6]

5. Moreover, the priests and Levites had now the courage and confidence to claim, at least theoretically, much more considerable emoluments, which, had they been really granted to them, would have made their position highly commanding from a worldly no less than a spiritual point of view; and they exacted them in a manner which not only rendered them independent of the people, but raised them infinitely above it; for they were made the direct and proud recipients of God's own bounty.[7] They introduced or proposed essential alterations most favourable to their order in the precepts regarding the tithes, the firstborn, and the portions falling to their share at the various sacrifices; they demanded for their abodes 48 towns with the surrounding districts which was evidently an attempt at greater concentration, although this was unable to prevent the complete dismemberment of the tribe; and they now represented their dispersion, the natural and inevitable result of historical causes, as a legislative measure wisely commanded by God

---

[1] Num. XVI. 1—32; comp. especially vers. 8—10; XXVI. 9—11.

[2] Comp. Num. XVI. 1 *sqq.*; XVII. 17—25.

[3] Num. III. 12, 13, 41, 45; VIII. 16—19; see p. 601.

[4] Num. I. 47—54; comp. XXVI. 62.

[5] Exod. XXX. 11—16.

[6] If Aaronites had lived only in the districts near Jerusalem, it might well be asked how they could accomplish their vocation in the centuries from Joshua to David, since during this time the national Sanctuary was never at Jerusalem but in various other parts of the country.

[7] See p. 595.

and designedly adopted for special religious ends; though even as such it was far from answering the purpose for which it was ostensibly devised, as has above been pointed out.[8] Yet, though many members of the tribe were notorious for hypocrisy, deceit, violence, and every iniquity which deserved and received the severest castigation,[9] the instances of Jeremiah and Ezekiel are alone sufficient to prove that some at least were animated by noble aspirations and worked ardently for the spiritual improvement of the people; and when the exiled Jews obtained permission to return to the holy land, the priests predominantly availed themselves of this privilege, and more than 4,000 returned with Zerubbabel alone.[10] Thus the priests became the expounders of the Law, the guides and, in some respects, the prophets, while the people, wholly excluded from all participation in the sacred rituals, and having become anything rather than "a kingdom of priests," lost all their natural religious privileges, which they could at no future time hope to regain, since the priesthood was for ever made hereditary in one family. And now the dignity of the High-priest, in whom the holiness of the tribe and its sacred mission culminated, was created, or at least invested with supreme significance and authority; the High-priest was not only the representative of the theocracy, but equivalent to it in spiritual glory.[11]

6. These notions and pretensions are found systematically set forth in the middle Books of the Pentateuch, especially in parts of Leviticus and Numbers written after the Babylonian captivity. "As long as the royal power was opposed to the priesthood, the hierarchy could not thrive; but when the former ceased at the time of the exile, the latter lifted its mighty head, and soon afterwards the towering colossus stood immoveable."[12] Yet even then these demands were but very imperfectly acted upon, since from that time down to the capture of Jerusalem by Titus we find incessant deviations from the Levitical precepts of the Pentateuch. Both Levites and priests lived together in Judah

---

[8] See p. 602. From Isa. XXIII. 17, 18 it has been concluded that the priests were considerably enriched after the fall of Tyre; but the allusion is too obscure to allow a safe inference.

[9] See *supra* p. 597.

[10] Comp. 2 Chr. XXIV. 20; Ezra II. 36—38; Neh. VII. 39—42; see also *Öhler* in Herz. XII. 184.

[11] Comp. *George*, Jüd. Feste, pp. 62—64, whose arguments for the very late introduction of the High-priesthood are deserving of attention, esp. p. 63: High-priests are not mentioned by Jeremiah, nor even by Ezekiel in his description of the future service of the Temple, whereas they constantly occur in works written after the close of the exile (see p. 575). — "Passages like Lev. XXI. 10 and Num. XXXV. 25 prove that the epithet גדול was not yet quite established as distinctive of the chief priest" (*Hervey*, in Smith's Bibl. Dict. I. 804), which just remark supports the views alluded to.

[12] *George*, l. c. p. 60.

and Benjamin, and in Jerusalem itself.[1] Even High-priests married foreign wives.[2] They tore their garments on hearing a blasphemy[3] or on receiving an account of a national calamity.[4] They became the creatures and tools of the monarchs by whom they were arbitrarily installed or deposed, especially when the dignity was, through bribery or violence, obtained by worthless or very youthful persons.[5] Occasionally, two or more High-priests occupied the office at the same time,[6] a practice opposed to its very essence.[7] In the period of the Maccabees, the High-priesthood was held by Jonathan and Simon, the sons of Mattathias, of the family of Jarib or Joarib,[8] of which it is uncertain whether it belonged to the line of Eleazar or Ithamar.[9] We hear of removals and even of murders of High-priests;[10] and Josephus[11] observes distinctly, "At first the High-priests held their offices to the end of their lives, although afterwards they had successors during their life-time." Antiochus Eupator deposed the High-priest Onias Menelaus, and appointed in his place Jacimus, "who was indeed of the stock of Aaron, but not of the family of Onias." After the death of Jacimus, the Jews were for seven years without a High-priest. Agrippa II permitted the musical Levites to wear priestly dress.[12] The Jews frequently refused the payment of the Levitical imposts as burdensome,[13] and had to be roused by popular leaders to a sense of their obligations.[14] We find mention made of "poor priests" who glean in the fields together with poor Israelites,[15] and of "a cereal sin-offering of priests,"[16] that is, a tenth part of an ephah of flour presented as a sin-offering in cases of such extreme poverty that the worshipper could not even afford two pigeons or turtle-doves, much less a lamb.[17] Nor does Philo draw a very glowing

---

1 See *supra* p. 634. 2 Neh. XIII. 28.

3 Matth. XXVI. 65.

4 1 Macc. XI. 71; comp. *Joseph.* Bell. Jud. II. xv. 4; *Mishn.* Horay. III. 5.

5 Comp. 1 Macc. VII. 9; 2 Macc. IV. 7, 24; XIV. 3, 7, 13; *Jos.* Ant. XV. iii. 3; ix. 3; XVII. iv. 2; vi. 4; XVIII. ii. 2; XIX. vi. 2, 4; XX. ix. 1, 7; XX. x. 1; Bell. Jud. IV. iii. 6, 8.

6 Annas and Caiaphas, Luke III. 2; John XI. 49 and XVIII. 13; *Joseph.* Ant. VII. xiv. 7 (*Σαδώκου καὶ Ἀβιαθάρου τῶν ἀρχιερέων*); XX. xix. 2; Bell. Jud. IV. iv. 2.

7 See *supra* p. 575.

8 1 Macc. XIV. 17, 29, 30, 35, 41; II. 1.

9 Comp. *Selden*, l. c. I. 10, p. 153; and Herod, his son Archelaus, and the Romans appointed High-priests from families of no particular distinction (*Jos.* Ant. XX. x. 1); see p. 632.

10 *Jos.* Ant. XV. iii. 1, 3; XVII. vi. 4; XX. ix. 7, "Herod deprived Matthias of the High-priesthood, and installed Joazar as his successor"; "Agrippa deprived Jesus, the son of Gamaliel, of the High-priesthood, and gave it to Matthias, the son of Theophilus."

11 Ant. XX. x. 1.

12 *Jos.* Ant. XX. ix. 6; comp. p. 587.

13 *Talm.* Sot. ad Mishn. IX. 10.

14 Neh. XIII. 12.

15 *Mishn.* Terum. IX. 2, 3; *Talm.* Terum. 57*a*, עניי כהנים.

16 מנחת חוטא של כהנים.

17 Lev. V. 11; see p. 280.

picture of the worldly condition of the priests; he not only alludes to priests in difficulty,[18] but he plainly observes, "The neglect of some persons.... is the cause of poverty (πενίας αἰτία) to the ministers of God;" and he speaks of a future time when he hopes the latter will be blessed with abundance of the necessaries of life.[19] During the procuratorship of Festus and Albinus, priests are related to have died of want, because the avaricious High-priests Ishmael and Ananias deprived them, by violence, of the *tithes*,[20] as if they had no other source of revenue whatever.

7. Yet when the Pentateuch was generally diffused and thoroughly studied, it could not fail to secure for the priests much of the authority and power which it claimed in their behalf.[21] Armed by this legislative code which they had themselves composed or devised, but had surrounded with a glorious prestige by the fiction of a supernatural origin at so early a time as that of the great mythical hero and lawgiver Moses, the priests had found the means of enthralling the entire life of the nation and of individuals by laws and rituals which rendered their services indispensable both on all grave and all minor occasions and emergencies. Accordingly, we find that after the Babylonian exile the hierarchy unfolded itself more decisively and took deeper root. All circumstances were favourable to its development. The wonderful deliverance from captivity through Cyrus, the hope of the realisation of splendid prophetic promises after the fulfilment of predictions of fearful tribulations, the growing aversion to heathens and paganism, and, not least, the uncertain political condition of the country, all this rendered the people disposed not only to tolerate but to court and to accept priestly advice. Zerubbabel was, at his return to Palestine, accompanied by 5,292 priests, 341 Levites, and 392 Nethinim, or nearly the seventh part of all immigrants, who, besides servants and singers, amounted only to 42,360 souls.[22] The priests were obliged to prove their pedigree, and to show that they really belonged to the holy tribe.[23] They were compelled to dismiss their foreign wives,[24] some of whom were married even to sons of High-priests.[25] While the

18 Ἐάν τινες ἀπορῶσι.

19 De Praem. c. 5.

20 *Jos.* Ant. XX. viii. 8; ix. 2.

21 Comp. *Jos.* Vit. 1.

22 Ezra II. 36—65. The view of Hengstenberg (Auth. des Pent. II. 8, 9) that the heathen rulers favoured the *theocratic* portion of the Jews because they saw in it the pith or kernel of the nation, has little probability, for it attributes to the heathen princes a familiarity with the deeper principles of a religion, which they had never shown much aptitude to understand or to appreciate. The theocratic portion especially longed for the return into the country in which the Temple had stood.

23 Ezra II. 61—63.

24 Ezr. IX. 1; X. 15, 18—24.

25 Neh. XIII. 28.

workmen were engaged in erecting the new Temple, the priests were present in their holy vestments, and blew the trumpets, whereas the Levites sang the hymns of David to the sound of musical instruments,[1] and took part in the solemnities held at the consecration of the new walls of the town.[2] The High-priest was the chief of the Sanhedrin;[3] as such he exercised spiritual jurisdiction over all Jews, even those who did not dwell in Palestine; and he could not be opposed or contradicted with impunity.[4] The Asmoneans were at once High-priests and civil rulers.[5] Combining clerical with worldly power, they were called priest-kings after the order of Melchizedek.[6] Judas, called Aristobulus, was High-priest and king, and wore a diadem; and after the death of Herod, "High-priests were entrusted with the dominion over the nation;"[7] and they were often supposed to be endowed with the gift of prophecy; thus Hyrcanus was called ruler, High-priest, and prophet.[8] Yet they were not raised above the law; the Mishnah declared, "the High-priest can be a judge and be judged, he may serve as witness, and others may bear witness against him;" he was subject to almost all the levirate regulations (or those of the יָבָם), except that he was not permitted to marry his deceased brother's widow; and he had even to suffer the punishment of stripes, if he had forfeited it by some offence.[9] The priests and Levites were divided into classes and their duties clearly regulated and defined.[10] For large numbers of them were required for the complicated and symbolical rituals of the Pentateuch, and their multitude was regarded as a blessing for the people.[11] The Levites themselves were deemed too holy to be charged with the low and menial

---

1 Ezr. III. 10, 11; it was different under Nehemiah (Neh. III. 1, 17, 18, 22, 26; V. 11, 12).

2 Neh. XI. 27—43.

3 Matth. XXXVI. 57; Acts V. 21; VII. 1; XXIII. 2.

4 Acts IX. 1, 2, 14; XXIII. 4; *Jos*. C. Ap. II. 23.

5 Comp. *Joseph.* Vit. c. 1.

6 Comp. Ps. CX. 4; see *supra* p. 150 see also *Michaelis*, Typische Gottesgelahrtheit, Pref. pp. 9—88, and 118—126.

7 *Jos*. Ant. XX. x. *fin*. Justinus in his distorted and mostly absurd account of the Jews observes that after the death of Moses, his son Aruas (Aaron), initiated in the Egyptian rites, was made *king*; and he continues, "semperque exinde hic mos apud Judaeos fuit, ut eosdem reges et sacerdotes haberent"; see also the enthusiastic description of the High-priest Simon, the son of Onias, in Sir. L. 5—21, "how he was honoured in the midst of the people in his coming out of the sanctuary! He was as the morning star in the midst of a cloud and as the moon at the full, as the sun shining upon the Temple of the most High, and as the rainbow giving light in the bright clouds."

8 *Joseph.* Ant. XIII. x. 7; comp. John XI. 51; also *Grätz*, Gesch. der Juden. III. 112, 113.

9 *Mishn*. Sanh. II. 1; comp. I. 5; Comm. on Genes. p. 620.

10 See *supra* pp. 566, 585.

11 Jer. XXXIII. 18, 21, 22.

offices entrusted to them in the Law; and they were therefore assisted in their task by servants who were regarded as the property of the Temple.[12] Tithes and firstfruits, the firstborn, and other imposts, were delivered up conscientiously,[13] and often with exaggerated minuteness.[14] Store-rooms (לשכות) were, in the precincts of the Temple, set apart for the contributions,[15] which stood under the careful control and administration of appointed officials.[16] Thus the priesthood enjoyed authority, honour, and influence;[17] then Malachi could declare, with regard to the priest, what in some respects is the absolute reverse of the terms used in Jacob's address, "The Law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips; he walked with Me in peace and equity, and turned many away from iniquity; for the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and people should seek the Law at his mouth; for he is a messenger of the Lord of hosts;"[18] they formed a kind of aristocratic caste;[19] Christ himself, the mediator, was distinguished by the name priest or High-priest;[20] and the word כֹּהֵן assumed, in the kindred dialects, the meaning of *prince* or *noble*.[21] The very literature of the Jews was thenceforth visibly coloured by the spirit of the Law. Even Ezekiel, living in the earlier period of the Babylonian exile, described the ideal priesthood of the future, on the whole, in harmony with the precepts of the Pentateuch.[22] But the Chronist could attempt to rewrite all the annals of his nation from a Levitical point of view, and to alter, nay palpably to falsify, the facts recorded by anterior, more truthful, and less biassed historians; he could, for instance, relate that when king Uzziah, though severely rebuked by the priests, did not desist from burning incense upon the altar, he was smitten with leprosy on the spot, and was never healed to the day of his death,[23] though

---

12 נתנים; see *supra* p. 584.

13 Neh. X. 36—40; XII. 44—47; XIII. 5, 12; 2Chr. XXXI. 11; comp. Mal. III. 8, 10; Ezek. XLIV. 28—30; Judith XI. 13; Tobit I. 7, 8; *Joseph.* Vit. c. 12; comp. *Mishn.* Avoth III. 13 (מעשרות סיג לעושר, tithes are a fence to wealth); V. 8, 9; Sot. IX. 13. Persons specially authorised inspected, for fixed fees, the firstborn beasts to decide whether they were sound or defective, that is, whether they belonged to the priests or to the Jewish owners (*Mishn.* Bechor. IV. 5).

14 Matth. XXIII. 23; Luke XI. 42; see p. 604.

15 Comp. 2 Chr. XXXI. 11; Neh. X. 38; XII. 44; XIII. 5, 12; Mal. III. 10.

16 Neh. XII. 44; XIII. 12.

17 Sir. VII. 31—35; *Jos.* Ap. II. 21; *Philo*, De Praem. cc. 1, 2.

18 Mal. II. 6, 7; comp. 2 Chr. XVII. 7—9. With what right Ewald (Alterth. p. 275) sees in these words "the description of the *original* virtues of Levi," requires no comment.

19 *Jos.* Vit. 1, *παρ' ἡμῖν ἡ τῆς ἱερωσύνης μετουσία τεκμήριόν ἐστι γένους λαμπρότητος.*

20 See p. 158.

21 See *supra* p. 559.

22 Ezek. XLIV. 15—31; see, however, *supra* p. 649 note 11.

23 2 Chr. XXVI. 16—21.

Uzziah's great predecessor Solomon had done the same act with perfect impunity. Finally, the Levites killed even the paschal lambs instead of the Israelites,[1] and thus deprived the latter of the last vestige of their original prerogatives.

Yet the exposition of the Law was not the exclusive privilege of any single class. It was the common right of all who possessed acumen, ability, or learning. Thus the scribes[2] and scholars formed gradually a more and more influential order honoured merely for their knowledge and piety. This was the more important as the main work of the nation for many centuries after the return from exile centred in the literary and legal development of the Scriptures. Among the doctors of the Mishnah were men from all tribes. Hence the priests could not maintain an intellectual preponderance, nor secure a dangerous superiority over the minds of the Jews. The demolition of the Temple by the Romans naturally deprived the priests and Levites of all spiritual power and nearly of all revenues. As the right of teaching is independent of descent, and the office of Rabbi may be held by any Jew of a certain moral and scholastic qualification, they enjoyed from that time to the present day only a few unimportant privileges in the Synagogue and the social life of the Jewish communities.[3]

---

8. After this sketch we shall briefly advert to the principal arguments which have been urged in favour of the traditional view. To trace the institution of priesthood, in the spirit of the Pentateuch, to Moses,[4] is absolutely against all historical evidence. As indeed the first origin of the sacrificial service goes back into remote ages, so also the first origin of the priesthood; but sacrifices and the priesthood remained long beyond the age of Moses in a primitive and

---

[1] 2 Chr. XXX. 17; XXXV. 10—14.

[2] סופרים, comp. 1 Chr. XXIV. 6; 2 Chr. XXXIV. 13.

[3] In the Synagogues, the Aaronites are called upon first, and the Levites second, to read the Law, or rather to speak the blessing over it, and then only other members of the congregation follow; and Aaronites pronounce or rather chant, on the five great festivals (Passover, Pentecost, New Year, Day of Atonement, and Tabernacles), that blessing over the people which is prescribed in Numbers (VI. 23—27), while the Levites minister to them in washing their hands which is required before the ceremony. Grace after meals, which is said aloud and with certain additional formulas if three or more persons partake of the meal, is spoken by an Aaronite if one is present. The firstborn sons are *redeemed* from priests (by פדיון הבן) for a small sum of money (see *supra* p. 611). Aaronites are not allowed to enter a house in which a dead person lies, except it be one of their nearest relatives.

[4] *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. II. 297—301 (and in general to p. 384), who argues, as if Moses had followed the example of the Egyptians; and similarly many others (f. i. *Plumptre*, l. c. II. 916; *Knobel*, Levit. p. 420).

patriarchal state. It has been asserted, that a gradual growth or development of the laws concerning the priestly functionaries is impossible or improbable, because these laws are closely connected with those regarding the general institutions of public worship;[5] but this is plainly moving in a vicious circle, and it is indeed surprising to find an able and learned man offer an argument so unlogical and unsatisfactory as this, "If the whole tribe of Levi was already at the time of Moses an initiated and priestly order, public worship must necessarily even in that period have been worked out and fixed in the manner described in the Pentateuch; for what necessity was there for appointing a whole tribe as priests, if there was no well-regulated and complicated worship?" that is, the sacrificial laws of the Pentateuch existed because the priestly ordinances were established, and the priestly ordinances were established because the sacrificial laws existed: instead of furnishing a proof at least of either proposition, it is attempted to support one unproved assumption by another equally unfounded. On the contrary, it may be maintained with much greater justice, that the priestly organisation is closely allied to the whole method of public worship; and since Moses did not introduce the sacrificial laws of the Pentateuch, as we have demonstrated elsewhere,[6] so he cannot have fixed the priestly organisation of the Pentateuch, nor have singled out a separate tribe for the service of Jehovah.[7] Let us briefly consider some occurrences that happened in the time of Saul and David. When the Ark of the Covenant had, by the Philistines, been returned to Beth-shemesh, it was by the inhabitants of the latter town sent to Kirjath-jearim, where it remained for a very considerable time, at least twenty years, far from the Tabernacle of which it formed the very soul and centre, and under the charge of a "stranger", Abinadab, and his son Eleazar;[8] and David, fearful of the terrible consequences of its presence, left it for three months in the house of Obed-Edom in Gath, and brought it to Jerusalem only when he was informed of the happiness that visibly blessed Obed-Edom's family.[9] If the duties of the priests and Levites had, at that time, been so clearly defined and so solemnly enjoined as is done in the Pentateuch, and if this organisation had even approximately resembled that attributed to Moses, how is it possible to account for such a neglect of the most sacred implement of the Tabernacle, which it was the chief duty of the whole tribe to guard and to honour?[10]

9. Again, the Deuteronomist ordains[11] that the "priests the Levites" should furnish every king with a copy of the Law that he should read in it daily and might act in accordance with its precepts. But king Josiah, when in the eighteenth year of his reign the "Book of the Law" was found, was astonished at its contents, which were perfectly strange to him. This ordinance of the Deute-

[5] So *Bähr*, Symb. II. 10.

[6] See pp. 37 *sqq*.

[7] Comp. *Vatke*, l. c. p. 221.

[8] 1 Sam. VII. 2; 1 Chr. XIII. 3; see *supra* p. 637.

[9] 2 Sam. VI. 9—12.

[10] It is needless to criticise the strange apologetic views designed to remove this difficulty; a specimen may be seen in *Hengstenberg*, Auth. des Pent. II. 48—51 ("das Volk sollte erst wieder innerlich Volk Gottes werden, ehe das Heiligthum unter ihm wieder hergestellt wurde"; "mit dieser Periode hat es eine besondere Bewandniss", etc. etc.). Far removed from the truth is, therefore, the view that "the reigns of David and Solomon were naturally the culminating period of the glory of the Jewish priesthood" (*Plumptre*, l. c. II. 923): under these reigns the priesthood just began to rise in authority.

[11] Deut. XVII. 18.

ronomist can, therefore, not have existed at that time, for else it would certainly have been acted upon by a king so pious as Josiah. The same remark applies to the injunction that the priests should, on the Feast of Tabernacles of every seventh year, read the Law to the assembled people; history shows before the seventh century no trace of the execution of such a precept; it disproves, in fact, the existence of a book of which even theocratic kings could be ignorant. The second Isaiah, liberal and high-minded, not only breaks through the traditional barriers, but declares, with an enthusiastic glance into the future, that even heathens who worshipped Jehovah would be acceptable as priests and Levites; so that even he, living in the sixth century, did not deem an hereditary priesthood indispensable, and attached greater weight to an inward vocation than to descent.[1] The circumstance that the priesthood is found in the tribe and family of Moses, and not among the Reubenites, the descendants of Jacob's firstborn son, does not prove that Moses was its founder or author, but only that his race or tribe evinced a more ardent interest or zeal in religious matters than the rest of the Israelites, whether they did so from inclination or necessity: had Moses indeed been the founder, *his* progeny, and not that of his brother Aaron, might justly be expected to have been singled out for the priestly dignity. According to the Pentateuch, Moses is said to have appointed from the various families of the Levites for the service of the Tabernacle 8,580 men,[2] of whom, as a compact body, there is no trace in subsequent periods at least to the time of Saul and David. It is indeed inconceivable how the existence of the priesthood in the tribe of Levi from early times can be maintained, since in Jacob's address, whether this be understood as history or prophecy, it is expressly pronounced, "Into their council my soul shall not come; in their assembly my glory shall not join,"[3] and the priests are just described as "the near ones" and "holy ones."[4] It is therefore inadmissible to assert that that arrangement goes back to the remotest times and is connected with the division of the tribes (*George*, Feste. p. 57). It has been averred that the Levites wandered about in the period of the Judges without settled abodes, because not all the Levitical towns had come into the undisturbed possession of the Hebrews (as Gezer and Aijalon):[5] but they wandered about, in a similar manner, long after the period of David and Solomon; and why were they not received in those Levitical towns, which had been conquered and which would certainly have sufficed for the accommodation of all? If it was temporarily impossible to live fully and completely in accordance with the "Mosaic" regulations, why was this not done as much as feasible?

---

[1] See *supra* p. 646; comp. *Gramberg*, Relig. Id. I. 239.

[2] Num. IV. 36—48. [3] Gen. XLIX. 6.

[4] See p. 560. It is hardly less than preposterous to assert that those words of Jacob, "later turned into a blessing, were fulfilled in the tribe of Levi", because the Levites after the sin of the golden calf, vindicated truth and justice in honour of Jehovah (*Öhler*, in Herz. VIII. 347; comp. *Philo*, Vit. Mos. III. 19): this is rather playing with the Bible than interpreting it. Unhistorical also is the whole conception of *Saalschütz*, Mos. Recht, I. pp. 90, 95 *sqq.* to 126 *passim*; Archäol. II. 342—360, ch. 78; see also *Hüllmann*, Staatsverf. der Israeliten, pp. 137—142; *Jost*, Gesch. des Judenth. I. 146, 147; *Plumptre*, in Smith's Bibl. Dict. II. 914—925 (who believes that it is "hardly necessary to do more than state these theories", namely the results of historical criticism); I. 100—108; etc.

[5] Josh. XXI. 21, 24; comp. XVI. 10; Judg. I. 35; *Öhler*, in Herz. VIII. 353.

Critics who maintain a different opinion from that advocated in this treatise, are yet compelled to admit that "Moses hardly gave a written law concerning priests and Levites, but rather introduced religious institutions by way of practice;"[6] or "its origin goes back to the earliest time; the Mosaic ritual, however much we may question the antiquity of some of its details, contains, no doubt, the groundwork on which the subsequent system was founded;"[7] or "the new priests were at first only the prophet Moses himself and Aaron, these possibly supported by their nearest relatives; the lower functions were performed by the domestic priests of the elder class who maintained themselves for a long time as ministers in private houses",[8] or "even the mode and extent of many duties of the priestly order changed in the lapse of centuries so exceedingly that, in later times, the common priests and often even the High-priests hardly still represented the arrangements made in the age of Moses and Joshua."[9] All this may be correct in so far as Moses possibly regulated and modified some customs of his time in harmony with the doctrines of monotheism — how much, it will ever be impossible to determine, considering the uncertain accounts we possess of the life and times of Moses. For this reason it is also precarious to argue that the new truths promulgated by Moses, together with the institutions and customs based upon them, required a new priesthood to guard them faithfully, to apply them with skill, to hand them down to future ages, and to guard them against errors and fluctuations:[10] when these new truths promulgated by Moses, shall have been accurately or even approximately ascertained and defined, it will be time to speculate upon the probable guardians appointed by him to protect them; and it is no more than a vague supposition to assert that "after Moses, there appeared in Israel a new priesthood distinguished by enlightenment, wisdom of rulership, and energy, and surpassing the preceding priesthood as decidedly as the religion of Jehovah surpassed the former creeds."[11] The contrary practices found in the post-Mosaic ages down to a late period of the divided empire, do not chronologically follow but precede the injunctions of even the earliest portions of the Levitical law as laid down in the Pentateuch, which were the result of severe efforts and protracted struggles on the part of the tribe of Levi; for although theocracy may be an ancient political form, especially in the East,[12] and may, in principle, have been acknowledged among the Hebrews in comparatively early times, as those of Gideon and Samuel,[13] yet it requires extended periods before it can be made the basis of such a hierarchy as is delineated in the Pentateuch.[14]

10. Customs indeed wavered and fluctuated, in many respects, for a very long time, before they were fixed by a uniform law, and sometimes opposing ordinances were, side by side, incorporated in the same code, without an attempt at conciliation.[15]

The priesthood was at first evidently extended over the whole tribe; had it from the beginning been limited to the progeny of Aaron, it would be impossible

---

6 *Knobel*, l. c.

7 *Stanley*, Jewish Church, II. 406.

8 *Ewald*, Alterthüm. p. 294.

9 *Ewald*, l. c. p. 283.

10 Comp. *Ewald*, l. c. pp. 274, 275.

11 *Ewald*, l. c.

12 It is too much to consider it as the "oldest" (*Bähr*, Symb. II. 9); for it pre-supposes a considerable degree of abstraction and religious education.

13 Comp. Judg. VIII. 23; 1 Sam. VIII. 7; see, however, p. 355 note 14.

14 See *supra* pp. 587—597.

15 See *supra* pp. 598 *sqq.*

to find reasons for the multifarious deviations manifest in subsequent periods, and especially for the position assigned in Deuteronomy to "the priests the Levites" (הכהנים הלוים) identical with "the priests the sons of Levi." This designation cannot possibly prove that "in later times, it had become customary in connection with the priesthood to regard principally the descent from Levi;" for the entire historical development shows that, in the lapse of time, the contrast between priests and Levites was maintained with increasing rigour, and the functions of both were separated with growing severity; in later ages, even all those Levites were refused admission into the holy service who were unable to trace their pedigrees to Aaron's family.[1] And hence it follows that the writings in which that designation is employed, and especially the Book of Deuteronomy, is of earlier date than those in which it is absent; just as the privileges and emoluments granted to the priests and Levites in the several Books are safe criteria of their relative dates. It is generally contended that Deuteronomy is meant to give supplementary laws only; but even if this were the case, as it certainly is not, its complete and systematic silence with regard to the difference between priests and Levites would be unaccountable.

In short, a natural, organic, and historical progress is only conceivable and traceable, if the priestly commands of Deuteronomy are regarded as the earlier, those of Leviticus and Numbers as the later ones; and all these regulations can only be harmonised with the accounts of the historical Books if they are placed in the latest times of the Hebrew monarchy, and partly in the period after the Babylonian exile. Not even Ezekiel, in his description of the ideal state, which he certainly desired to invest with the utmost splendour, ventured to raise his proposals so high as Leviticus and Numbers demand in reality. His festival sacrifices are moderate compared with those of the hierarchical Books; for the seven days of Tabernacles he requires only an aggregate of 105 animals,[2] whereas the Book of Numbers prescribes 212;[3] he is neither aware of nor does he insist upon an idea like that of the Pentateuch, of a Levitical tribe and one priestly family destined to retain their high dignity for all future times;[4] and he does not invest the office of the High-priest with particular eminence or spiritual power.[5] Do these circumstances not irresistibly force upon us the conclusion that not even Ezekiel knew the Books of Leviticus and Numbers as complete compositions, as otherwise he would, certainly, have been led to adhere to their arrangement, and at least to reproduce their spirit?[6]

11. The sketch above attempted indeed justifies the remark, "The sons of Levi were essentially a warrior caste; as their first father, so were they; ... every

[1] See p. 563. This will also serve to show how untenable is the opinion that "the Levites endeavoured to become more and more equal to the higher priests, if not in duties, at least in dignity", and that therefore the Deuteronomist "no more" mentions the distinction between "higher and lower priests" (so *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 300).

[2] Ezek. XLV. 25. [3] See p. 309.

[4] Comp. *Vatke*, l. c. p. 349.

[5] See *supra* p. 631.

[6] Hence *Vatke* (l. c. p. 344) observes justly, that as "there existed in the period of the Judges no distinct priestly tribe, and the priestly dignity was not yet strictly circumscribed in opposition to the totality of lay-men, so the same applies, with few modifications, to the times reaching down to the Babylonian exile"; and again, "it was only in the later time of the empire of Judah that the system of the Pentateuch was rendered possible; indeed it began at

step of their early history is marked deep in blood."[7] This character of the tribe gave rise to the traditions concerning the slaughter of the Shechemites,[8] the massacre of the worshippers of the golden calf,[9] and the murder of the idolatrous Israelite and his paramour by the hand of Phinehas.[10] For a long time, the Levites may have been ready, as they perhaps were compelled, to defend by the sword the Sanctuary which it was their duty to guard;[11] and this warlike attitude, which appeared even at so late a period as that of the Maccabees, may have been congenial to their turbulent tastes.[12] Yet this native character of the tribe must be distinctly separated from the character of the priestly office which was gradually conferred upon its members. That office, as delineated in the Pentateuch, was not warlike but peaceful; it did not require "the vigour and fierceness of youth", but the calmness and equanimity of manhood and old age; nor did it demand "the robust frame which could endure the endless routine of the sacrifices and carry away the bleeding remains, the quick eye and ready arm which could strike the fatal blow;"[13] these were not *priestly* functions; the victims were, as a rule, killed by the worshippers themselves;[14] the priests had merely to sprinkle the blood, to watch over the burning of the animals or of parts of them, and of the frank-incense, and thereby to secure the grace of God and His forgiveness; all the other duties were performed by the Levites who were themselves later assisted by the Nethinim. The blowing of the trumpets and the address to the army at the beginning of battle had no military but a religious import; the former was meant to symbolise that the Hebrews "would be remembered before the Lord and delivered from their enemies;"[15] and the latter is in harmony with the theocratic scheme of the Pentateuch. We should, therefore, not be justified in acceding to the remark, "Those who were prepared to wash their feet in the blood of the living enemies of their country, and to shed their own blood in the vanguard of the Israelite host, were not unsuited to the more tranquil, though not less sanguinary work of the sacrifices;" even more questionable is the opinion, "this remorseless energy was a concentration of the indomitable zeal which was to be the weapon (so to speak) of the whole Hebrew race in its conflicts with the world;"[16] but after all that has been said, it needs hardly to be pointed out with how little justice a distinguished writer and learned divine compares the Hebrew priests to *butchers*, "one of the coarsest of human occupations," and then exclaims, "Butcher and Priest are now the two extremes of the social scale; a fine moral lesson is involved in the fact that they were once almost identical".[17] But their office was neither "narrow" nor "outward;"[18] it was not "almost wholly independent of any other conditions than those of a physical and ceremonial nature;"[19] it does not "repel us by the coarseness of its grain and the rudeness of its subjects;"[20] it bears not merely "a secular and earthly character."[21]

---

that time gradually to develop itself, and became then a fixed practice after the Babylonian exile" (p. 216); comp. the judicious observations of the same critic l. c. pp. 118, 119.

7 *Stanley*, Jewish Church, II. 407.

8 Gen. XXXIV. 25—30.

9 Exod. XXXII. 26—29.

10 Num. XXV. 11—13.

11 Comp. *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 292.

12 Comp. *supra* p. 639.

13 *Stanley*, l. c. p. 411.

14 See p. 184.

15 Num. X. 9.

16 *Stanley*, l. c. pp. 408, 412.

17 L. c. p. 413.

18 P. 418.

19 P. 420.

20 P. 426.

21 P. 427.

# A. CONSECRATION OF THE SANCTUARY AND OF AARON AND HIS SONS.

## CHAPTER VIII.

SUMMARY.—Moses carries out the commands previously received (Ex. XXIX) concerning the consecration of Aaron and his sons, and of the Tabernacle and its utensils. He directs Aaron and his four sons to bathe themselves; he then clothes them with their official garments, anoints the Tabernacle and its vessels, and Aaron himself (vers. 1—13); he next presents a bullock for a sin-offering; puts some of the blood upon the horns of the brazen altar, and burns the flesh partly upon it, and partly without the camp (vers. 14—17); then he offers a ram for a holocaust (vers. 18—21), and lastly, a ram specially for the consecration; for he puts some of its blood on the right ear, right hand, and right foot, of Aaron and his sons, and sprinkles the rest on the altar around; he places the fat and the fat parts, together with the right shoulder and three kinds of unleavened cakes, on Aaron's and his sons' hands, waves, and then burns them upon the altar, while he appropriates to himself the breast; he sprinkles some of the mingled oil and blood taken from the altar upon the priests and their garments; after which the priests eat the meat in the Court of the Tabernacle (vers. 22—32). The same ceremonies are repeated for seven days, during which time Aaron and his sons are forbidden to leave the Court (vers. 33—36).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Take

1—5. Commands had been given for constructing the Tabernacle and its imutensils (Exod. XXV. 1—XXVII. 19; XXX. 1—10, 17—21); Aaron and his sons had been appointed priests, and their official vestments described (XXVIII); the ceremonies to be observed at their consecration had been minutely specified (XXIX), together with the ingredients and the preparation of the anointing oil (XXX. 22—33). After the historical episode of the golden calf (XXXII—XXXIV), the successful execution of some of these commands had been related — of those concerning the Tabernacle and its utensils, the anointing oil, and the priestly garments (XXXV. 4—XXXIX. 43). Then God ordered to rear up the Sanctuary, to arrange the holy implements in their due places, to anoint them, and lastly, to wash, to clothe, and to anoint Aaron and his sons (XL. 1—15). Moses had faithfully carried out the injunctions which he had received (XL. 16—33), except those regarding the anointing of the Tabernacle and the consecration of Aaron and his sons. But before advancing to record their accomplishment also, the narrative pauses in order to insert precepts and ordinances indispensable to the effectual performance of these last commands. For the consecration of the priests, from which the anointing of the Tabernacle was inseparable, was to be accompanied by all the principal

**Aaron and his sons with him, and the garments, and the anointing oil, and the bullock for the sin-offering, and the two rams, and the basket of unleavened bread; 3. And assemble all the congregation to the door of**

kinds of sacrifice. It seemed, therefore, desirable to premise a comprehensive code of the sacrificial laws; such a code was presented in the seven first chapters of Leviticus; and now the narrative returns to the point where it was broken off at the end of Exodus, and at once proceeds to the historical account of the initiation of the holy functionaries at the national Sanctuary. A general connection between the second and the third Book of the Pentateuch can, therefore, not be disputed; and the arrangement of the parts must be regarded as essentially logical (comp. notes on I. 1—9). This conclusion is confirmed by the manner, in which the writer here describes the execution, which plainly refers to the corresponding injunctions in Exodus (comp. vers. 2, 3, 9, 13, 17, 21, 29, 35, 36; see Phil. Rem.). Yet it would be rash to contend that this was the position of the respective portions in the original documents. The command in Exodus (XXIX) is so detailed that it can hardly be declared unintelligible or supposed to require extraneous elucidation; it alludes to the various sacrifices as matters entirely familiar to Moses; without additional or particular directions, it states, "it is a sin-offering", or "it is a burnt-sacrifice", or "it is a ram of consecration" (vers. 14, 18, 22); it exhibits the whole of the ceremonial law in full operation, as has even been admitted by champions of a different opinion (as *Bähr*, Symb. II. 424); it would indeed have been to Moses no more than an aggregate of obscure phrases, were it not framed on the supposition of his perfect acquaintance with the sacrificial laws. Its authors could, therefore, not possibly have deemed it necessary to interpose between the behest and the achievement a long and varied account of the ritual of sacrifices. Hence it must be inferred, what indeed is sufficiently manifest from our observations on the preceding chapters, that these laws were inserted in their place — and we must concede, inserted on the whole judiciously — by the revisers of the two Books, who could find no better arrangement for the multifarious and often incongruous matter at their disposal. Moreover, it cannot be denied that the second Book concludes, in some respects, abruptly. For after all the orders had been given, the text summarily states, "And Moses did according to all that the Lord had commanded him; thus he did" (Exod. XL. 16); and yet the consummation of the charge concerning the anointing of the Tabernacle and the consecration of the priests, is there not related, but is reserved for a much later place, where it seems to stand severed from its natural connection. It is most probable that the *narrative*, forming the groundwork of the composition, was originally continuous, but that the *laws*, which also constituted documents complete in themselves (comp. VII. 37, 38; XXVI. 46; XXVII. 34), were inserted where the context seemed to require or to admit them.

Moses provided himself with all the objects which he knew to be necessary for the ceremonial — the holy garments of Aaron and his sons, one bullock and two rams, and a basket containing three kinds of unleavened cakes (Ex. XXIX. 2); and then he proceeded with Aaron and his four sons, Nadab,

**the Tent of Meeting. 4. And Moses did as the Lord had commanded him; and the congregation was assembled**

Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, to the door of the Tabernacle to commence the consecration.

Philological Remarks. — Our chapter undoubtedly points to the 29th of Exodus and forms its sequel. Some matters which in the former section are introduced as new and indefinite, appear here as known and familiar; for instance, we read here את פר החטאת and ואת שני האילים (ver. 1), whereas Exodus has simply פר אחד (not only without the demonstrative את but without the qualifying החטאת) and ואילים שנים; more strikingly still, our chapter has merely ואת סל המצות *and the basket of unleavened bread*, whereas in Exodus the contents of the basket are minutely described (ver. 2, "unleavened bread, and unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil; of fine flour of wheat shalt thou make them"; comp. ver. 3, סל אחד), to which specification our chapter could naturally refer. For the same reason, the washing of Aaron and his sons, and their investiture with the holy garments, are mentioned without explanatory introduction (vers. 6 *sqq*.). Indeed, the whole purport of the previous command is implied in the verse, "And Moses said to the congregation, This is the thing which the Lord ordered to be done" (ver. 5); and our chapter is very careful in stating that Moses faithfully carried out the injunctions before received from God (כאשר צוה יהוה את־משה, vers. 9, 13, 17, 21, 29, 34; or כאשר צֻוֵּיתִי, ver. 35). There are indeed various differences in the statements of both chapters; but they concern the form rather than the matter, and some follow unavoidably from the relative nature of command and execution (as in ver. 1, which mentions at once the priestly garments known from the text in Exodus to be required for the ceremony; comp. also vers. 23, 24 with Exod. ver. 20). Hence the narrative is, in our passage, rather more solemn; here the whole people is assembled before the Tabernacle (vers. 3, 4), of which no mention is made in Exodus; here the vestments of the High-priest are described not only more fully and more systematically, but almost with completeness (the drawers מכנסים alone being omitted); the significant and holy Urim and Thummim are specially named, although they form a part of the breastplate (חשן); and the golden plate (ציץ) of the mitre is more accurately qualified (vers. 7—9; comp. Exod. vers. 5, 6). The anterior portion (vers. 30, 35) simply orders that the consecration is to last for seven days; but in our Book, Moses commands Aaron and his sons not to move, during this time, "from the door of the Tent of Meeting" (ver. 33), and he even adds, "You shall abide at the door of the Tent of Meeting day and night seven days, and keep the charge of the Lord lest you die; for so I am commanded" (ver. 35). In Exodus, Moses is directed to cook the flesh of the ram of consecration (ver. 31, ובשלת), whereas, in our chapter, Moses orders Aaron and his sons to cook it (ver. 31, בשלו). More questionable than these divergences is perhaps the fact that, according to Leviticus, the Tabernacle with all its vessels is consecrated and anointed, and the altar is sprinkled with the oil seven times (vers. 10, 11; comp. XVI. 9); whereas the command in Exodus merely mentions the altar without enjoining the sprinkling (לא ידעתי היכן נצטווה בהזאות הללו, observes Rashi on ver. 11), and this not, as in our chapter, before the consecration of the priests,

**to the door of the Tent of Meeting. 5. And Moses said to the congregation, This *is* the thing which the Lord has commanded to be done.**

but in an appendix at the conclusion of the ceremony (vers. 36, 37; comp. Ex. XL. 9—11, 12—16). In other respects also, the *order* of the rites varies materially in both sections. For the succession of the acts to be performed with the ram of consecration (איל מלואים), is, in Exodus, as follows (vers. 20—26): Moses was 1. To put some of its blood upon the ear, hand, and foot of Aaron and his sons; 2. To sprinkle the rest of the blood round the altar; 3. To sprinkle a part of this blood and of the anointing oil upon the garments of Aaron and his sons; 4. To place the fat and the fat parts, together with the right shoulder and one of each of the three sorts of unleavened cakes, upon the hands of Aaron and his sons, and to move these objects as a wave-offering before God; 5. To burn them upon the altar; and 6. To wave the breast, and to keep it as his own portion. But in Leviticus (vers. 22—30), the sprinkling of the blood and of the anointing oil upon the garments is not the third, but the last act of Moses; this seems indeed the more plausible order; for thus the sacrifice is first completed, and then follows the sanctification of the vestments; whereas, in Exodus, the latter ceremony interrupts the sacrificial ritual. Yet it may be urged as an explanation that, in the command, everything that concerned the blood was to be strung together (1—3), while in the execution, the probable and rational arrangement was observed (see *infra* on ver. 30). Nor can we be surprised at the omission, in Leviticus, of some general laws which, in Exodus, are connected with the injunctions, as the suppression of the statute regarding the breast and the right shoulder of thank-offerings to be invariably handed over to the priests, or the silence concerning Aaron's holy garments in which all his successors were to be consecrated (Exod. vers. 28—30); for our chapter is simply the narrative of a single and special event, and therefore appropriately excludes all general or legislative remarks. Be this as it may, the differences pointed out, like some minor deviations in diction and sense (comp. Exod. ver. 31 and Lev. ver. 31), are without great weight; the correspondence is too clear, the coincidences are too varied to allow a doubt with regard to the connection which obviously exists between the two sections. — But this affords all the more reason to suppose that both stood originally in a much greater proximity than they occupy in the present form of the Pentateuch; therefore, the assertions of a perfect logical unity in the arrangement (*Ranke*, Untersuch. I. 100—102; II. 73—75, 82—85; *Bertheau*, Gruppen, pp. 130—132, and others), are by no means justified, and there is force in the remark of De Wette (Beiträge, II. 299) that "the supposition of *one* compiler of both Books would render it impossible to explain, why the narrative was so dismembered"; — and in order to remove the inconsistency which, at first glance, is involved in Exod. XL. 31, 32 (comp. *Gramb.* Rel. Id. I. 176, 193), it is necessary to translate the verbs there occurring (ורחצו and ירחצו) not as preterites, which would imply the existence of the whole service in full force, and would pre-suppose the actual consecration of the priests and the Tabernacle, but as futures, "That Moses and Aaron . . . should wash their hands . . . when they come into the Tent . . . they

**6. And Moses made Aaron and his sons approach, and washed them with water. 7. And he put upon him the tunic, and girded him with the girdle, and clothed him with the robe, and put the ephod upon him,**

should wash." — The writer evidently intended to convey that, in accordance with the solemnity of the occasion, or in order to prove in the most public manner possible the election of Aaron and his sons, the whole congregation was present in the Court of the Tabernacle, or partly before it (vers. 3, 4, Vulg. *ad ostium* and *ante fores*), and not, as has been contended (by Ebn Ezra, Dathe, Vater, Rosenmüller, Cahen, a. o.) merely the elders or chiefs of the tribes (the זקני ישראל, IX. 1; Exod. XII. 21; etc.; קריאי העדה, Num. I. 16, or נשיאי עדה קריאי מועד, Num. XVI. 2; comp. VII. 2; XXVI. 9; XXVII. 21; Lev. IX. 1 and 5; Exod. XII. 3 and 21; Deut. XXXI. 28 and 30; Josh. XXIII. 2; XXIV. 1; comp. *Michaelis*, Mos. R. I. §§ 45, 46; *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. pp. 36—53; *Keil*, Archäol. II. 217—224); he is unconcerned about the difficulties of space which rendered a literal execution impossible (comp. esp. Deut. XXIX. 9, 10, "You stand this day all before the Lord your God, your chiefs of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood to the drawer of thy water").

**6—13.** The consecration of the priests was accomplished by a double series of acts, each consisting of three distinct ceremonies. The first series comprised the washing, the clothing, and the anointing of the priests; the second the presentation of the three chief kinds of animal sacrifice — a sin-offering, a holocaust, and a thank-offering — though in a form partly modified from those prescribed for ordinary occasions. Either series included both preliminary or general, and special or characteristic rites. For the first of the six acts — the washing — was designed partly as a common preparation and partly as an emblem of that purity so pre-eminently demanded by the priestly office; the second — the clothing — constituted the real investiture with the sacerdotal dignity, and visibly marked out Aaron and his sons for their sacred mission; the third — the anointing — was intended to typify that they were endowed with the holy spirit of God, and thus supernaturally fitted for their august functions; the fourth and the fifth, or the two first of the second series — the sin-offering and the burnt-offering — were again general preparations usually accompanying solemn rituals, and expressive of that feeling of sinfulness and submissive obedience which is particularly desirable in human mediators between their fellow-creatures and God; while the sixth act — the thank-offering — formed a peculiar and most essential part of the ceremonies, so that the sacrifice was most emphatically called "the offering of the consecration" (מִלֻּאִים). The three preliminary acts symbolised the *duties* and *requirements*, the three others the *distinctions*, the *endowments*, and the *privileges*, of the priesthood; and the six, in their combination, suggested everything that characterised the sacerdotal office and its ministers.

Holy actions required a state of perfect purity. They were, therefore, usually commenced by washing the garments or bathing the body. The Hebrews were enjoined to do the former when the revelations of Mount Sinai were announced as impending (Exod. XIX. 10, 14); the latter formed

**and girded him with the band of the ephod, and dressed him with it. 8. And he put the breast-plate upon him: and he placed on the breast-plate the Urim and the**

probably one of the chief rites to be observed by the stranger who adopted the faith of the Israelites (comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 433), so that the Talmudical rule arose, "circumcision without baptism is unavailing" (מל ולא טבל כאלו לא מל); and both ablution and change of garments were ordered by Jacob when he purified his household, directed its members to remove all idols, and pledged them to the and true sole worship of God (Gen. XXXV. 2; see p. 167). While ordinarily, or previous to every official function in the Sanctuary, the priest was commanded to wash his hands and feet with the water of the laver in the Court (see p. 572), the High-priest, on the Day of Atonement, was charged to bathe his whole body before he commenced his solemn duties (Lev. XVI. 4). How much more indispensable must the same complete lustration have appeared when the first High-priest and the first priests were initiated in their holy ministrations, and were to be marked as men singled out for perpetual purity and elevation of mind, and as instruments of peace and atonement. How this lustration was accomplished by Moses, and before the whole congregation, is not noticed in the text; it is hardly probable, that the whole people were supposed to witness it; and the Court was sufficiently extensive to admit of an arrangement suitable for the requirements of the case. Such acts of cleanliness are so natural, that we should expect to find them, on similar occasions, among other nations also, even if they were not recorded by distinct historical testimonies, as, for instance, with regard to the initiation into the mysteries of Isis, which was necessarily preceded by careful ablutions (comp. *Apul.* Metam. XI. p. 410, ed. Nisard, "deducit me ad proximas balneas, et prius sueto lavacro traditum, praefatus deum veniam, purissime circumrorans abluit;" see *supra* p. 167—171, and on the sacredness of water pp. 232—234; also *Kitto* on ver. 6). The rites ordained for the consecration of the *Levites* differed, indeed, in many respects, from those prescribed for the consecration of the *priests*, since the ceremonials were designed to reflect, in a significant manner, the difference between the internal nature of the office of either; yet the Levites had not only to clean their bodies, but also to wash their garments (Num. VIII, 7, 21); in the former respect, they were equal to the priests, but, in the latter, they were inferior; for as they received no distinct or official vestments, they were required to clean their ordinary clothes; their initiation was a *cleansing* (טהר), not a *sanctifying* (קדש); they were ordered to be pure in their external appearance and in their thoughts, because their life was connected with the Sanctuary, but they were not dressed in peculiar and symbolical garments, because their services, subordinate and menial, bore no relation to the work of grace and atonement.

The clothing of Aaron and his sons was, therefore, no indifferent or unessential act; it was a part of the actual induction into their sacred offices; it invested them with the visible emblems of their holiness and their functions, and marked them as distinct from the rest of the nation; justly, therefore, observed the Talmud, "when the priests are clothed in their garments, their priesthood is upon them, when they are not clothed in their garments, their

Thummim. 9. And he put the mitre upon his head, and put upon the mitre, on its forefront, the golden plate, the holy crown, as the Lord had commanded

priesthood is not upon them" (Zevach. 17*b*; comp. also *Maimon.* Kele Hammikd. X. 4; Cusari I. 99). It is on account of the importance of this act, that all the articles of the High-priest's dress, as they were put by Moses on Aaron, are separately enumerated, and are thus evidently intended to recall their significant meaning — the tunic and the girdle, the robe and the ephod, the breast-plate with the Urim and Thummim, and the mitre with the golden plate; the drawers (מכנסים) alone are not mentioned, because, as has been plausibly supposed, Aaron put them on himself immediately after his ablution (comp. VI. 3; Exod. XXVIII. 42); and in the same manner, the garments of Aaron's sons are specified (ver. 13).

The washing typifies the removal of uncleanness, whether physical or moral, and the clothing is the outward badge of the priest's avocation; therefore, the former implies essentially a negative element, and the latter is of an external nature appealing to the senses: then the anointing, the third act of the first series, supervenes as a positive element; it adds the endowment of the priest with the spirit of God; it tends to enlighten his mind and to ennoble his heart, in accordance with the meaning of his vestments. For oil typifies the holy spirit, and the sanctity which it ensures (see p. 115). It will, therefore, be understood why the anointing was used chiefly to mark the gradation between the various classes of the priesthood. For while the High-priest was distinguished by a pouring out of oil upon his head, the seat of reason and intellectual life, and hence the noblest part of the human organism, and by a pouring out — not a sprinkling — so copious that it could poetically be described as flowing down his beard (Ps. CXXXIII. 2), and denoted the fulness and abundance of the Divine spirit required by, and granted to, the spiritual chief of the nation, the common priests were more sparingly anointed, and the Levites not at all: for the High-priest was the embodiment of the entire sum of theocratic holiness; the common priests represented merely individuals; and the Levites were but the servants of the priests (see p. 583). Moreover, while every new High-priest was to be anointed in the same manner as Aaron himself (Exod. XXIX. 29, 30; Lev. VI. 13, 15), the anointing of his sons was supposed to suffice for the ordinary priests in all future ages, when the consecration of the chief was considered to involve that of the whole order, and descent alone was deemed sufficient to secure sacerdotal rights (comp. *Abarban.* on Exod. XXX. 22—33). — This seems to have been the law, if we take the ordinances of the Pentateuch as a whole. Yet the subject is not without difficulties, since the statutes do not agree among themselves. First, it is surprising that the anointing of Aaron's sons is neither mentioned in the commands concerning the consecration, in Exodus, nor in our chapter. The omission can hardly be accidental in descriptions so detailed and so accurate even with respect to minor points; it can only be explained by the supposition that the author of these portions considered the anointment of the common priests not to have taken place in Moses' time. On the other hand, it is elsewhere stated not only that

Moses. 10. And Moses took the anointing oil, and anointed the Tabernacle and all that *was* therein, and sanctified them. 11. And he sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times, and anointed the altar and all its

Aaron's sons were to be anointed (Exod. XXVIII. 41; XXX. 30), but that they were to be anointed in the very same manner as Aaron himself (Exod. XL. 15); they were consequently called "anointed priests" (כהנים משוחים, Num. III. 3), as the High-priest is designated "*the* anointed priest" (הכהן המשיח); and they are said, like their father, "to have the anointing oil of the Lord upon them" (Lev. X. 7). It is insufficient to urge, in explanation of these discrepancies, that the High-priest was anointed by oil being poured (יצק) upon his *head* (comp. ver. 12; XXI. 10, 12), the other priests merely by putting oil (משח) with the finger upon the *forehead*, or by partially sprinkling it upon their body (see Philol. Rem.); for this would, on the one hand, not be a mode of anointing *identical* with regard to High-priest and priests (Exod. XL. 15); and it would, on the other hand, render the silence in our portion and in the corresponding chapter of Exodus still more surprising, since a difference so remarkable in the procedure of anointing would certainly have required particular notice. Nor ought it to be asserted that the sprinkling of the *garments* with the anointing oil which applied both to Aaron and his sons (ver. 30), harmonizes the contradictory passages (so f. i. *Kurtz*, Opfercultus, p. 285; comp. *Carpzov*, Appar. Crit. p. 66); for that ceremony was entirely distinct from the proper act of anointment; and — what is even more essential — the oil was not sprinkled alone, but mingled with the blood of the ram of consecration; and the blood formed at least an equally important ingredient. The identity of the mode of anointing the High-priest and the common priests is, therefore, far from established.

The differences, though not to be reconciled, may at least be thus accounted for. First, it must be observed that at the time, when the passages under discussion were committed to writing, the question with regard to the anointing of the common priests had lost all practical importance, since it was generally agreed, that, after their first consecration by Moses, they required no anointing; and the ordinary practice of all ages confirmed this view. It was, therefore, only a matter of tradition or of speculative probability whether Moses anointed Aaron's sons or not. Now, on this point, either the sources or the opinions of the various writers differed. For a long time, all the Levites alike were admitted to priestly offices, as has been demonstrated above (p. 599); those who wrote at the periods when this usage prevailed, must naturally have considered the anointing of Aaron's sons superfluous, since these were the ancestors of but a very small minority of the priests. But when, later, the priesthood was exclusively reserved to Aaron's family, that is, to the progeny of Eleazar and Ithamar, it was deemed important to hallow them through the consecration of their sires by the hand of Moses himself. Therefore, on the whole, earlier documents omit, later ones mention the anointment of Aaron's sons. Again, for long periods the office of High-priest, which seems to be the culminating point of the institutions of Hebrew hierarchy, was less conspicuous or pre-eminent; it was,

vessels, both the laver and its base, to sanctify them.
12. And he poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's
head, and anointed him, to sanctify him. 13. And Moses

in a spiritual point of view, hardly superior to that of ordinary priests; and, therefore, the anointment of Aaron and of his sons was supposed to have been entirely identical (Exod. XL. 15). However, simultaneously with the gradual separation between the priests and Levites, the distinction between the High-priest and the common priests gained ground; and as that distinction could be marked most strikingly by the significant act of anointment, Aaron was represented as anointed, while his sons were not (comp. VI. 13; XVI. 32; XXI. 10, 12; Num. XXXV. 25); and this is obviously the point of view prevailing in our chapter (ver. 12). Two considerations were in conflict: the holiness of the priests, as the supposed descendants of Eleazar and Ithamar, seemed to demand the anointment of the latter; but the greater holiness of the High-priest appeared to require the restriction of that ceremony to Aaron alone; and this dilemma engendered a diversity of views and statements. Thus even minor points reflect the entire history of the spiritual development of the Hebrews, and support the results derived from general and comprehensive surveys.

The oil used for so solemn a rite was not to be the bare product of nature, but was to be enhanced in value and significance by the admixture of four fragrant substances, which number was to mark the completeness of the act, and the perfection of the priests' endowment with the Divine spirit (see p. 117).

Together with the appointed mediators, it was deemed essential to hallow the place where they were to perform their all-important work; therefore, with the oil used for the consecration of the priests, Moses anointed first the Tabernacle in the stricter sense (מִשְׁכָּן) that is, the Holy and the Holy of Holies (Comm. on Exod. p. 476), and then the utensils of the Court, especially the brazen altar on which the sacrifices were to be burnt, and which, therefore, was the chief instrument of atonement (vers. 10, 11). That altar was sprinkled with the holy oil *seven* times, then anointed with all its vessels, and thus sanctified (comp. XVI. 9).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — The passage above quoted from Apuleius (Metam. XI.) describing the initiation of "Lucius" as a priest of Isis, is highly interesting as a parallel, and evidently contains the origin or model of impressive customs observed even in some modern societies or fraternities: the very first step was his *ablution*; then he was taken into the temple of the goddess where he received secret instructions; next, after ten days of strict preparation, during which he was to abstain from luxurious food, especially all meat and wine, he was, in the night of the eleventh day, clothed in a new linen garment, and the chief ceremonies began; "*I approached the confines of death*", he relates, "and having trod on the threshold of Proserpine, I returned *having been borne through all the elements*"; thence those who have passed through the rites were called "quodam modo *renati*"; and he continues, "At midnight I saw the sun shining with its brilliant light, and I approached the presence of the gods beneath, and the gods of heaven, and stood near and worshipped them"; in the morning he was dressed in "twelve stoles", the chief of which was "the Olympic stole", of linen elegantly coloured, with a precious scarf falling

**made Aaron's sons approach, and put tunics upon them,**

from the shoulders behind the neck down to the ankles, all covered with sacred and symbolical figures, as Indian serpents, Hyperboraean griffins, and winged birds; then "arrayed like the sun", with a burning torch in his right hand, a chaplet round his head, from which the shining leaves of the palm-tree projected like rays of light, and so placed as to resemble a statue, he was shown to the multitude; this he regarded as his "natal day", and celebrated it with festive banquets; the same rites were passed through on the next day, after which he was privileged to view the holy image of the goddess; lastly he poured out his feelings in an ardent prayer of praise and thanksgiving, and embraced the High-priest who had initiated him, and whom he thenceforth regarded as his "parent" (meum jam parentem). In opposition to ceremonials like these, Philo observes (De Sacrif. c. 12), and no doubt in harmony with the principles of the Pentateuch, "The lawgiver entirely removes out of his sacred code of laws all ordinances respecting initiations and mysteries, and all such trickery and buffoonery" (*πρὸς τὴν τοιαύτην τερθρείαν καὶ βωμολοχίαν . . . μηδεὶς οὖν μήτε τελείσθω τῶν Μωσέως φοιτητῶν καὶ γνωρίμων, μήτε τελείτω*). — On the הכהן המרובה בבגדים, who, according to Jewish tradition, was in the time of the second Temple, substituted for הכהן המשיח, since the holy anointing oil had been lost, see p. 575; also *Talm.* Horay. 11*b*; 12*a*; Kerith. 5*b*; *Reland*, Ant. II. i. 3. — Moses himself washed Aaron and his sons (ver. 6), at least partially, as he performed all the principal acts necessary for the consecration; וירחץ is, therefore, not "he ordered them to wash or to bathe themselves" (Ebn Ezra, Rashi, a. o.); though, probably שרף (ver. 17) is to be understood in a similar manner (comp. ver. 31). — Geddes, following the uncertain authority of a few manuscripts, transposes some words in vers. 7 and 8, and reads, ויתן עליו את האפוד ואת החשן ויחגר וכ', which alteration is obviously uncalled for. Aaron had been fully dressed, including the mitre (ver. 9), because, completely arrayed in holiness, he was to witness the important ceremony of the expiation of the Tent and the altar; when, therefore, oil was to be poured "on his head" (ver. 12), he had naturally to take off the mitre (comp. Exod. XXIX. 6, 7): it is unnecessary to assume a *hysteron proteron* in the text, and to suppose that the anointment of Aaron preceded his investiture with the garments, which would imply a very inappropriate anti-climax. — The multitudinous speculations bestowed upon the *form* of anointment are all equally futile and groundless, although they date partially from a very early time. The Talmud (Kerith. 5*b*; Horay. 12*a*) declares, "the kings were anointed in the manner of a crown (that is, all round the head), but the High-priests in the manner of a Greek *X* or *K*" (כמין כי יוני or כמין כף יוני), the oil being first poured upon the head, and then put between the eyebrows; this is explained by Rashi (on Horay. l. c.) in the following manner: "the person who performed the act, began by anointing between the eyebrows, then the drew the finger over the head, and continued till he reached the neck, so that the anointment took the form of כ" (comp. also id. on *Talm.* Kerith. l. c., on Exod. XXIX. 7, and XXX. 26; *Kimchi* on Ps. CXXXIII. 2): but the Hebrew כ has no resemblance either with the Greek *X* or *K*, and to add to the singularity of the explanation, Rashi observes elsewhere (on Exod. XXIX. 2), that the Greek כי has the form of the Hebrew נ. Yet both

and girded them with girdles, and put turbans upon them, as the Lord had commanded Moses.

14. And he [Moses] caused the bullock for the sin-

views, namely that the anointment took the shape of the Hebrew כ, and that it took that of the Greek X, have been extensively adopted, the former chiefly by Jewish writers, because כ is the initial of כהן, or because the High-priest was to serve God with his hand (כף, Abarbanel), the latter by Christian interpreters, because X resembles the cross (comp. Ezek. IX. 4), and the High-priest is the type of Christ (e. g. *Selden*, De Succ. in Pontif. II. 9; *Schickhard*, De Jure Hebr. Reg. Cap. I. theor. 4, p. 75; *Lundius*, Jüd. Heiligth. III. xxvii. 28, 29; *Reland*, Antiqq. III. i. 5, 7, comp., however, Ravius in loc.); while Vitringa (Obs. Sacr. p. 457) curiously combines both opinions ("quia in ea litera X latet duplex litera caph Hebraea, ad dorsum sibi obversae, hac specie ɔc, et quia litera כ est prima vocis כהן)". — The Talmudical distinction between יצק and משח is fictitious (*Talm.* ll. cc.). Yet it has frequently been defended, and most elaborately by Abarbanel, who maintains (on Exod. XXX. 22—33, Rule V, p. 104*a* ed. Amsterd.), that the two acts symbolise two different characteristics of the High-priest — his election and his endowment with the holy spirit, though he cannot help confessing that both terms appear to be synonymous; nor are the reasons by which he endeavours to account for the anointment of all successive High-priests, but of the first common priests only, at all acceptable, namely, because the former were invariably elected or singled out from among their brethren on account of their excellence, whereas the latter were all alike admitted to the sacred functions merely on account of their birth: but according to the tenour of the Law, the dignity of the High-priest was evidently also meant to be strictly hereditary; but it was so important and comprehensive, that it seemed, at every change, to require a renewal of the Divine spirit and grace (comp. *Carpzov*, Appar. Crit. pp. 59, 60, 67, 68; *Vitringa*, l. c. pp. 454—457; *Bauer*, Gottesd. Verf. II. 317, 318; *Bähr*, Symb. II. 167, 168; etc.). — It has, on the one hand, been asserted that "the later High-priests were not anointed, and that the anointment of Aaron was the first and the last, valid for all future times" (*Hengstenb.* on Ps. CXXXIII. 2, vol. IV. 2, p. 82); while it has, on the other hand, been contended that even all the common priests of later times were anointed and consecrated (*Keil*, Comm. on Lev. pp. 60, 61): the commands of the Pentateuch on both points are beyond misconception (Exod. XXIX. 29, 30; Lev. VI. 13, 15). Nor is there any foundation for the opinion that later "not all the priests of the house of Aaron were anointed, but the sacrificial priests only, from whom the High-priest was chosen" (*Ewald*, Alterthümer, p. 290): the Pentateuch knows no such distinction between "ordinary" and "sacrificial" priests. — The suffix in פניו (ver. 9) refers to Aaron, for מצנפת is of feminine gender. — The singular אַבְנֵט (ver. 13; comp. Exod. XXIX. 9), where logically the plural would be required "and he girded them with girdles" (comp. כתנות, מגבעות), must be understood in a distributive sense, "he girded each of them with a girdle" (comp. Gramm. § LXXXV.); the plural אַבְנֵטִים (Exod. XXVIII. 40), which the Samaritan codex offers, was, perhaps, not commonly used.

**14—21.** The second or sacrificial series of ceremonies begins with a sin-

offering to be brought near; and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the bullock for the sin-offering; 15. And Moses slew *it*, and took the blood, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger, and purified the altar; and he poured the *other* blood at the bottom of the altar, and sanctified it, and expiated it. 16. And Moses took all

offering, and then proceeds to a holocaust. The first of these introductory acts corresponds with the preliminary rite of bathing in the first series, to which it is on the one side kindred, on the other opposed; for it is indeed negative in its character, in as much as it aims at the removal of sin; but it does not express this object merely by an external symbol, but accomplishes it by a sacrifice which secures Divine grace and forgiveness: the purification is, by the sin-offering, not only aimed at, but effected; and it is effected in a much deeper sense than it can even be aimed at by the lustration. However, the sin-offering killed on this exceptional occasion strictly resembled no sacrifice of the same class, as ordinarily presented. For commonly, either the blood of the sin-offering was partially brought into the Holy, and then the entire victim was burnt; or the blood did not come beyond the Court, and then certain parts of the victim were allowed to be eaten (VI. 18, 19, 23; see pp. 259, 260). But the blood of the sin-offering here commanded for the consecration of Aaron and his sons was wholly disposed of at the brazen altar in the Court (ver. 15), and yet the animal was to be completely delivered up to the flames (ver. 17). Why, on the one hand, was no part of the blood taken into the Sanctuary? or why, on the other hand, could the flesh not be eaten? To begin with the latter point, it will be easily understood, that there was no suitable person to receive and to consume the flesh. The priests, to whose share it ordinarily fell, could not eat it, because they were, in this instance, not the atoning mediators, but the objects of atonement themselves; nor could Moses partake of it, because it was "most holy", and could, therefore, be permitted to priests exclusively (VI. 18, 19), and not even to him who, on that extraordinary occasion, and by the special command of God, performed priestly functions. Less obvious is the explanation of the other point. It might appear, at first sight, particularly appropriate to take a part of the blood of expiation into the Holy, to put it there on the altar of burnt-incense, and to sprinkle it before God (IV. 5—7, 16—18), since a more solemn opportunity for the exercise of the most imposing rites can scarcely be imagined than the initiation of the permanent intercessors between God and his chosen people. If, nevertheless, in this most essential respect, the less sacred ceremonial was observed, and the blood was disposed of at the brazen altar alone (IV. 25, 30, 34), the reason can only be analogous to that which involved the clue to the former question, namely, that Moses, the *Levite*, though he anointed all implements of the Sanctuary, was on no account, and not even once and exceptionally, to be permitted, in connection with sacrifices, to enter the Holy, which was reserved for the *priests* alone, and which it was a heinous crime and an impious rebellion, on the part of any "stranger" to defile by his presence (see p. 563). Moreover, the blood was

**the fat, that *was* upon the bowels, and the great lobe of the liver, and the two kidneys, and their fat, and burnt *it* upon the altar. 17. But the bullock, both his hide, his flesh, and his dung, he burnt with fire without the camp, as the Lord had commanded Moses. 18. And he made the ram for the burnt-offering come near; and**

brought into the Holy in two cases only — if the sacrifice was presented in the name of the whole nation or of the High-priest, because the former *is* the sum of all theocratic holiness, and the latter *represents* it; but he represents it only *in consequence* of his consecration; therefore, while the consecration was not completed, and while he was not fully qualified for his elevated office, he could neither claim its high prerogatives, nor did he bear all its heavy responsibilities in a manner that his sin should require so powerful an expiation. Therefore, Aaron's sin-offering was not even invested with its full solemnity, when he himself presented his first initiatory sacrifice, irrespective of a peculiar transgression or of periodical atonement (IX. 9). Yet that particular sin-offering was to be connected with a particular object; it was not merely designed to purify the priests, but also to sanctify the altar, where they were thenceforth charged to approach the presence of God; it was not simply an expiatory sacrifice, but most properly an offering of initiation: for as the *sin* of the people defiled the *Sanctuary* and its utensils (XVI. 16, 19), it was necessary not only to remove the former, but also to sanctify the latter. Therefore, the blood was not simply "sprinkled round about upon the altar", as was the case with holocausts (I. 5, 11) and the thank-offerings (III. 2, 8, 13), nor was it merely "put upon the horns" of the altar with the finger, as was done with the sin-offerings of the less solemn kind (IV. 25, 30, 34); but "Moses took the blood and put it upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger, and purified the altar" (ver. 15): the horns of the altar were not only to be carefully touched with the blood by the finger, but they were at all sides to be so entirely covered with the blood, that this ceremony might be understood to mean not merely the atonement of those, for whom the sacrifice was presented, but also the sanctification of the altar itself. Now the meaning of the rituals observed at this sin-offering will be clear. Moses brought the bullock to the Court of the Tabernacle; Aaron and his sons placed their right hands on the head of the victim, because they were, in this instance, not the priests, but the offerers. Moses killed the animal, because he, the chosen mediator of the Covenant, through whom Israel became the people of God and a holy nation, was to perform as many functions as was compatible with his position; he disposed of the blood in the manner described and burnt the fat and the fat parts on the altar in the Court, while all that remained of the animal he directed to be delivered up to the flames without the camp (vers. 14—17).

The last preliminary was a holocaust; it was even more important than the sin-offering; it was not merely negative in its nature; for it typified the complete and absolute abandonment of all human and selfish aims, and the unconditional submission to the Divine will and guidance; it followed, therefore, appropriately after the sin-offering, by which Aaron and

**Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the ram. 19. And Moses killed *it;* and sprinkled the blood upon the altar round about. 20. And Moses cut the ram into its pieces, and he burnt the head, and the pieces, and the fat. 21. And Moses washed the bowels and the legs in water; and he burnt the whole ram**

his sons had become worthy of being accepted as the pure servants of God; and Moses might well hope, that the animal then rising in the flames of the altar, would indeed be "a burnt-sacrifice for a sweet odour to the Lord".

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — The custom of the consecration of priests by means of sacrifices seems to have been of early date among the Hebrews; king Abijah reproached Jeroboam and his followers in these terms, "Whoever comes to consecrate himself (למלא ידו) with a young bullock and seven rams, may be a priest to no-gods" (2 Chr. XIII. 9). — It cannot be doubted that the words, "And Moses took the blood, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger, and purified the altar, and poured the other blood at the bottom of the altar", allude to *the same* altar, namely that of burnt-offering; the supposition that they refer to the two different altars, the first part to the golden, the second to the brazen one, would involve a defiance of all rules of intelligible expression (comp. IX. 9; see IV. 7, 18, where the two altars mentioned in a similar connection, are clearly and even minutely distinguished); while the assumption that the altar of burnt-incense is meant, is rendered impossible by the fact that blood was never poured out at the bottom of that altar, within the Holy (comp. *Rosenm.* in loc.), but when blood was put on its horns, it was also sprinkled "before the Lord", that is, on the vail (see IV. 6, 7, 17, 18; pp. 501, 502), to which no allusion is made in our passage. — From Exod. XXIX. 10, 11, 16, 20, it is clear that *Moses*, and not Aaron, brought the bullock to the door of the Tabernacle, and killed it, and that he likewise slaughtered the two other sacrifices (והקרבת and ושחטת); therefore ויגש (in ver. 14) must be referred to the subject of the preceding verse; while וישחט (in vers. 15, 19, 23) is to be connected with the *following* subject (ויקח משה), in accordance with a not unusual peculiarity of the Hebrew syntax (see on I. 1). This is also the case in vers. 16 (ויקח and ויקטר משה), 20, 21; and we have translated accordingly. — ואת הדם (ver. 15) stands for ואת־כל־הדם (IV. 7, 18), and means, like the latter phrase, all the *remaining* blood; see on IV. 7. — Here (ver. 15) and in IX. 9, the verb יצק is employed in the sense of *pouring out* (comp. 1 Ki. XXII. 35), while elsewhere, in similar contexts, שפך is used (IV. 7, 18, 25, etc.) without difference of meaning. — Although לכפר עליו may simply mean "to make atonement upon it", since this was the chief object of the altar, it is, with greater probability, here to be rendered in connection with the preceding ויקדשהו, "and he sanctified it by expiating it", that is, "and expiated it" (comp. the corresponding passage in Exod. XXIX. 36 וחטאת על־המזבח בְּכַפֶּרְךָ עליו; also XXX. 10; Lev. XVI. 18, 33; see Gramm. §. 98. 5; so also Rosenm., De Wette, Herxheimer, a. o.), because the whole verse treats of the expiation of the altar, and כִּפֵּר is, in this sense, synonymous with חִטֵּא which Onkel. here renders וְדַכֵּי (see

upon the altar: it *was* a burnt-sacrifice for a sweet odour, an offering made by fire to the Lord, as the Lord had commanded Moses.

22. And he made the other ram come near, the ram of consecration; and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the ram. 23. And Moses slew *it*, and took of its blood, and put *it* upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon

p. 476). — In ver. 17, first the whole animal (ואת־הפר) is mentioned, and then its parts (ואת־עורו וכ') are specified, while Exod. XXIX. 14 has, more simply, ואת־בשר הפר ואת־עורו וכ'.— Whether Moses himself performed the burning of the sin-offering without the camp (ver. 17), and the washing of the bowels and of the legs of the holocaust (ver. 21), is uncertain, as these operations might well have been confided to any clean assistant, and the verbs שָׂרַף and רָחַץ may be taken in an impersonal sense. — Philo (Vita Mos. II. 17) understands the holocaust as an offering of gratitude for all the blessings enjoyed by man; but even if gratitude were in accordance with the nature of the burnt-offering, it would stand in no relation to the ritual of consecration, to which all acts must be referred.

**22—32.** And now followed the concluding ceremony, in which the whole ritual culminated; it was the proper and distinctive "sacrifice of consecration"; it defined and qualified all the general acts which had preceded. External and inward purification, atonement and free devotion of all powers and thoughts to God, investiture with the characteristic garments, and endowment with the holy spirit — all these duties and qualifications were necessarily to be symbolised, before the priests could be introduced to the rights and privileges of their office. In form, that sacrifice was a thank-offering; it was, therefore, evidently designed to express the humble gratitude of Aaron and his sons for having, without any title or merit, been selected for functions so exalted and for prerogatives so uncommon; but it was connected with rites which once more and comprehensively pointed to the peculiar nature of their mission. Moses brought the animal, a ram like the burnt-offering, to the door of the Tabernacle; Aaron and his sons, of course, imposed their hands upon its head; and when Moses had killed it, he put some of its blood upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot; and he then repeated the same ceremony with Aaron's sons. The significance of these acts is self-evident: they were to remind the priests, that henceforth it was their duty pre-eminently, to listen to the commands of God, to act in accordance with His will, since even their consecration was a "filling of the hand" (מלא יד), and to walk in His ways (comp. Exod. XXVIII. 35); the general piety emblematically enjoined by the holocaust, was thus distinctly specified in its chief manifestations, and was clearly brought home to the minds of the elected ministers. The *right* members of the body were chosen for this peculiar ceremony, because the right side was regarded as the more honoured, more important, and more auspicious, and therefore included the left (see p. 176 note 2; comp., however, *Lucan*, Phars. VI. 563); and the *extremities* only, and not the *entire* members

**the great toe of his right foot. 24. And Moses made Aaron's sons come near, and put of the blood upon the tip of their right ears, and upon the thumbs of their right hands, and upon the great toes of their right feet; and Moses sprinkled the blood upon the altar round about. 25. And he took the fat, and the fat tail, and all the fat that *was* upon the bowels, and the great lobe**

were marked with the blood, because the act was symbolical, and the most conspicuous part sufficed to point to the whole and to represent it. The blood of the ram of consecration was, therefore, the blood of pledge and covenant; it bound the priests to the authority of God as their Lord and sole Master. It was, hence, not superfluous even after the oil with which they had been anointed. For the oil bestowed upon them, supernaturally, enlightenment, and wisdom, and holiness of heart; but the blood typified their own personal efforts in which they vowed to be untiring in virtuous and godly conduct; the one raised them above the level of ordinary humanity, the latter reminded them most forcibly of their human obligations; the former, in fact, was freely and graciously granted to them by God, the latter involved a mutual compact. In view of this paramount importance of the consecration-offering, it might well be asked, why the animal selected for it was a ram, and not, like the sin-offering, a bullock, which was regarded as the noblest victim (pp. 82, 83). We may venture the supposition that as the ram was the ordinary, and perhaps the most primitive, sacrificial animal, it was deemed particularly appropriate for a ceremony designed to convey the ordinary duties and privileges of priesthood, since it recalled more plainly than any other animal, the usual service of the altar. A distinction from the sin-offering might have appeared the more desirable, because the sin-offering was a preparatory, the thank-offering the characteristic sacrifice of the ceremonial.

After Moses had sprinkled the remaining blood "on the altar round about", as was the custom in all thank-offerings, he proceeded to another and very remarkable ceremony meant to illustrate another side of the priestly mission. He took the fat, and the fat parts, and the right shoulder of the victim, put upon this flesh and fat one cake of each of the three unleavened kinds which he had brought with him in a basket, placed the whole upon the hands of Aaron and his sons, and consecrated it to God by the peculiar rite of waving (תְּנוּפָה, pp. 199—201); after which he "took all of it from their hands, and burnt it on the altar upon the burnt-offering; it was a consecration (מִלֻּאִים), for a sweet odour, an offering made by fire to the Lord" (ver. 28); while he himself received, for his own portion, the breast of the victim, after he had waved it also. Now, what was the meaning of this "consecration"? It could not denote that God presented the priests, for the future, with the portions so hallowed (thus *Bähr*, Symbol. II. 426; *Winer*, Real-Wört. I. 381; *Öhler* in Herz. XII. 179; a. o.); for on the one hand, the breast which fell to the share of the priests, was not consecrated, while, on the other hand, the fat and fat parts, which were always burnt, were among the waved objects. Nor could it symbolically promise and guarantee to the priests that sacrifices would never be wanting among the Hebrews; nor did it exactly refer to

of the liver, and the two kidneys, and their fat, and the right shoulder; 26. And out of the basket of unleavened bread, that *was* before the Lord, he took one unleavened cake, and one cake of oiled bread, and one wafer, and put *them* on the fat *and the fat* parts, and upon the right shoulder. 27. And he placed all *these things* upon

the gifts which the priests would have to present to God (thus *Keil*, Archäol. I. 265, 266), because the right shoulder was not generally burnt on the altar. That ceremony cannot, indeed, be explained by the ordinary sacrificial practice, because it is entirely exceptional and singular in character. Aaron and his sons could not receive the right shoulder and the breast, their usual perquisites in thank-offerings, because the ram was not sacrificed for others, but in their own name, and because they were, at that time, not even fully authorised as priests — they were virtually not more than private individuals. Those parts might, therefore, have naturally been assigned to Moses. But though Moses, on this one occasion, *officiated* as priest, he *was* no priest; a distinction was to be made between him and the consecrated functionaries of the Sanctuary; and he received, therefore, but one of the parts, while the other — the right shoulder, which was the proper gift (תְּרוּמָה) set aside for the priests — was included in the objects to be burnt on the altar (comp. p. 554). Though Moses was not permitted to partake of the sin-offering, it might be supposed that he was allowed to eat of the thank-offering, because the former was so sacred that its blood was, in certain cases, brought into the Holy, while the latter bore, ordinarily, a more social and more homely character (see pp. 76, 77). But not so on this occasion. For that which remained of the offering of consecration after the waved portions had been burnt, and after Moses had taken the breast for himself, was to be eaten by Aaron and his sons alone, and not in company with invited guests; it was not even to be shared by their families. The meal was to recall the solemnity of the sin-offering rather, than the light conviviality of the thank-offering. This is explicitly stated in the words, "And Aaron and his sons shall eat those things wherewith the atonement was made, to consecrate and to hallow them; but a stranger shall not eat thereof, for they are holy" (Exod. XXIX. 33). That Aaron and his sons were allowed to consume the flesh, will not be found surprising, if the character of the sacrifice as one of covenant and unity with God is considered. But it was also to be eaten in the Court of the Tabernacle itself, and not merely in a clean place; and the remainder was to be burnt on the very same day, as was the case with the praise-offerings, and nothing was to be reserved for the following day, as was permitted in the ordinary thank-offerings. Moreover, the cereal offering included no leavened bread, as was the case in the usual thank-offerings (VII. 13), because it formed a part of the sacrifice of covenant, from which everything leavened was to be kept aloof, as also in the laws of the paschal lamb, which, in later times, was virtually also a thank-offering (pp. 290, 291). Everywhere the solemnity of the sacrifice is evident. Thus much is certain that the rites connected with the ram of consecration were intended to convey that thenceforth the family of Aaron, and that family alone, should be privileged and charged to perform

Aaron's hands and upon his sons' hands, and waved them *for* a wave-offering before the Lord. 28. And Moses took them from their hands, and burnt *them* on the altar upon the burnt-offering: they *were* consecrations for a sweet odour; it *was* an offering made by fire to the Lord. 29. And Moses took the breast and waved it *for* a wave-offering before the Lord; it was the portion of Moses from the ram of consecration, as the Lord had commanded Moses. 30. And Moses took of the

the service of the altar, and to offer the sacrifices in the name of the chosen people.

The altar, a principal object in the Tabernacle, had been anointed with oil (vers. 10, 11); it had also been sprinkled with the blood of the holocaust and of the ram of consecration (vers. 19, 24); it had thus been marked both as a place of Divine holiness and as an emblem of solemn covenant concluded between God and His appointed ministers; in a similar manner, the High-priest, and through him the whole order of priests, had been anointed with oil, and had been marked with the blood of consecration in some of the most important parts of the body allowing a symbolical reference to moral and religious conduct. But not even these acts, so clearly corresponding with each other, were deemed sufficient to express the intimate connection between the priests and the altar, and to enforce the idea that the former were not only sanctified, but allied to God. A still more striking ceremony was performed. The oil and the blood that mingled upon the altar, were sprinkled upon Aaron and his garments, and upon his sons and their garments: the sanctification and the alliance were to be exhibited, not as two separate ends, but as one and the same object coinciding by their reciprocal bearing; the priests were sanctified only in order to be allied to God, and they could be so allied only by being sanctified. They were to be holy not merely as religious functionaries but in all their relations of life; therefore, the blood and the oil were sprinkled both upon their official garments and their persons; the garments were thus consecrated as holy and priestly vestments exclusively devoted to religious service, and not to be profaned to other purposes; while the persons were sealed as entirely and unreservedly claimed by God, and raised above the human standard. Thus the ceremonial is aptly brought to a conclusion by a significant act which judiciously combines and concentrates the most essential of the preceding rites.—It follows, from these remarks, that the oil and the blood were of equal importance, and that neither the one nor the other was subordinate. It follows also that both were not, as in some other cases, separately sprinkled upon the priests and their vestments (comp. XIV. 14, 15, 25, 26), but in the compound form they had assumed by mixing upon the altar; else the separation would unquestionably have been stated in the text, as it was stated in those instances alluded to; moreover, it would have been impossible to mention, in the command of Exodus (XXIX. 21), first the blood and then the oil, and in our chapter (ver. 30) first the oil and then the blood; since in the case of their being sprinkled separately, the order in which this was

anointing oil and of the blood which *was* upon the altar, and sprinkled *it* upon Aaron *and* upon his garments, and upon his sons und upon his sons' garments with him; and he sanctified Aaron *and* his garments, and his sons and his sons' garments with him. 31. And

done, would have been significant. Nor did the ceremony refer exclusively, or even predominantly, to the garments; it aimed at the sanctification of the garments and the persons alike. Nor can it be considered singular, that the marking of the ear, the hand, and the foot preceded the sprinkling of the altar with the mingled oil and blood, a circumstance which has occasioned needless speculations (comp. *Kurtz*, Opfercultus, pp. 280—290): for the proper act of expiation was the sin-offering, the first of the sacrificial series; after the confession of absolute allegiance conveyed by the holocaust, the ceremonies of the ram of consecration appropriately commenced with the marking of the members, at once the most striking and the most specific act denoting the priests' readiness and zeal, which they could then promise with purified minds; and the ritual is terminated by a most comprehensive and suggestive act, recalling the priestly privileges and duties.

Philological Remarks. — It seems evident that the holocaust was more closely connected with the preceding sin-offering than with the following thank-offering. The latter stands so decidedly separate from the rest, and is so manifestly the distinctive sacrifice of consecration, that it must appear strange indeed to couple it with the holocaust, the most general and most comprehensive of all sacrifices. The circumstance that both consisted of the same animal, the ram, is insufficient to support the opposite opinion (*Bähr*, Symb. II. 427); as it is extremely difficult to explain, in all cases, the choice of the victims (see *supra*; comp. also 2 Chr. XIII. 9; Ezek. XLIII. 19—23). The expiatory offering and the holocaust were preparatory sacrifices, upon which followed the thank-offering as the chief medium of covenant and consecration; yet it is inappropriate to render איל מלואים "the ram of perfection" or "completion" (*κριὸς τῆς τελειώσεως*, Sept., *Phil.* Vit. Mos. III. 17), and thus to identify מלואים and שלמים (so Targ. Jonath. דכר אשלמותא דשלים בכולא; comp. Rashi on ver. 22, איל השלמים ··· שממלאין ומשלימין את הכהנים בכהונתם); for the word מלואים has a different meaning (see on VII. 37). The selection of the ram (איל) has been accounted for by the circumstance that rams are the leaders of the flock, and אילים are *primores civitatis* (*Bähr*, l. c.); however, not the ram, but the bullock is, in the Pentateuch, regarded as the chief victim. — The Jewish view on the relative meaning of the sacrifices here described is thus expressed by Rabbi Levi ben Gershon: "Of the sin-offering nothing but a small quantity of fat was presented to God, because the offerers were not yet worthy of being honoured by His acceptance of their gift. But when they had been expiated and purified, they could offer a holocaust which was entirely devoted to Him, and by which they intimated that they were wholly dedicated to His service. And lastly, they presented a sacrifice kindred to a thank-offering, of which one part is given over to God, another to the priests, and the third to the worshippers, to indicate that the suppliants had acquired the

**Moses said to Aaron and to his sons, Boil the flesh *at* the door of the Tent of Meeting, and there eat it with the bread that *is* in the basket of consecration, as I**

favour and grace of God to such a degree that they could eat with Him at the same table" (see also *Abarbanel* on Exod. XXIX): it is unnecessary to point out, how far this vague and general explanation expresses the specific character of the rites. Philo (l. c.) interprets the ceremony of marking the ear, the hand, and the foot with blood, in the following manner: *ὅτι δεῖ τὸν τέλειον καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ καὶ βίῳ παντὶ καθαρεύειν — λόγον μὲν γὰρ ἀκοὴ δικάζει, χεὶρ δὲ ἔργον σύμβολον, διεξόδου δὲ τῆς περὶ τὸν βίον πούς*. The objections that have been raised against these and similar explanations (for instance, by *Philippson*, Pentat. pp. 575, 576) are of little weight. — תְּנוּךְ אזן (ver. 23) is the tip of the ear, the extreme part; Onkel. רום אודנא; Sept. *λοβὸς τοῦ ὠτός*; Vulg. extremum auriculae; Luther Ohrknorpel, and Targ. Jonath. חסחוס אודנא דאהרן דהוא גדירא דמציעאה (cartilago). — The Samaritan codex reads (in ver. 25) החלב האליה (comp. Exod. XXIX. 22), which is more correct and more logical than the received reading את־החלב ואת־האליה, since the אליה is, according to the usual Biblical conception, counted as one of the fat parts (III. 9; VII. 3; comp. IX. 19; see p. 494). — Keil (Archäol. I. 265; comp. Comm. on Levit. p. 60) thus interprets the ceremony of sprinkling the mingled oil and blood, "The blood taken from the altar typifies the *soul* united with God through atonement; while the holy anointing oil is the symbol of the *spirit* of God, the principle of all spiritual life in the kingdom of God; hence that act of sprinkling endows the *souls* and the *spirits* of the priests with the heavenly power of Divine life:" however, the blood typifies, in this ceremony, not so much the *soul* as the *covenant*; and the explanation, singular in itself, would be extremely strange, if, as is required, it be applied to the *garments* (comp. also *Kurtz*, Opferc. pp. 292, 293). — Instead of על אהרן על־בגדיו (ver. 30), an asyndeton, we read, more distinctly, in Exod. XXIX. 21, על אהרן וְעל־בגדיו. Wessely supposes that asyndeton to intimate that the sprinkling was intended for Aaron's *garments* principally, because his *person* had already been anointed, whereas in the case of the sons, it was required both for the garments and the persons — a playful speculation. — It is not easy to understand, how blood could at all be taken from the altar, as it had already some time before been sprinkled upon its sides (even if the more favourable arrangement of Exodus be adopted, see *supra* p. 663), and none of it was allowed to come upon its upper surface (see p. 191 note 7); it must, therefore, have rapidly flowed down to the base or coagulated at its sides. — We may here refer to the analogous, though more immoderate ceremonies of the "Taurobolium," which sacrifice was, among other occasions, presented at the initiation of the High-priest of Cybele. It has been described as "a baptism of blood", and was believed to effect spiritual regeneration. The High-priest, gorgeously dressed in a toga of silk and a golden crown, entered a large pit over which were placed boards loosely joined and perforated with holes. A bull covered with garlands and flowers was led upon the boards, and there slaughtered so that the blood fell through the chinks and holes in showers upon the priest, who not only received

have been commanded, saying, Aaron and his sons shall eat it. 32. And that which remains of the flesh, and of the bread you shall burn with fire.

33. And you shall not go out of the door of the Tent of Meeting, *for* seven days, until the days of your consecration be at an end; for *during* seven days you

it eagerly upon his body and clothes, but "held back his head and face to let it flow on his cheeks, his ears, lips, and nostrils, nay, he allowed the eyes to be wetted, and even moistened his tongue with it, and some he swallowed." (Guttas ad omnes turpe subjectans caput, Et veste et omni putrefactus corpore: Quin os supinat, obvias offert genas, Supponit aures, labra, nares obicit, Oculos et ipsos perluit liquoribus, Nec jam palato parcit et linguam rigat, Donec cruorem totus atrum conbibat). When he came forth in such horrible state, he was received with congratulations by the people, who adored him at a distance, because they now considered him as entirely purified by the blood of expiation (Omnes salutant atque adorant eminus, Vilis quod illum sanguis et bos mortuus Foedis latentem sub cavernis laverit; see *Prudentius*, Carmina, Peristephanon X, Romani Martyris Supplicium, vers. 1011—1050, pp. 278, 279 ed. Obbarius). — The Septuagint adds after אהל מועד (ver. 31) appropriately *ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ*, and the Samaritan text במקום קדש. — It seems preferable to read in ver. 31 (and in X. 18) כאשר צֻוֵּיתִי *as I have been commanded* (as in ver. 35 and X. 13), instead of צִוֵּיתִי (and so translate here Sept. *ὃν τρόπον συντέτακταί μοι*, Vulg. sicut praecepit mihi Dominus, Onk. כמא דאתפקדית, and in X. 18 Sept. *ὃν τρόπον συνετάγη μοι*, Vulg. sicut praeceptum est mihi, Targ. Jonath. כמא דאתפקידית); for Moses would hardly refer to his own repetition of the Divine commands (ver. 5), but rather to the commands themselves (comp. ver. 36; IX. 6; and Exod. XXIX. 31); moreover, it is nowhere intimated when and where Moses had previously explained these to Aaron and his sons.—On הנותר בבשר see note on V. 9.

**33—36.** In order to endow the ceremonial of consecration with the utmost solemnity of which it was capable, it was to be repeated, in exactly the same manner, for *seven* successive days, during which Aaron and his sons were forbidden to leave the holy precincts of the Tabernacle, whether by day or by night. If this were not clear from our text, "And you shall not go out of the door of the Tent of Meeting for seven days, until the days of your consecration be at an end; for during seven days shall you be consecrated" (ver. 33), it is raised beyond all doubt by the wording of the commands in Exodus, "For seven days shall he of Aaron's sons who will be priest in his stead put the garments on" (XXIX. 30); and "For seven days shalt thou make an atonement for the altar and hallow it" (ver. 37); nay, it is expressly stated, "Seven days shalt thou consecrate them" (תמלא ידם ver. 35), which naturally necessitates seven times the "ram of initation" (איל מלואים) — "and thou shalt offer *every day* (לַיּוֹם) a bullock for a sin-offering of atonement" (ver. 36); the other acts, both those which precede, and those which follow, are then matters of course; and the re-iterated expiation of the altar is specially mentioned (vers. 36, 37). Indeed, if any deviations from the ritual described had been intended,

**shall be consecrated. 34. As has been done this day, *so* the Lord has commanded to do, to make an atonement for you. 35. And you shall abide *at* the door of the Tent of Meeting day and night *for* seven days, and**

the text, so elaborate and so minute, would not have failed to specify them; it is scarcely possible to understand the assertion that the two rams were offered on the first day only, since a repetition of these sacrifices would have been without aim and object (*Bähr*, l. c. p. 415): for what was more important and more characteristic than the ram of consecration, with its varied and most significant rites? And if it is certain from the plain statement of our passage that the sin-offering — the mere negative element in the sacrificial series — was presented seven times, it is impossible to doubt that the two other sacrifices, positive and specific in their import, were deemed equally indispensable; and this view is corroborated by Ezekiel's account of the initiation of future priests (XLIII. 25, 26), an account presenting various other parallels of great interest (vers. 22—27). Seven is the number of *sanctification*; therefore, every chief act was to be repeated seven times; for to *consecrate* is to *sanctify* (see p. 561); but seven is also the number of *covenant;* the ceremonial was to express the perpetual covenant concluded between God and the house of Aaron; its meaning is, therefore, well expressed in the words of Sirach, "Moses consecrated him (Aaron), and anointed him with holy oil; this was appointed to him by an everlasting covenant, and to his seed, so long as the heavens should remain, that they should minister to Him, and execute the office of priesthood, and bless the people in His name" (XLV. 15).

It needs hardly to be observed, that the ritual executed in the manner specified and explained, everywhere betrays its very late origin. It exhibits, as has been admitted on all sides, the whole of the ceremonial law in full operation; it alludes, as to a well-known and familiar matter, to sin-offerings, the most recent class of sacrifices, which was not even in the time of the Deuteronomist legally fixed; and it bespeaks that stage of Levitical organisation which, as we have proved, characterises the most advanced phase in the spiritual life of the Hebrews. We will not urge that history has preserved to us no instance, nor even any indirect mention of or remote allusion to any pontifical consecration approaching in its mode that which is here ordered for all successive High-priests; nor do we attach much importance to the fact, that in some passages of the Pentateuch where the rites of consecration are referred to, no animal sacrifice whatever is named, but that it is simply stated, "And thou shalt clothe with the sacred garments, Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him; and thou shalt anoint them, and consecrate them, that they may serve Me as priests" (Exod. XXVIII. 41; comp. XXX. 30); or "And thou shalt bring Aaron and his sons to the door of the Tent of Meeting, and wash them with water; and thou shalt clothe Aaron in the holy garments, and anoint him, and sanctify him, that he may serve Me as priest; and thou shalt bring his sons, and clothe them with tunics; and thou shalt anoint them, as thou hast anointed their father, that they may serve Me as priests" (Exod. XL. 12—15): we do not consider such omission altogether decisive or cogent, for it may be designed in passages preceding the statement of the sacrificial legislation. But we are

**you shall keep the charge of the Lord, lest you die; for so have I been commanded. — 36. And Aaron and his sons did all the things which the Lord had commanded through Moses.**

justified in laying stress upon the following point. In a previous section, partially consisting of some undoubtedly old portions (ch. VI), a ritual is enjoined to be observed on the day of the High-priest's anointment, as "an eternal statute" (VI. 12—15). Now that ritual, though evidently not stated with completeness, contains features entirely different from those described in our chapter. A cereal offering is ordained to be prepared in a peculiar manner; while no animal sacrifice is mentioned. The High-priest himself, and not Moses, was evidently meant to present the offering. It is preposterous to find in this passage an allusion to "the impending consecration of the priests" (*Ranke*, Untersuch. II. 84), as if an internal connection existed between that ordinance and our chapter. Even if we were inclined to ignore the *argumentum ex silentio*, we are compelled to conclude from what is plainly stated, that, at earlier periods, the consecration of even the chief priest was accomplished in a most simple manner, by anointment, and by a cereal oblation presented in the morning and the evening; while gradually, as the Levitical principles and theories were unfolded, the ceremony assumed larger proportions, and was at last invested with every significant symbol which the new system was able to devise.

The initiation of the *Levites* will be described and explained in its due place (Num. VIII. 5—22).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — The injunction that Aaron and his sons were never to leave the Court of the Tabernacle during the whole of the seven days is probably to be taken in a literal sense, since the entire period of consecration was to be uninterruptedly devoted to pious exercises and holy thoughts; though the author had scarcely realised to himself with clearness the possibility of the strict execution of the injunction. — The duration of *seven* days in connection with holy acts is so much in accordance with the conceptions of the Pentateuch (see Comm. on Exod. pp. 448—450, on Genes. p. 157), that we need not take it here as a symbol to denote that "the priests were dedicated to that God who created the universe in seven days" (Clericus, Rosenm., Gerlach, a. o.). Öhler observes justly (Herz. XII. 179), "on each of the succeeding six days not only the sin-offering, but undoubtedly the two other sacrifices also were to be repeated; for the prescribed 'filling of the hands' was effected by the sacrifice of consecration, which again pre-supposed the holocaust"; comp. also *Keil*, Levit. p. 62. — At the initiation of Lucius also identical rites were repeated on successive days ("dies etiam tertius pari cerimoniarum ritu celebratur", *Apuleius*, l. c. *supra* p. 668). — יְמַלֵּא (in ver. 33) and עָשָׂה (in ver. 34) are to be taken in an impersonal sense, *the consecration shall take place*, and *it has been done*, since the verbs can, grammatically, neither refer to Moses nor to God, though, logically, they apply to the former, a construction familiar to the Hebrews (comp. VII. 35; see Gramm. §. 101. 2).

## CHAPTER IX.

**Summary.**—On the eighth day, Aaron, by the direction of Moses, sacrificed a sin- and a burnt-offering for himself and his sons, and a sin-, a burnt-, and a thank-offering for the people, and added to them the necessary cereal oblations. In both cases, the sin-offering was presented in the same manner as that brought on the days of consecration, that is, the blood came on the brazen altar of the Court only, and yet the flesh was burnt entirely (vers. 8—11,15). In the thank-offerings, both the breasts and right shoulders of the victims were waved, a deviation from the ordinary ritual suggested by the peculiar nature of the occasion (ver. 21). Then Aaron blessed the people (ver. 22), and went with Moses into the Holy, and both blessed the people again; after which God appeared in His glory, and sent fire from heaven which consumed the sacrifices on the altar: the people, at once rejoiced and awed by the miracle, worshipped God (vers. 23, 24).

1. And it was on the eighth day *that* Moses called Aaron and his sons, and the elders of Israel. 2. And he said to Aaron, Take for thyself a young calf for a

1, 2. After the priests had been installed into their office, it was deemed desirable at once to exhibit them in the full activity of their ministrations. No time was to be lost to prove how essential their services were for the welfare of the theocracy, and how eagerly the new officials themselves longed to perform their noble functions. Therefore, as a natural continuation in the description of the inaugural rites, follows an accurate account of the sacrifices which they presented on the first day of their priesthood, which was the eighth after the commencement of the consecration. As, in spite of their election and anointment, the sense of human sinfulness and frailty which they shared with those for whom they interceded, was to be kept alive in their minds, the offerings at which they officiated in the name of the people, were preceded by offerings in their own behalf. And these sacrifices were a sin-offering and a holocaust, both recalling moral insufficiency and dependence; they did not include a thank-offering, because such stern and humiliating feelings were to be mingled with no element which, however distantly and indirectly, might foster the sentiments of pride and self-complacency. In order to distinguish the sacrifices of the eighth day from the more solemn ones of the week of consecration, the sin-offering was no bullock, which is the *victima maxima*, but a young calf, pointing indeed to that solemnity, but inferior to it in degree; though the holocaust consisted, as in the previous ceremonies, of a ram. In reality, Aaron and his sons might seem to require, on the eighth day, no particular expiation, since they had passed the preceding seven days exclusively in acts of atonement and holiness; but the principle that they could not possibly be the mediators for the forgiveness of the people, unless they had first secured it for themselves, was to be strikingly enforced in their very first acts of public ministration.

**Philological Remarks.** — It is evident from these remarks that the command specially addressed to Aaron (קח־לְךָ עגל בן־בקר וכ') applies to his sons also; for as the High-priest

sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering, *both* without blemish, and offer *them* before the Lord. 3. And to the children of Israel thou shalt speak, saying, Take a kid of the goats for a sin-offering, and a calf and a lamb, *both* of the first year *and* without blemish, for a burnt-

and the common priests had been installed alike, so they entered upon their functions simultaneously (comp. vers. 9, 12, 18—20), and required, therefore, the same preparation. — Jewish tradition considers that the "eighth day" was a day of new-moon, the first of Nisan (comp. Exod. XL. 2), and that, on this day, the offerings of the chiefs of the people commenced or were continued (Num. VII; comp. *Talm.* Zevach. 101*b*; Shabb. 87*b*); and on these unsupported conjectures, it bases numerous fanciful interpretations in this and the next chapter, which it would be unprofitable to mention in detail (comp. also Targ. Jonath. on X. 16).

3, 4. An offering more grand and more comprehensive than that of the priests, was prescribed for the people; for it was intended as the first active manifestation of the holy community at the national and sanctified altar through hallowed intercessors; it partook, therefore, also of the character of an initiatory sacrifice. It comprised all the chief classes — the sin-, the burnt-, and the thank-offering —, coupled with a cereal oblation, and it included all the ordinary sacrificial animals. The sin-offering consisted of a kid of the goats usually set apart for public sacrifices of that kind (pp. 83, 84); but each of the two other offerings was composed of two animals, evidently to enhance their importance and their effect — the holocaust, of a calf and a lamb, and the thank-offering, of a bullock and a ram. This last point is significant: for while the sacrifice of the priests was without any thank-offering, that of the people included one of an imposing nature, for which the two greatest and most valued victims were chosen. For the people were pre-eminently to harbour and to manifest the feeling of gratitude; they had advanced a most decided step towards their lofty and spiritual goal; they had witnessed the fulfilment of an essential point of the promises they had received; they had now obtained the certainty that, whatever their worldly destinies, their higher interests and those which constitute true happiness, peace of mind and the grace of God, were for ever secured, and established upon imperishable foundations. Yet, though an occasion for deep gratitude, it was not an opportunity for festive exultation. The joy was tempered by solemnity. For the new covenant was, on that very day, to be supernaturally ratified. God Himself and His glory were to appear in the midst of the people, and thus palpably to prove to them that He indeed had ordained and sanctioned the Tabernacle, the sacrifices, and the priests, and that He was ready to accept the offerings that would be presented in that holy place through His chosen ministers (see on vers. 22—24). Therefore, the thank-offering, though stately from the *species*, was limited in the *number* of the victims; it was small compared with the eucharistic sacrifices offered on emergencies like the dedication of the altar (Num. VII. 17, 23, *sqq.*, 88); and for a kindred reason, the holocaust was more simple than that of the new-moons and festivals (Num. XXVIII. 11, 19, *sqq.*). The

offering, 4. Also a bullock and a ram for a thank-offering, to sacrifice before the Lord; and a bloodless offering mingled with oil; for to day the Lord will appear to you.

5. And they brought *that* which Moses commanded before the Tent of Meeting: and all the congregation drew near, and stood before the Lord. 6. And Moses

convivial repasts were to be moderate and of no protracted duration. All arrangements prescribed were thoughtfully adapted to the character of the occasion.

Philological Remarks. — Aaron was to speak to "the children of Israel" (ver. 3) who attended the ceremonials (ver. 5; comp. VIII. 3, 4), probably through the elders (ver. 1); yet it is unnecessary to read (in ver. 3) ואל זקני ישראל (Samar., Sept. τῇ γερουσίᾳ; see p. 664). — The calf and the lamb together formed the holocaust (hence the singular עולה, vers. 3, 16, 22, 24), as the ox and the ram combined constituted the thank-offering (whence שלמים has, in vers. 4, 18, 22, the meaning of the singular). — The thank-offering was to include a שור, which is of epicene gender (Gramm. § 22. 2); for that sacrifice might consist either of a male or a female animal (see p. 243). — It is evident, that the Divine vision here promised ("for to day the Lord will appear to you", ver. 4; comp. ver. 6) is an *exceptional* manifestation, designed as a special sanction of the inauguration of Aaron's family; it cannot, therefore, be brought into connection with the general promise of God, that He would meet with the children of Israel at the Tabernacle "that it be hallowed by His glory" (ונקדש בכבדי, Exod. XXIX. 43) — a view taken by those anxious to establish a fictitious continuity in the narratives and statements of the second and third Book of the Pentateuch (so *Ranke*, Untersuch. I. 101). The command concerning the consecration of the priests and the order concerning its execution stand, indeed, in a close relation; but the account of the execution is supplemented by the introduction of incidents quite peculiar to this section and not referring to anterior allusions. — The past נִרְאָה (ver. 4), unless indeed the reading נִרְאֶה, or the participle, be preferable, has the sense of the future, "to day God will appear to you" (comp. Gramm. § 93. 4), that is, so certain and infallible is the promise that God may be said to have already appeared to you. It is less simple to understand the words to mean, before the day has passed, the Lord will have appeared to you (comp. Gramm. l. c. 6).

5—21. The whole congregation assembled in the Court of the Tabernacle and before it. They stood thus "before the Lord", in His holy presence. Moses explained to them the ceremonies about to be performed, that they might understand the important effects which these rites were designed to work for their own spiritual condition and that of their religious guides. They were to be adequately prepared for appreciating the Divine manifestation that was expected. Then Moses solemnly called upon Aaron to approach the altar and to commence the sacrifices (ver. 7). Now, in these sacrifices, Aaron, the High-priest, performed all the significant and truly sacerdotal functions. He occupied a position so conspicuous that through him the general

said, This *is* the thing which the Lord has commanded *that* you should do, in order that the glory of the Lord may appear to you. 7. And Moses said to Aaron, Approach to the altar, and offer thy sin-offering and thy burnt-offering, and make an atonement for thyself and for the people; and offer the sacrifice of the people, and make an atonement for them, as the Lord has commanded.

8. And Aaron went to the altar and slew the calf of the sin offering, which *was* for himself. 9. And the sons of Aaron brought the blood to him; and he dipped his finger in the blood, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar, and poured out the *other* blood at the bottom of the altar. 10. But the fat, and the kidneys, and the

command concerning the offerings was addressed to the people (ver. 4, הַדָּבָר); and to him the general execution was confided so far, that Moses no longer watched the details, while these were in course of performance (comp. IX. 16). Nay, he was immediately afterwards honoured with a direct communication from God (X. 8; comp. Num. XVIII. 1, 8, 20); while his sons assisted him in all those ministrations which were later committed to the Levites. Thus the holocaust and the sin-offering could be called *his* sacrifices (ver. 7), though they were intended for his sons likewise (comp. XVI. 6, 11). But the atonement which he was to obtain through the offerings, was not so important for the sake of himself, but on account of the people to whose benefit it would redound: for the High-priest's purity involved the purity of the nation, as the High-priest's guilt implied the nation's guilt, and in him the holiness of the community was concentrated and reflected (p. 578). Hence Moses commanded Aaron, "Offer thy sin-offering, and thy burnt-offering, *and make an atonement for thyself and for the people*" (וְכַפֵּר בַּעַדְךָ וּבְעַד הָעָם); and then the expiation of the Israelites was to be solicited anew by sacrifices offered for them specially (ver. 7).

The priests' sin-offering presented on the eighth day did not materially differ from that of the seven preceding days. In neither case, was any of the blood brought into the Holy; it was wholly disposed of at the *brazen* altar though the flesh was burnt entirely (see p. 671). For not even on the eighth day had Aaron's dignity reached its full independence and glory; it still remained, to a certain degree, under the control of Moses, who gave commands to his brother, as he had received them from God. Therefore Aaron was not permitted to pass beyond the Court; he was not yet fully qualified to appear in the immediate presence of God. Yet, in some respects, the sin-offering of the eighth day was less solemn than that of the preceding week; the victims were not quite identical (see *supra*); and blood was indeed put with the finger on the horns of the brazen altar, but not "round about" the horns (סָבִיב, VIII. 15; p. 671); the reason is obviously that on the previous occasions, the blood of the sin-offering served not only for the

great lobe of the liver of the sin-offering, he burnt upon the altar, as the Lord had commanded Moses. 11. And the flesh and the hide he burnt with fire without the camp. 12. And he slew the burnt-offering, and Aaron's sons presented to him the blood, and he sprinkled it round about upon the altar. 13. And they presented the burnt-offering to him, with its pieces and the head; and he burnt *them* upon the altar. 14. And he washed the bowels and the legs, and burnt *them* upon the burnt-offering on the altar.

15. And he brought the people's offering, and took the goat, which *was* the sin-offering for the people, and

expiation of the priests but, at the same time, for the sanctification of the altar, wherefore a complete marking of the horns was deemed necessary as a fit symbol. Then followed the holocaust, probably accompanied by the usual cereal oblation (p. 217), though this is not mentioned in the account. As it was the first burnt-offering after the consecration, the text is explicit in describing the manner, in which it was to be sacrificed, in order to obviate any possible impurity; the head and the other principal members were to be first delivered up to the flames, and formed the proper holocaust, and then only the bowels and the legs were added, after they had been carefully washed (see p. 240). The sin-offering, with which the sacrifices for the people commenced, was presented with exactly the same ceremonies as that which the priests offered for themselves: a part of the blood was put on the horns of the brazen altar, and the rest poured out at its base; yet all the flesh was burnt. For as the priests were not yet, to the full extent, the free mediators, so was the people not yet the free theocratic community; therefore, no blood of the sin-offering came into the Holy. However, not even the priests were allowed to eat of the flesh, because, whatever the ceremonial, it was the sin-offering of the *people*, among whom the priests were also concluded; and naturally nobody could partake of the flesh of his own sin-offering. For as the sacrifice of the High-priest was, at the same time, a sacrifice of the people, so the sacrifice of the people was, *eo ipso*, a sacrifice of the High-priest and of the priests; the connection between the one and the other was so intimate and so clearly organic, that it is impossible to speak of a sacrifice of the people in contradistinction to that of the priests (so *Hofmann*, Schriftbeweis, II. 1. p. 282): the latter formed an indispensable part of the former. Hence this expiatory sacrifice stood midway between that ordinarily presented for the whole people and that of an individual Israelite (comp. pp. 279, 280).

Now, all these things were executed under the immediate command of Moses (comp. vers. 1—6), and in such a manner as to secure not only his satisfaction, but also the approbation of God, who appeared in a wonderful vision to express His sanction (ver. 23). And yet it is later stated that Moses was greatly incensed at Aaron and his sons for not having eaten the flesh of the sin-offering, as they ought to have done, since the blood of the victim had not been brought into the Holy; and that he was only appeased when

slew it, and offered it as a sin-offering like the first. 16. And he brought the burnt-offering, and offered it according to the law. 17. And he brought the bloodless offering, and took a handful of it, and burnt *it* upon the altar, besides the burnt-sacrifice of the morning. 18. And he slew the bullock and the ram *for* a sacrifice of thank-offering, which *was* for the people; and Aaron's sons presented to him the blood, and he sprinkled it upon the altar round about. 19. And the fat *and the fat* parts of the bullock and of the ram — the fat tail, and that which covers *the bowels*, and the kidneys,

Aaron pleaded exceptional circumstances in extenuation of the otherwise unjustifiable omission (X. 16—20). It is, therefore, impossible to doubt that we have here two different views on the same subject by two writers — the one taking the whole nature of the initiation into account, and therefore regarding the exclusion of the blood from the Holy as an incidental point which does not destroy the character of the offering as one of the whole people; the other strictly insisting upon the fact of that exclusion, and applying to it a general and formal rule: the view of the former is more comprehensive and more developed, that of the latter limited and rigid. The narrative in our chapter manifestly embodies the later and more matured conceptions (see also on X. 16—20).

After the holocaust had been presented with the prescribed rites, and in conjunction with the legal *minchah*, the last act followed — the thank-offering, in which evidently the ceremonial of the day was meant to culminate. The fat and the fat parts of both the bullock and the ram were, of course, burnt on the altar, but before this was done, they were placed on the breasts of the two animals, which were priestly portions, strikingly to intimate that these parts were burnt in the name of the priests. Then both the breasts and the right shoulders were sanctified by Aaron with the rite of waving, and surrendered to him and his sons. Ordinarily, the breast alone was waved; but on this peculiar occasion, the right shoulder was included in the same act; for it was deemed desirable to mark all the priestly portions as hallowed, because given up by God to His appointed servants by a free act of grace. A cereal oblation, though again not mentioned, most probably accompanied the thank-offering (comp. VIII. 26).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — On אֶל־פְּנֵי (ver. 5) see on VI. 1—11 (ver. 7). — The construction of the words זה הדבר אשר־צוה יהוה תעשו (ver. 6), though not so plain as that of the corresponding phrase in VIII. 5, where לעשות is used instead of תעשו, is without difficulty if אשר is supplied before תעשו,. which was probably omitted on account of the preceding אשר, "this is the thing which the Lord has commanded that you should do": the apocopated future וְיֵרָא implies the end or result, "in order that the glory of the Lord may appear to you". Various other explanations have been proposed; for instance, "this thing which the Lord has commanded you shall do" (which would require הדבר הזה); or "this, namely the thing" etc. (which is hard and forced); or "this

and the great lobe of the liver — 20. They put the fat *and the fat parts* upon the breasts, and he burnt the fat *and the fat parts* upon the altar. 21. And the breasts and the right shoulders Aaron waved *for* a wave-offering before the Lord, as Moses had commanded.

22. And Aaron lifted up his hands towards the people,

is the thing which the Lord has commanded; do it, and the glory of the Lord will appear to you" (De Wette; which would give to the verb תעשו an impossible meaning, besides entirely disregarding the masoretic accents).— In order to avoid a serious difficulty pointed out in the notes on vers. 22—24, the Sept. renders הקטיר (ver. 10), utterly against the Hebrew usage, by ἀνήνεγκεν; since the fat was later *burnt* by the heavenly fire. — From the explanation above given of the commands regarding the holocausts it follows that עַל־הָעֹלָה (ver. 14) does not mean "in the manner of the burnt-offering", but simply "on the burnt-offering" (see on III. 1—17, ver. 5). — הִמְצִיא (vers. 12, 18) is literally *to make find* or *touch*, that is, *to hand over* or *to deliver up* (as in 2 Sam. III. 8; Zech. XI. 6), equivalent to הקריב (ver. 9); the distinctions attempted between both verbs (for inst. by Wessely — המציא is to put into the hand, הקריב to put within reach of somebody) are artificial.— חִטֵּא (ver. 15) is *to kill for a sin-offering* or חטאת (comp. VI. 19; see note *in loc.* p. 544); the Sept. and Vulg. render incorrectly καὶ ἐκαθάρισεν αὐτόν (sc. λαόν) and expiatoque altari.— כַּמִּשְׁפָּט — .קרבן הטאת ,scil ,כראשון (ver. 16) *according to the ordinance* (comp. V. 10). — The athnach under שור (ver. 19) is required by the sense, since the אליה, which in sheep only was counted to the fat parts, stands in antithesis to החלבים of the שור (see p. 494). — הַמְכַסֶּה (ver. 19) *that which covers, the covering*, that is, evidently, המכסה את־הקרב (III. 3, 9, 14, etc.) *the fat that covers the bowels*; the Sept. has indeed the addition ἐπὶ τῆς κοιλίας and after והכליות καὶ τὸ στέαρ τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῶν. — It seems preferable to connect the 19th and 20th verses in this manner: "And the fat... they put the fat etc." (so Vulg., Luth., a. o.), a construction like that of IV. 11, 12; for the intervening verb ויזרקהו (ver. 18) almost forbids us to suppose החלבים וכ׳ (ver. 20) to depend on וימציאו (ver. 18). — In offering the ram of consecration, the waving of the right shoulder preceded the burning of the fat (VIII. 25—28); but in the thank-offering of the people, on the eighth day, the burning of the fat preceded (ver. 20), evidently because the fat was not, as in the former case, also waved: it is, therefore, unnecessary to take הֵנִיף (ver. 21) as a pluperfect. — Instead of כאשר צוה משה the Samaritan text and many Hebrew manuscripts read כאשר צוה יהוה את משה (comp. VIII. 13, 17, 21, etc.) and the same sense is expressed in some copies of the Sept. and other ancient versions — a difference analogous to that between צֻוֵּיתִי and צִוֵּיתִי in VIII. 31 and 35, see p. 680.

**22–24.** Now Aaron and his sons were indeed fully invested with all the symbols of their office; they were thoroughly qualified even for its highest functions; and Aaron, filled with the spirit of God in consequence of his anointment, and purified from sin by repeated expiatory offerings, could, for the first time, raise his hands and bless the people in the name of God. Thus his ministrations in the

**and blessed them; and he came down from offering the sin-offering, and the burnt-offering, and the thank-**

Court were completed on that momentous day, and he could "descend" from the elevation leading to the altar not by steps, but by a gently sloping dam of earth, on which he had performed the rites of the various sacrifices (Comp. Exod. XX. 23; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 380, 484). But it remained for him to burn incense on the golden altar; and it was for this purpose probably, that he entered the Holy, not however alone, but together with Moses, who had been the mediating link between him and God (ver. 23). But it is surprising, according to the stricter views of the Pentateuch, that Moses should have been permitted to step into the Holy, which was scrupulously reserved for Aaron and his descendants alone. We are hence entitled to infer that this statement dates from a time, when the distinction between priests and Levites was not yet rigidly enforced, and when all the members of the tribe of Levi were admitted to priestly functions (p. 600). The later date of the concluding verses of this chapter is confirmed by other reasons. We will lay no stress on the circumstance, that the people are blessed again by Moses and Aaron (ver. 23), after they had been duly blessed by Aaron (ver. 22), to whom this privilege was later exclusively assigned: but it is impossible not to see the discrepancies implied in the following words, "And there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat and the fat parts: and the whole people saw it, and they shouted, and fell upon their faces" (ver. 24). These statements are in contradiction both with those immediately preceding and those before recorded. For the burnt-offering sacrificed on the eighth day had been actually burnt, as is distinctly remarked and even twice repeated (vers. 13, 14, (ויקטר על־המזבח); moreover, the thank-offerings had been presented *after* the holocaust, and their fat and fat parts also had been burnt upon the altar (ver. 20, ויקטר החלבים המזבחה): how then was it possible that after all this a fire should "consume upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat and fat parts"? Again, on a previous occasion, the command had been given to keep a perpetual fire upon the brazen altar (VI. 5, 6); it must be supposed that this command had at once been complied with; for one of its chief objects was that the altar should always be in readiness for the regular morning and evening holocausts (VI. 2, 5); and these were indeed supposed to have been duly offered at the time of the consecration (comp. vers. 17, מלבד עלת הבקר). If, therefore, a pure fire, miraculously sent from heaven, was at all desirable, it should have been sent when the service of the brazen altar was *commenced*, and not after it had for some time been in full operation, and had been employed in the most solemn sacrifices of consecration. Thus the narrative is not only encumbered with a mythical element, but it is so encumbered purposely and contradictorily: the simplicity of the conceptions maintained in previous sections is abandoned, and partially replaced by crude and heathen notions (see p. 530). Under these circumstances, we are justified in asking, whether the words, "And the glory of the Lord appeared to all the people" (ver. 23), occupy their right place? Probably, they formed indeed part of the original narrative of the chapter, because they

**offering. 23. And Moses and Aaron went into the Tent of Meeting, and came out, and blessed the people:**

are alluded and pointed to in earlier verses (4, 6), which we have no decisive criteria for declaring as interpolations; but they may have concluded the chapter, in this manner, "And Aaron lifted up his hands towards the people, and blessed them; and he came down from offering the sin-offering, and the burnt-offering, and the thank-offering: and the glory of the Lord appeared to all the people" — it may be, in the form of a cloud, as He is frequently described to have shown Himself (Ex. XIII. 21, 22; XVI. 10; XXIV. 16; XXXIII. 9; XL. 34—38; Num. XII. 5; 1 Ki. VIII. 10; 2 Macc. II. 8). Thus the account of the eighth day would be complete and well-finished. But when the revisers intended to add the miracle of the heaven-sent fire, they deemed it, not injudiciously, to be an apt illustration of the promised vision, and arranged the matter accordingly: "the glory of the Lord appeared to all the people, and there came a fire out from before the Lord". For indeed the "glory" (כָּבוֹד) or "goodness" (טוּב) of God (Exod. XXXIII. 18, 19, 22) manifested itself, according to Biblical and ancient notions generally, like "a devouring fire", or "a burning fire" not consuming its object (Ex. III. 2), or a brilliant light shedding a halo around (Exod. XIII. 21, 22; XIX. 18; Hab. III. 4), filling sacred spots (Exod. XL. 34, 35; Num. XIV. 10; XVI. 19; XVII. 7), and revealing the Divine presence, whether to destroy, to threaten, or to encourage (Lev. X. 2; Num. XI. 1—3; XVI. 35; Job I. 16), and as the nature of fire was held to be kindred to the nature of God, the Jews and Neoplatonicians developed, in the course of time, the idea of a *logos* — a ray emanating from God as from the essence of light; and Philo could declare not only that "God is the first light", the "archetype of every other light", or rather that the real model was "His own most perfect word, the light" (ὁ πληρέστατος αὐτοῦ λόγος, φῶς); but even, "The invisible Divine reason, perceptible only by intellect, was called the image of God; and the image of this image is that light, perceptible only by the intellect, which is the image of the Divine reason" (De Somn. I. c. 13; De Opif. Mundi c. 8; comp. De Victim c. 4; see Ezek. I. 27, 28; Ps. CIV. 2; Dan. II. 22; VII. 9, 10; 2 Ki. II. 11; VI. 17; Wisd. VII. 26; James I. 17; John I. 4, 5; also Cusari II. 54; see *supra* pp. 527—530). But, in whatever form the author of the main narrative understood the vision to have taken place, it could not, as we have shown, assume the form of fire sent from heaven in order to burn the holocaust and the fat on the altar: this feature is evidently derived from an older, because less pure and simple, document, or from a general tradition which not unfrequently represented such heaven-sent fire as a certain mark of God's favour and a striking proof of His omnipotence (comp. Judg. VI. 17, 21; XIII. 19, 20; 1 Ki. XVIII. 38; 1 Chr. XXI. 26; 2 Chr. VII. 1; 2 Macc. II. 10; *Philo*, Vit. Mos. III. 18; also Rev. XIII. 13; *Virg*. Ecl. VIII. 105; and Aen. XII. 200, Audiat haec Genitor, qui foedera fulmine sancit). When, therefore, the people saw the miracle, they at once recognised the Divine presence, and acknowledged the Divine power: "they shouted" in awe, and "fell on their faces" in deep submission and gratitude (comp. Gen. XVII. 3; Judg. XIII. 20; 1 Ki. XVIII. 39; esp. 2 Chr. VII. 3).

Philological Remarks. — The custom that the priest "lifted up his

**and the glory of the Lord appeared to all the people. 24. And there came a fire out from before the Lord,**

hands" (וישא את־ידיו) when he blessed the assembled congregation, may have originated in the circumstance that, in blessing individuals, the hands were imposed upon the heads of those upon whom the benediction was pronounced (comp. Gen. XLVIII. 14, 17, 18; see p. 178 note 5; *Rosenm.* Schol. on ver. 22; *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 45; and some older writers): in the former case, the imposition of the hands was recalled and imitated as far as feasible (comp. Luke XXIV. 50). — The blessing here bestowed upon the people first by Aaron, and then by him together with Moses, appears to have been formally uttered by them in virtue of their dignity and office, for "Aaron lifted up his hands to the people, and blessed them"; it is different from the general expression of approval and thanks, which is likewise termed "blessing" (ברך), but was permitted to any private individual, and was conveyed by Moses before (Exod. XXXIX. 43). But whether it is meant to be that blessing prescribed in Numbers (VI. 24—26), as the Talmud, followed by many writers, contends, or some other benediction, cannot be decided, as it is difficult to determine the relative dates of that formula and of our chapter. The Midrash declares the blessing to have consisted of the last verse of the 90th Psalm ("let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us" etc.), inscribed "the prayer of Moses"! (comp. Targ. Jonath. "May the spirit of God receive your sacrifice with favour, and remit and pardon your sins"). — וירד (ver. 22) is not merely *abiit, recessit* (Clericus), but *he descended*, since a sloping dam of earth led up to the top of the altar (Comm. on Exod. p. 484). — Though אהל מועד frequently means the *Court* of the Tabernacle, in contradistinction to קדש *the Holy* (comp. XVI. 3, 4, 17, esp. 20, 23), it must here evidently be taken in the latter signification, since Moses and Aaron first went into it, and then "came out" to bless the people, who were assembled in the Court (comp. ver. 5). The object of Moses and Aaron in entering the Holy was most probably to burn incense (hardly "ut Moses Aaroni ostenderet quomodo esset suffitus adolendus", Clericus), not to pray, and certainly not "to send the promised vision", or, as has been ludicrously, if not profanely, observed, "that Moses might introduce Aaron and present him to God" (Keil). — The fat and fat parts (החלבים) burnt by the miraculous fire, included of course those of the sin-offering likewise, though this was not properly "food of the Lord." — De Wette also (Beiträge II. 302—304) and others declare the two last verses to be an interpolation, for reasons similar to those above urged. The attempts at proving that they do not destroy the unity of the narrative are ineffectual. For instance, on the one hand, the previous allusions to the burning (ויקטר) of the sacrifices (vers. 13, 14, 20) were understood as "anticipations" (Corn. a Lapide, per anticipitationem accipienda), which is against all common sense and the usage of any language; on the other hand, the Divine manifestations here mentioned (ver. 23) were taken as *past* events, so that ותצא was translated as a pluperfect, "fire *had come out*", namely after the first sacrifice (and so Geddes וַיֵּרָא "and God *had* appeared"); but ותצא is manifestly co-ordinated with ויבא, ויצאו, etc. and with ותאכל וַיַּרְא, etc. Again, it has been observed that the flesh which Aaron had before begun to burn, by putting it on the permanent fire of the altar, was now

and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and

fully consumed by the fire of God (Vater, Stähelin, Herxheimer, a. o.), which would assign to the latter a most insignificant part, nay render it superfluous; or that "it is only necessary not to suppose Moses and Aaron to have stayed in the Sanctuary so long, that the sacrifices must inevitably have been burnt on the altar in the mean time" (*Ranke*, Untersuch., II. 80) — however short their absence, the *holocaust* at least must have been all but consumed, since it preceded the thank-offering; and what is more essential, the miracle would be meaningless, unless we suppose that the fire sent from heaven, and that fire alone, consumed the sacrifices. Nor can the words ותצא אש וכ׳ describe the ordinary burning of the offerings by the permanent fire of the altar, which was called "fire of Jehovah"; for the process was evidently meant to be miraculous, and filled the people with rejoicing, awe, and veneration; and the term "fire came out from before Jehovah" cannot refer to fire already on the altar. The view that the ordinary flame required *hours* for the combustion of the sacrifices, whereas the heavenly fire accomplished it in a *moment*, and that this was the miracle (Brentano, Wogue), besides being trifling, is open to all the objections we have urged (comp. also *Talm.* Yom. 21*b*; *Maimon.* Mishnah Tamid II. 1; Cusari II. 26 init.; see *supra* p. 7 note 23). — Jewish tradition, not satisfied with the one extraordinary miracle recorded in our narrative, declared that a heavenly fire descended to consume *every* sacrifice accepted by God with favour (comp. Pirke R. Eliezer c. 53; Cusari III. 53, ותראה האש; II. 26 med., נפעלה האש בחפץ אלהים ברצותו באומה והיה אות קבול מנחתם ותשורתם), nay that this distinction was accorded to all the sacrifices of the patriarchs (Cusari II. 14, המזבחות שהיו לאבות אשר נענו באש העליונה והאור אלהי); Theodoret renders indeed, in Gen. IV. 4, with respect to Abel's sacrifice, καὶ ἐνεπύρισεν ὁ Θεός; and the words ועולתך ידשנה (in Ps. XX. 4) were explained in a similar sense (so Kimchi, שישלח אש לשרפה ויקבלנה לרצון). Similarly Solinus (Polyhist. V. 23) remarks with respect to sacrifices performed on a certain hill in Sicily, "Si adest deus, sacrorum probator, sarmenta, licet viridia, ignem sponte concipiunt, et nullo inflagrante halitu ab ipso numine fit incendium"; and to enhance the miracle he adds, "ibi epulantibus alludit flamma, quae flexuosis excessibus vagabunda, quem contigerit non adurit; nec aliud est quam imago, nuncia perfecti rite voti" (see *supra* p. 529; comp. also *Plin.* H. N. II. 107 (111); *Bochart*, Hieroz. L. II. c. 35, pp. 360—364). The compilers indeed desired the two last verses to be *considered* as the "culminating point" of the narrative; but they were unable to remove the traces of the heterogeneous composition. It is singular that the very same miracle of heavenly fire descending to consume the sacrifices has in several other instances been added by Levitical interpolators (comp. 1 Chr. XXI. 26 and 2 Sam. XXIV. 25; 2 Chr. VII. 1, 2 and 1 Ki. VIII. 62, 63). Philo (Vit. Mos. III. 18) describes our miracle in a manner well reflecting the Jewish notions on the subject, "From out the innermost shrine, whether it was a portion of the purest possible aether or whether the air, according to some natural change of the elements, had become dissolved with fire, a body of flame suddenly shone forth, and with impetuous violence descended on the altar and consumed all that was there-

the fat *and the fat parts.* And the whole people saw *it*, and they shouted, and fell on their faces.

on, with the view, as I imagine, of showing in the clearest manner that none of the things that had been done, were accomplished without the special providence of God"; and he derives the necessity for such miraculous flame from the circumstance that the ordinary fire "is defiled by infinite impurities", since it is used for boiling and roasting animals, burns men, and lays entire cities in ashes (comp. also *Joseph.* Ant. III. viii. 6, *ἐπικειμένων δὲ τῶν ἱερείων τῷ βωμῷ, αἰφνίδιον ἐξ αὐτῶν πῦρ ἀνήφθη αὐτόματον, καὶ ὅμοιον ἀστραπῆς λαμπηδόνι ὁρώμενον τῇ φλογὶ, καὶ πάντα ἐδαπάνα τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ*). Less in harmony with the spirit of our passage is the explanation of Hengstenberg (Opfer, p. 33), that the fire which consumed the sacrifices was "an emblem of the Divine nature", and signified "the watchful energy which allows nothing to exist by its side"; for that flame was evidently not "the devouring fire" which is an occasional attribute of the Deity jealously combating the worship of any other god (Deut. IV. 24; see *supra*); and more artificial still is the remark of Keil (Archäol. I. 209), that the fire typifies "the strength and energy of that Divine holiness, which rules on the altar, devours what is sinful and transitory in the sacrifices, in order to enhance and to sanctify the vital power of the purified gift": for, according to the tenour of the narrative, that fire referred to the sacrifices only in so far as it implied a ratification of the election of Aaron's family for the priestly office — if it is at all permitted to interpret a mythical trait irregularly appended.

# CHAPTER X.

SUMMARY.— Nadab and Abihu, the two eldest sons of Aaron, burnt incense in an unlawful manner, for which offence they were killed by a heavenly fire. Moses reproved Aaron for his negligence in superintending his sons; and when the bodies had been buried by relatives, Aaron and his two surviving sons were forbidden to evince any demonstration of grief and mourning, as this would be incompatible with the nature of their office (vers. 1—7). Then follow a few ordinances regarding the duties of the priests (ver. 8—11). Aaron and his two sons were commanded to consume their portions of the thank-offerings and of the cereal oblations which had been presented on the "eighth day" (vers. 12—15); and finally, Moses argued with Aaron and his sons because the latter had burnt the flesh of the people's sin-offering entirely, instead of eating the priestly portions of it; but he was satisfied with the reasons urged by his brother in justification (vers. 16—20).

1. And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took

1—7. There lived in the reminiscence of the people a tradition of an offence committed by Nadab and Abihu, Aaron's two eldest sons, against the strict laws concerning the burning of incense, and of the rapid and fearful retribution which befell them in consequence (comp. XVI. 1; Num. III. 4; XXVI. 61; 1 Chr. XXIV. 2). The compilers of Leviticus considered that they could find no more appropriate place for that legend than immediately after the consecration of the priests and the Divine vision that had sanct-

**either *of them* his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and presented before the Lord a strange offering made by fire, which He had not commanded them. 2. And there went out fire from before the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord. 3. Then**

ioned it: the crime was the more striking after acts of such solemnity, and the terrible punishment was more justified after such singular manifestations of grace; the holy ceremonies and the Divine goodness on the one hand, and the profane levity of those who had been so signally distinguished on the other hand, appeared to form a strong and impressive contrast, which indeed makes itself felt in the almost dramatic progress of the narrative. This appears to have been the sole guiding principle in the arrangement of the portions; and it seems impossible to discover or to prove an internal connection and a pragmatic continuity. It has been contended that Nadab and Abihu, filled with joy and perhaps elevated by wine (ver. 9), wished to accompany the grateful shouting of the people with an incense-offering, and thus to enhance the homage of God; or that, terrified by the heaven-sent fire (IX. 24), and regarding it as a mark of Divine wrath, they considered a fumigation desirable to appease God and to save the people (comp. Num. XVII. 11, 12): but these combinations are fanciful and untenable; the conjecture that Nadab and Abihu had indulged in wine, is derived from a later passage which stands in no connection with ours (ver. 9); and it was absolutely impossible that they should have looked upon the heavenly fire as a manifestation of Divine anger.

God had commanded that Aaron alone was to burn incense in the Holy, on the golden altar, every morning and every evening; that the incense should be prepared in a peculiar manner from certain fixed ingredients (Exod. XXX. 7, 8, 34—36); and that it was to be kindled by the holy flame taken from the brazen altar (comp. Lev. XVI. 12, 13). All these commands were contravened by Aaron's sons: they had no right at all to perform the fumigation; and they seem to have used ordinary incense, and to have burnt it in the Court, in unhallowed vessels, and at an irregular time (comp. XVI. 2). Thus they presented a "strange" (זָר) or unlawful offering, recklessly defying God's explicit injunctions. Therefore, the text states, "There went out fire from before the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord" (ver. 2), that is, in the Court of the Tabernacle (comp. ver. 4). It is scarcely legitimate to enquire, how the author pictured to himself the occurrence which he touches rather than describes, whether he understood lightning, or a flame descending from heaven similar to that which had fallen upon the altar, or a sudden and uncontrollable spreading of the blaze on the altar, or a fire in any other form. It is irrelevant to press the literal sense of mythical embellishments. It is sufficient to know that similar direct intercessions of God by means of fire were deemed possible (comp. Num. XI. 1; XVI. 35; 2 Ki. I. 10, 12; Job I. 16; *Talm.* Sanh. 52*a*). Thus much is certain that the writer did not consider the fire to have *consumed* the two men, whose bodies and very garments were left intact (vers. 4, 5); and in this sense we must understand the words that

**Moses said to Aaron, This *is it* that the Lord spoke, saying, I will be sanctified through those that are near Me, and before all the people I will be glorified. And Aaron remained silent. 4. And Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel the uncle of Aaron,**

the fire "devoured" (וַתֹּאכַל) or "burnt" (שָׂרַף) them (vers. 2, 6). It appeared that the afflicted father might expect an explanation of the fearful punishment sent as an example and a caution. Moses was unable to offer him comfort; on the contrary, he could not help implicating in the guilt Aaron himself, who ought to have watched and directed his heedless sons; and Aaron acquiesced in the reproof: he was silent (וידם); he withheld those loud and passionate wails natural on such mournful occasions (Exod. XI. 6 and Comm. in loc.; Ezek. XXIV. 15—17; comp. Ps. XXXVII. 7). The warning could not be more striking nor more conspicuous. The men so suddenly carried off by an awful death, had just been included in the most solemn rites which pointed them out as the special favourites of the Deity. They had before been deemed worthy of beholding the Divine presence (Exod. XXIV. 1, 11). They belonged to those who were to be "near God" (קְרֹבִים, see p. 560), enjoying His light and His glory. But this distinction, so far from being a shield and protection, singled them out the more strongly for Divine retribution; for, said Moses to his brother, "This is it that the Lord spoke, I will be sanctified through those that are near Me, and before all the people I will be glorified" (ver. 3). The guardians of the Law were expected to set the example of the most unswerving obedience. The choicer their privileges, the more uncompromising were their duties. Aaron felt the justice of the sentence; and merging his human feelings in the spiritual requirements of his mission, he yielded in meekness and resignation. The event was to be rendered instrumental for teaching the lesson it implies, thoroughly and emphatically. It was indeed, under all circumstances, defilement in the *High-priest* to touch the corpses of even his children; but ordinarily, priests were permitted to approach the bodies of their brothers (p. 572): yet, in this instance, when Nadab and Abihu were to be buried, and taken from the Court of the Sanctuary to a place without the camp, not Eleazar and Ithamar, but some more distant relatives were charged with the task. Nor was the choice even of these relatives without significance. It fell upon Mishael and Elzaphan, the children of Uzziel. Why were the sons of the elder brothers Izhar or Hebron, likewise Aaron's uncles, passed over, and the sons of the younger Uzziel selected? (comp. Exod. VI. 18, 22). One of Izhar's sons was Korah, who later rose in impious rebellion against Aaron's priesthood (Num. XVI.), while of Hebron no children are mentioned. As Nadab and Abihu had been killed for the vindication of the Sanctuary and its laws, they were to be brought to their last resting place by men whose piety was unquestioned. Again, neither their father nor their surviving brothers were to show any outward mark of grief. The High-priest and the priests, ordinarily subjected to different rules of mourning, were this time placed on the same rigid footing. Neither the one nor the other were to neglect their hair or rend their garments, which

**and said to them, Come near, carry your relations from before the Sanctuary out of the camp. 5. So they went near, and carried them in their tunics out of the camp,**

were ordinary manifestations of affliction and despair (XXI. 10; Gen. XXXVII. 29, 34; Josh. VII. 6; Judg. XI. 35; 1 Sam. IV. 12; 2 Sam. I. 2, 11; III. 31; XIII. 13; 2 Ki. II. 12; etc.; see Comm. on Exod. XI. 6; comp. *Lucian*, Dea Syr. cc. 6, 53). They were not to leave the holy Tabernacle, the seat of serenity and peace, which no sorrow could approach or disturb. Their disobedience in this respect was threatened to cause not only their own death, but also disaster to the Community with which they were identified. An exhibition of sadness and dejection on their part was considered not merely as a weakness but a crime; for it tended to prove that they were unworthy of their great spiritual office, and that their human were stronger than their heavenly ties; whereas it was the duty of the true priest "to say to his father and to his mother, I have not seen them, nor to acknowledge his brothers, nor to know his children; but to observe the word of God, and to keep His covenant" (Deut. XXXIII. 9). For "the anointing oil of the Lord was upon them", by which they were raised above the level of human cares and anxieties (comp. XXI. 10, 12). But while the natural mourners were to display the utmost indifference, the whole *people* was invited to bewail the calamity which had befallen some of their appointed mediators; for the "holy nation" was to be reminded, in the most impressive manner possible, of the awful sanctity of the public worship. — The classical parallels of Minos who, on hearing of the death of his son Androgeus, completed the sacrifice to the graces in which he was engaged, merely taking off his crown and ordering the music to cease; of the High-priest or consul Horatius Pulvillus who, while occupied in the dedication of a temple to Jupiter, received the news of his son's death, and yet completed the ceremony unmoved; and of Xenophon who, when informed during a sacrifice of the death of his eldest son Gryllus in the battle of Mantinea, laid aside his wreath, but resumed it when he learnt that his son had died bravely and victorious; these and similar parallels do not altogether coincide with our narrative; for in the two former cases, the father merely delayed the expression of his sorrow till after the sacred act, and in the third, he conquered his grief not by stronger feelings of religion but of patriotism; comp. *Apollod.* Bibl. III. xv. 7; Liv. II. 8; *Aelian*, Var. Hist. III. 3; *Diog. Laert.* Xen. X (54); *Val. Max.* V. x. 1 (ne — Pulvillus — patris magis quam pontificis partes egisse videretur), 2 exter. (Xenophon declared, majorem se ex virtute filii voluptatem, quam ex morte amaritudinem sentire).

We need hardly point out the extreme rigour and severity which our narrative breathes; it shows the Levitical spirit in all its relentless sternness, insisting upon a literal submission to its injunctions with inflexible tyranny: the story is meant to serve as a terrible warning to all who dare to deviate from the minutest behests of the priestly legislation, and it reflects the most advanced stage of hierarchical pretension (comp. also Exod. XXVIII. 35, 43; XXX. 21; Lev. VIII. 35; Num. XVI; 2 Chr. XXVI. 16—21).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — On the genealogy of Aaron see Exod. VI. 16—25; Num. III. 1—4; XXVI. 57—61; 1 Chr. XXIV. 1, 2. — It is not

**as Moses had said. 6. And Moses said to Aaron and to Eleazar and to Ithamar, his sons, Do not let your heads be dishevelled, nor rend your clothes, lest you**

impossible that the words "Nadab and Abihu ... took either of them *his censer*", justify the inference that both were in the habit of burning incense; if this is the case they did so in opposition to the laws of the Pentateuch which allowed the High-priest alone to burn incense *in a censer* (comp. Lev. XVI. 12, 13; Num. XVII. 11), though common priests might burn it on the golden altar in the Holy (Exod. XXX. 7, 8), or on the brazen altar as a part of the "memorial" (אזכרה) of bloodless oblations (Lev. II. 2, 3, 16, etc.; comp. pp. 118, 119); the fumigation of Korah and his associates in censers was exceptional and directed by Moses for an unusual purpose (Num. XVI. 6, 7, 17, 18, 35). — The "fire" offered by Nadab and Abihu is called זָרָה *strange*, a term frequently employed in connection with sacred things. Derived from זור *to recede*, *to stand aloof*, or *to be distant*, the sense of זָר is qualified according to the object with which it is brought into relation. Thus the families of priests and the Levites are זָרִים in reference to the priests or Aaronites (Exod. XXIX. 33; XXX. 32; Lev. XXII. 10, 12, 13; Num. III. 10, 38; XVII. 5; XVIII. 7); Israelites in comparison to priests and Levites (Num. I. 51; XVIII. 4); non-Israelites in relation to Israelites (Joel IV. 17; Isai. I. 7; Jer. LI. 51; Ezek. XI. 9); and the same epithet is applied to incense not prepared in the prescribed manner, and therefore not holy (Exod. XXX. 9), and in our passage to the burning of incense not performed in accordance with the Law (so also Num. III. 4; XXVI. 61). Analogous to זר is the use of *ἀλλότριον* in connection with religious matters, f. i. *Jamblich.* De Myster. V. 25, *ὁμοῦ δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀξίαν εὐλάβειαν ἔχειν, μή πῃ τῶν θεῶν ἀνάξιόν τι δῶρον προςαγάγωμεν ἢ ἀλλότριον.* — אֵשׁ must here be taken in the sense of אִשֶּׁה "an offering made by fire"; אֵשׁ זָרָה cannot be "profane fire" (Dathe, Rosenm. ignis non ex altari sumtus, a. o.; comp. Lev. XVI. 12; Revel. VIII. 5), as in this case we should expect in the *first* part of the verse ויתנו בהן אֵשׁ זָרָה. Josephus (Ant. III. viii. 7) understands unlawful incense (*κοιμίσαντες ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν οὐχ ὧν προεῖπεν Μωϋσῆς θυμιάτων, ἀλλ' οἷς ἐχρῶντο πρότερον*), which no doubt was a part of the offence. — On the force of אשר לא צוה אתם meaning, by way of *litotes*, "which he had rigidly interdicted to them", see Gramm. § 75. 14. — In Rome, the law commanding the use of "sacred fire" was extended to the chief priest of Jupiter (*Gell.* Noct. Att. X. 15, ignem e flaminia, id est, flaminis Dialis domo, nisi sacrum efferri jus non est). — The view that the fire which destroyed the two brothers came from the altar has been adopted and defended by Ewald (Alterth. p. 344, "als ob das verschmähte sanfte Feuer des innern Heiligthumes dann plötzlich gewaltig auflodernd sich von selbst zur Vernichtung des falschen Feuers und Opferpriesters nach aussen ergösse"; see also Gesch. II. 172, 176 note 2); but there is no trace of such a conception in the Old Testament. — The two eldest sons of Aaron offered the incense and died לפני יהוה (ver. 2) or את פני יהוה (comp. ver. 4), that is, in the Court, not in the Holy, where it was alone to be burnt at appointed times, and where the *Levites* Mishael and Elzaphan would not have been permitted to enter (ver. 4). — The two dead men were taken from the Court "in their tunics", and probably buried in them, since

**die, and lest He be wrath upon all the congregation; but let your brethren, the whole house of Israel, bewail the burning which the Lord has caused. 7. And you**

the garments worn at a time of so awful a Divine judgment, could not well be used by others, even if they had not become "unclean" by their contact with the corpses. — We confess that the word ותאכל (ver. 2) is not without difficulty; for the natural sense of אכל is *to consume*, not *to slay*, and it is incompatible with a perfect preservation of the bodies including even the garments of the persons of whom it is said that "fire consumed them"; we are, therefore, justified in supposing that the compiler of this episode combined two different traditions, but gave greater weight to that form of the legend which narrated that the two men were killed, but not consumed. — נִקְדַּשׁ with בְּ is *to be glorified through somebody* or *something* by showing might and greatness with respect to that person or object (Ezek. XX. 41), but more especially by his or its destruction, involving a manifestation of power (comp. Exod. XIV. 4, 17, 18; Num. XX. 13; Ezek. XXXVIII. 16; the meaning in Exod. XXIX. 43 is different); it is not *in the midst* of persons (in which sense בְּתוֹךְ is used. XXII. 32); nor "I desire to be held holy by those who are near Me" (Vater, Brentano, a. o.), which feeble truism accords little with the emphasis of the passage (yet similarly *Clericus* and *Rosenm.*, quaecunque ad cultum meum pertinent, ea sacerdotes mei sacra habeant oportet); and the future אקדש has here not the force of the imperative. It seems likely that the phrase בִּקְרֹבַי אֶקָּדֵשׁ was, in the author's time, current, if not proverbial (הוא אשר דבר יהוה וכ'); it may have been used to express that God is severest towards those whom He loves most (comp. Prov. III. 12; Am. III. 2, "You only I have loved of all the families of the earth, therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities"; 1 Pet. IV. 17, "Judgment begins at the house of God"; see also *Ewald*, Gesch. II. 127; Alterth. pp. 279, 280); and the author, slightly modifying its sense, employed it here so as to mean, "I will force the people to acknowledge My greatness and justice by chastising My own servants." In any case, it is futile to seek allusions to this phrase in preceding portions (as Exod. XIX. 22 or XXIX. 43), or to adduce it as a proof that "God spoke and commanded many things to Moses and the Israelites which were not written down but transmitted orally" (Cornel. a Lapide a. o.). But the reader will not be surprised at the following view of Ghillany (Menschenopfer, pp. 694—699): Nadab and Abihu were in reality *sacrificed* to God on the altar, either for a ratification of Aaron's election and appointment, or to conciliate God's favour for the impending expeditions; this sacrifice was by the revisers of Leviticus changed into supernatural death in consequence of some fictitious offence; and the very phrase בקרבי אקדש originally referred to *sacrifices of priests* which God demanded as a proof of perfect submission! So completely may the judgment be warped by one fatal prejudice. — אחיכם (ver. 4) is *your kinsmen;* for Mishael and Elzaphan were the great-cousins of Nadab and Abihu, as their father Uzziel was Aaron's uncle. — Aaron and his two surviving sons are commanded ראשיכם אל־תִּפְרָעוּ (ver. 6), which words can, according to the context in which they appear, only mean, "do not let your heads be dishevelled," so that פָּרַע, equivalent to שַׁלַּח פֶּרַע (Ezek. XLIV. 20; comp. Num. VI. 5, גַּדֵּל פֶּרַע; Lev.

shall not go out from the door of the Tent of Meeting, lest you die: for the anointing oil of the Lord *is* upon you. And they did according to the word of Moses.

8. And the Lord spoke to Aaron, saying, 9. Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with

XIII. 45), is used in the sense of *loosening* or *letting grow wild* (comp. פָּרוּעַ *dissolute*, Exod. XXXII. 25; and figuratively אֶפְרַע *I shall absolve* or *remit*, Ezek. XXIV. 14); for the mourner naturally neglects his hair and allows it to remain disorderly (comp. *Kirchmann*, De funeribus Romanor. II. 12, pp. 200*sqq*; *Geier*, De Ebraeor. luctu, VIII. 2, 3; see also *Knobel* on XXI. 10). It is especially on account of the parallel passage in Ezekiel ("they — the priests — shall not shave their heads, nor shall they allow it to grow wild, they shall only poll their heads"), that we prefer this rendering to the translation "you shall not uncover your head" (comp. Num. V. 18, see p. 285 note 13), that is, divest it of your mitre or turban which was supposed to be a mark of mourning (*Augustin.* Quaest. 32 in Levit.; comp. Ezek. XXIV. 17; Sept. ἀποκιδαρώσετε, Vulg. nudare; *Talm.* Moed Katon 15*a*; Kimchi s. v.; Luth. blössen, so also Clericus, Michaelis, Rosenm. a. o.); or "you shall not bare it by shaving off the hair" (comp. Lev. XXI. 10; so Gesen., De Wette, Maurer, Herxheim. a. o.), though that was frequently done in mourning (Deut. XXI. 12, 13; Isai. XV. 2; Jer. XVI. 6; XLI. 5; Am. VIII. 10; Ezra IX. 3; Job I. 20; *Herod.* II. 35), a custom which still prevails to some extent among the Arabs (see also *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. pp. 127, 128). That פרע is simply *to let grow* (comp. Targ. Onk. and Jonath. לא תרבון פירוע, Rashi אל תגדלו שער, Ebn Ezra, Selden, Keil, a. o.; comp. *Herod.* II. 36), can neither be proved from the Hebrew nor the Arabic use of the root. — פָּרַם *to tear* occurs, besides, in XIII. 45; XXI. 10 (Sept. διαῤῥήξετε, Vulg. scindere); it was certainly distinguished in sense from קרע (as is evident from *Mishn.* Sot. I. 5, "the priest takes hold of her garments אם נקרעו נקרעו אם נפרמו נפרמו"), although it is uncertain in what manner (the פרימה is supposed to involve many קריעות, or the former is rending sideways, the latter lengthways, so *Bartenura* in loc.; or the one is a rent in the seam, the other in the material, so *Kimchi* s. v.). — לא is from the preceding words ולא תמותו to be supplied with ועל כל העדה וכ׳ "and lest He be wrath"; see Gramm. § 104. 9.*a*. — On the custom of tearing the garments in grief, see *Kirchmann*, l. c. II. 17, pp. 241, 242; *Geier*, l. c. XXII. 9*sqq*. Philo (De Vict. c. 13) observes correctly "the piety of the priests overcomes the natural goodwill and affection towards their relatives and dearest friends, and it is both honourable and right that piety should at all times prevail."

**8—11.** "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is boisterous, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise" (Prov. XX. 1): this view of the effects of wine taken in excess, though, in moderation, it "gladdens the heart of man" (Ps. CIV. 15), recurs in various forms (Hos. IV. 11; VII. 5; Isai. V. 11, 12; XIX. 14; etc.). It gave rise to the law that neither High-priest nor priest was to partake of wine or strong drink (שֵׁכָר) when they entered the Tabernacle for the performance of their sacred functions; death was to be the penalty of contravention; and the ordinance was to remain in force for all future times. Com-

**thee, when you go into the Tent of Meeting, lest you die: *it shall be* a statute for ever throughout your gene-**

posure and perfect concentration of thoughts, the utmost nicety in the prescribed observances, and a dignified appearance — these requirements so essential during the ministrations, were deemed incompatible with the enjoyment of wine, which was forbidden entirely because even a little may mislead to intemperance, and because experience had shown the frequent licentiousness of the priests and its fatal consequences; "they also have erred through wine" exclaimed Isaiah (XXVIII. 7), "and go astray through strong drink, the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink; they are consumed by the wine, they go astray through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment". Philo insists upon the prohibition with great ardour and decision; wine, he observes, was most wisely interdicted to the priest during his sacred functions, on account of four results which it produces — "hesitation, forgetfulness, sleep, and folly"; nay it effects "destruction of reason"; and he adds a strong denunciation of wine in general, "we must look upon the use of it as a most unprofitable thing for all the purposes of life, in as much as it weighs down the soul, dims the outward senses, and enervates the body" (De Monarch. II. 7; De Victim. c. 13; comp. De Ebriet. cc. 32—34; see p. 573 note 15). A similar law existed in reference to the Egyptian priests (*Plut.* Is. 6; *Porph.* Abst. IV. 6), and those about to be initiated into the mysteries of Isis during the time of preparation (*Apul.* Metam. XI. l. c.); also among the Persian Magi (*Clem. Alex.* Strom. III. p. 446) and the Pythagoreans (*Jamblich.* Vit. Pyth. cc. 16, 24). The effects of wine are described by Porphyry nearly in the same manner as by Philo, "it causes injury to the nerves, brings on fulness of the head, and excites amatory desires" (Abst. IV. 6). The worshippers at Heliopolis on no account brought wine into the temple, not even for libations; they avoided it during their purifications; for it was regarded as the blood of those who had fought against the gods, had fallen, and mingled with the earth, whence the vine took its origin (*Plut.* Is. 6). Athenaeus (XV. 48) remarks on the authority of Pylarchus, "Among the Greeks, those who sacrifice to the sun make their libations of honey, as they never bring wine to the altars of the gods, saying that it is proper that the god who keeps the whole universe in order, and regulates everything, and is always going round and superintending the whole, should in no respect be connected with drunkenness" (comp. *supra* pp. 139, 231 note 24, on *νηφάλια*). Among several Greek tribes the custom obtained that whoever intended to consult an oracle or to perform any other sacred act, was to abstain from all food on that day, but from wine for three days previously. Plato advised that no man, when in camp, should taste wine, but exist upon water alone, so also no slave, whether male or female, no magistrate during his year of office, neither pilots, nor judges while engaged in their duties, nor members of the council when about to deliberate upon matters of moment (*Plato*, Legg. II. 14, p. 674 A, B; comp. *Cornel. a Lapid.* Comm. in loc.; *Outram*, de Sacrif. pp. 70, 71). This, however, was the only dietary restriction imposed upon the Hebrew priests as such, nor was even wine forbidden to them ordinarily. The same precepts with respect to food applied to both priests and people, for they reflected as clearly as any other branch of the legislation, the holiness

**rations: 10. And that you may distinguish between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean; 11. And**

of the people as "a kingdom of priests" (see ch. XI). Not so among other nations, where priests and people were, in this respect also, separated by a wide chasm. Thus, for instance, the Egyptian priests had a distinct code regulating their food; they were not allowed to eat fish (*Porph.* Abst. IV. 7); they hardly looked upon beans, which they considered an unclean pulse (*Herod.* II. 37; comp. *Diod. Sic.* I. 89); they abstained from the flesh of sheep and pigs, which they supposed to produce superfluous humours; they shunned, in fact, the flesh of all quadrupeds not horned, and those with uncloven or many-cleft hoofs; some of them avoided all animal food in general, and even eggs, and in times of lustration also salt and bread (comp. *Porph.* Abstin. IV. 6).

To the injunction regarding the abstinence from wine, a few other remarks are added to characterise the duties of the Hebrew priests: these were the authorities to be appealed to in all matters of religion and purification; and it was their duty to instruct the people in all Divine ordinances supposed to have been communicated through Moses (comp. p. 569).

Nobody can seriously contend that a real connection exists either between these verses (8—11) and the preceding episode concerning the death of Nadab and Abihu, or between these verses themselves. It is scarcely necessary to refute the playful view too frequently advanced both by ancient and recent writers that "possibly Nadab and Abihu drank wine with the thank-offering, and in their excitement or drunkenness presented the unlawful fumigation"; and a simple perusal of the passage under discussion suffices to show that a special injunction (regarding the wine) is loosely coupled with comprehensive principles summarising some of the most characteristic duties of the priests. We cannot, therefore, but conclude that these verses, introduced as they are by a separate heading (ver. 8), form a little fragment by themselves, put into this place without any perceptible reason or right, and properly requiring a very different position, if the Book were judiciously arranged (see the Introduction); in fact, if they are preserved in their integrität they must be pronounced as unskilfully and even illogically written, and recall the lax and negligent style of a late period, which the restriction to the Aaronites of the mission of teaching, instead of being extended to all the Levites, bespeaks no less intelligibly (comp. Deut. XXXIII. 10. see p. 600).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — It cannot even be admitted that the connection between the deed of Aaron's sons and the command of our verses consists in "the levity which loses calmness and reflection for lawful actions" (Baumgarten, Keil) — a connection so remote and artificial that few will discover or appreciate it; nor is it easy to understand the careless remark, "it is clear how the threat in ver. 7 introduces the ordinance in vers. 8—11" (*Stähelin*, Krit. Untersuch. p. 6); and justly observes Clericus (in loc.), "ex solo ordine narrationis, qui passim negligitur, vix duci potest certa conjectura." — A few commands respecting the duties and rights of the priests, are represented as having been directly communicated by God to Aaron (ver. 8; Num. XVIII. 1, 8, 20; see p. 686); because after his consecration as the head of the theocracy, he was supposed to be no less fitted for immediate Divine communion than Moses; it is trifling to conjecture that the honour was accorded to Aaron in order to console him

that you may teach the children of Israel all the statutes, which the Lord has spoken to them through Moses.

12. And Moses spoke to Aaron and to Eleazar and to Ithamar, his sons that were left, Take the bloodless offering that is left of the offerings of the Lord made by fire, and eat it unleavened before the altar; for it *is* most holy. 13. And you shall eat it in the holy place, because it *is* thy due and thy sons' due of the sacrifices of the Lord made by fire; for so I am commanded. 14. And the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder shall you eat in a clean place; thou, and thy sons, and thy daughters with thee; for as thy due, and thy sons' due they have

for the loss of his sons, and it is more objectionable still to understand the verse to mean, "And the Lord spoke to Aaron through Moses" (Ebn Ezr. a. o.), as the accentuators also seem to have taken it, writing וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָֹה instead of וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָֹה: "And the Lord spoke (to Moses) to tell to Aaron" (comp. Isai VII. 10). — It is difficult to find the grammatical construction of the next verses; the infinitives ולהבדיל and ולהורות (vers. 10. 11) are introduced abruptly; they cannot be brought into connection with the preceding verse, since the "distinguishing" and the "teaching" did not devolve upon the priests, when "they came into the Tent of Meeting", but in the course of their general duties. Clericus adds, without authority, "iis abstinete" before ולהבדיל, "connectendae orationis causa cujus nexus alioqui durissimus est." Ebn Ezra observes playfully, "the wine destroys the consciousness of the toper, so that the things become confused in his mind, and hence the text urges that the priest is to *distinguish* (להבדיל) between things holy and profane" (comp. also *Talm.* Zevach. 17*b*).

**12—15.** The burnt-offerings of the priests and of the people, and probably also the thank-offerings of the latter, that had been presented on the eighth day, were accompanied by bloodless oblations, though these are not expressly mentioned except in the first case (IX. 4). But of the flour a handful (II. 2), and of the unleavened cakes one of each kind only was burnt on the altar as a memorial (comp. VIII. 26, 31); the remainder of the flour was to be baked into unleavened bread, and eaten, together with the other cakes, "beside the altar", that is, in the Court of the Tabernacle (VI. 9, 19), because those remains belonged to the class of "most holy" things (קדש קדשים, see p. 76), and were for ever assigned to the male descendants of Aaron as a part of their fixed dues (comp. VI. 10, 11). In a similar manner, Aaron and his sons were to consume the breasts and right shoulders of the two thank-offerings (IX. 21), since these portions were granted to them as a perpetual revenue from the thank-offerings of the Hebrews. Now, both the breasts and the right shoulders had, at that peculiar sacrifice of the eighth day, been "waved" (IX. 21); the writer, therefore, enjoined as a general command, that the same parts should be waved in *all* thank-offerings together with the fat (ver. 15). The universal and permanent applicability of the ordinance cannot be questioned both on account of the context and the wording. But a previous law demanded the waving of the breast only, while

been given out of the sacrifices of thank-offerings of the children of Israel. 15. The heave-shoulder and the wave-breast shall they bring with the offerings made by fire of the fat *and the fat* parts, to wave *them for* a wave-offering before the Lord; and it shall be thine and thy sons' with thee, by a statute for ever, as the Lord has commanded.

16. And Moses searched after the goat of the sin-offering, and, behold, it was burnt. And he was angry

the shoulder was either simply to be "taken off" as a gift for the priest, or consecrated by another rite, that of "heaving" (see pp. 202, 203). Which of the two statutes was in force? or which possesses greater authority and probability? It may be assumed as a natural principle, that the older sacrificial practice was characterised by greater simplicity, while nice distinctions and more complicated regulations were adopted in the course of time, as the Levitical system was developed and accepted. Now, it is not easy to explain, why just the breast alone should be "waved", while the shoulder, the other and no less important priestly appurtenance, was not included in the rite. Antiquarians have in vain attempted to discover a satisfactory reason; and so obscure is the subject that uncertainty prevails even with regard to the exact manipulation to which the shoulder was subjected (see l. c.). It is, therefore, probable that, at first, both the breast and right shoulder were waved; but that, later, a distinction in the treatment of both was deemed desirable, whatever the reason which suggested the modification. Hence we have a right to consider the injunction of our passage, based as it is upon a supposed ceremonial observed in the time of Moses himself, as embodying the older practice, whereas the refining alteration was introduced at a subsequent period.

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — The אשי יהוה (ver. 12) are the *cereal* offerings burnt by fire; and that which remained after the appointed portions had been consumed by the flames, fell to the share of the priests. On חק (ver. 15) see note on VI. 11, p. 536.

**16—20.** While the narrative appears to continue the record of incidents connected with the celebrations of the eighth day, it involves itself into a contradiction which we have above pointed out, and which well characterises the nature of the compilation (see notes on IX. 5—21). The priests abstained from eating of the sin-offering of the people, because they had been commanded to burn it entirely. But another writer believed it to be an invariable rule that the priests were bound to eat the flesh of those expiatory sacrifices of which the blood had not been brought into the Holy (VI. 22, 23): for the meal was, in such cases, an essential and an official part of the expiatory rites; it bore no social character; it was not even shared by the families of the priests (see pp. 210, 211); the sin-offering was incomplete without it; for it implied the declaration that the sacrifice had indeed achieved its appointed end of atonement; since, as Philo observes, God would not have invited His servants and ministers to partake of the repast, unless perfect forgiveness had been granted (De Victim. 12). Therefore Moses asked Aaron's

with Eleazar and with Ithamar, the sons of Aaron *who were* left, saying, 17. Wherefore have you not eaten the sin-offering in the holy place? for it *is* most holy, and *God* has given it you to remove the iniquity of the

sons reproachfully, "Wherefore have you not eaten the sin-offering in the holy place? for it is most holy, and God has given it you to remove the iniquity of the congregration, to make atonement for them before the Lord" (ver. 17). For as the victim, by its death, symbolically took upon itself the deserved punishment, but not the guilt, of the offerer (p. 292), it could be eaten, as a clean and pure animal, by the priests who had been instrumental in transferring that retribution from the worshipper to the animal, that is, in effecting the expiation. — If the blood came into the Sanctuary, it was of itself deemed sufficiently effectual to work that end, while it hallowed the entire animal to such a degree that not even the priests could partake of it. — Moses adressed his remonstrances to Nadab and Ithamar alone (ver. 16); but though he did not mention Aaron, evidently out of respect for the supreme dignity with which he had just been invested, he naturally included him in the expression of his displeasure. Aaron feeling this, and perhaps aware that his responsibility was even greater than that of his sons, undertook the reply on their behalf and his own. His sons, he observed, could hardly be deemed fit to eat of the people's sin-offering on a day when they had shown by a holocaust and a sin-offering, how much they stood in need of atonement themselves, and how far they were removed from that holiness which that solemn meal required; and he, Aaron himself, plunged into grief by the sudden and awful death of his two eldest sons, was not in a condition of mind, and as a mourner scarcely qualified, to partake of a sacrificial meal, were it even one of so solemn a character as that connected with a sin-offering (comp. Deut. XXVI. 14). To some extent, the reason assigned on behalf of Aaron applied to his sons also — for they had lost their brothers; and the reason assigned on behalf of his sons applied to Aaron likewise — for the holocaust and the sin-offering had been presented for him as well: but in Nadab and Abihu the moral insufficiency, in Aaron the bereavement was felt more strongly; and the excuse was framed accordingly. "And", concludes the text, "when Moses heard that, he was content" (ver. 20). But this remark excites surprise in more than one respect. Granted even that the apologies, though opposed to the precepts of the sacrificial code, were prompted by a spirit of piety and humility, and granted moreover, that the plea brought forward for exonerating the brothers is acceptable, since the eighth day may be considered as completing the initiation; it must be asked, how Moses could acquiesce in the justification ventured by Aaron for himself? Had Aaron not, immediately before, been most emphatically warned not to give way to his natural feelings and instincts, but absolutely to sacrifice them to his spiritual office? (vers. 6—8). How then could Moses approve of Aaron's declaration that he was unable to eat of a sin-offering, afflicted as he was by a domestic calamity, especially as he was in a state of perfect purity, since he had never left the holy precincts? And had not Aaron been distinctly invited to eat of the thank-offerings and of the bloodless oblation, without offering any objection? (vers. 12—14). Again, what position does Moses oc-

**congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord. 18. Behold, the blood of it was not brought into the Holy within: you should indeed have eaten it in**

cupy in this remonstrance? He is, at first, of opinion that the priests ought by all means to have eaten the flesh of the people's sin-offering; when he finds they have not done so, he is seized with wrath, and gives vent to it in vehement and bitter terms arraigning the priests for desertion of their most important duty; but when he hears Aaron's exculpatory arguments, he at once retracts his opinion and declares himself satisfied. It must strike every attentive reader that the spirit of this passage is utterly foreign to that which pervades the rest of the narrative. While everywhere else Moses acts clearly as the mouthpiece and agent of God, and is, therefore, infallible in his views and arrangements, he evidently acts here on his own account, appears irritable, and is liable to mistaken opinions which he is compelled to renounce, and his brother is enabled to correct — an instance of passionate and rash condemnation on his part, on account of misconstruction of the motives, similar to that related later, when the Reubenites and Gadites desired abodes in the east of the Jordan (Num. XXXII. 6 *sqq.*). This difference in the tenour of the composition is highly interesting; for it leads to the conclusion that the account of this dispute must have originated at an earlier time, when the human individuality of Moses as lawgiver and spiritual guide was still preserved by tradition in distinct and well-marked features, and had not, as happened in the course of ages, faded into the dim and shadowy outlines of a mere instrument and messenger of supernatural revelations; it must have originated very long indeed before Moses could be made to say, "The Lord has sent me to do all these works; for I have not done them of my own mind" (לֹא מִלִּבִּי, Num. XVI. 28).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — So discordant is the spirit of these verses that even orthodox Jewish writers have been forced to notice it as exhibiting "a singular physiognomy without analogy in the Bible;" but so far from appearing like a later "talmudical controversy" (Wogue), our passage bears a more primitive character; and if we have here indeed a fragment from some old work on the priesthood, the same which contained the narrative of David's meeting with the priest Ahimelech at Nob, so obscure in many points (1 Sam. XXI.; *Rappoport*, in the introductory Essay to *Stern's* edition of Parchon's Lexicon, p. XIII), some light is thrown upon the date of our section, for nobody will assert that works on the Hebrew priesthood were written before the time of Moses. See also the discussion on the subject in *Talm.* Zevach. 101. Baumgarten (Comm. p. 153) remarks, "Moses, the lawgiver, abandons the severity of the letter and listens to Aaron's reason ... In as much, therefore, as the priesthood of Aaron is above the Law, it is not the direct opposition of the Spirit, but contains, in its anointment, the future development of the Spirit, of which it even partially partakes: from this double nature of Aaron's priesthood it may be explained how the complete subjection of the priests to the statutes, and the freedom of the priests from the letter of the Law, could be manifested on the same day" — observations apt and ingenious from the writer's point of view, but utterly untenable upon principles of historical criticism: the priesthood of Aaron is in no sense

the holy *place*, as I commanded. 19. And Aaron said to Moses, Behold, this day have they offered their sin-offering and their burnt-offering before the Lord; and

whatever "above the Law," by which it is entirely circumscribed in the minutest detail; and the concession of Moses points instructively to a time of fluctuation and transition when "the Law" had not yet obtained supreme force and unalterable shape; for when this object had been secured, a "development of the Spirit" was impossible — as far as the Law had power to prevent it. Another unavailing attempt at overcoming the difficulty of our narrative is that of Gerlach (in loc.), "It was sufficient for Moses to infer that Aaron recognised the rule all the more strongly, the more decidedly he represented his proceeding with regard to the meal as an exception": the authority of the law is respected by its observance, not by its arbitrary, were it even exceptional neglect. — The second Book of Maccabees (II. 11) seems vaguely to allude to the incident here related in the words, "And Moses said, Because the sin-offering was not to be eaten, it was consumed" (*καὶ εἶπε Μωυσῆς, Διὰ τὸ μὴ βεβρῶσθαι τὸ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἀνηλώθη*). — "The goat of the sin-offering" here referred to is that sacrificed on the eighth day in the name of the people (IX. 15), certainly not that of the chief of the tribe of Manasseh presented, together with other sacrifices and gifts, on the eighth day after the dedication of the altar recorded in Numbers (VIII. 58, so Michael., Rosenm., a. o.), with which portion ours stands in no such connection (comp. notes on IX. 1, 2). — After נתן we must supply לֶאֱכֹל from the preceding אכלתם, whatever has been asserted to prove the contrary (for inst. by *Kurtz*, Opferc. p. 204; *Hofmann*, Schriftbeweis, II. 1, p. 184; comp. *Keil*, Archäol. I. 235). — The term נָשָׂא עָוֹן (ver. 17) means here evidently *to remove* or *to expiate sin*, a signification which it frequently has both in prose and poetry (Gen. L. 17; Ex. XXVIII. 38; XXXII. 31; Ps. XXV. 18; XXXII. 1, 5; LXXXV. 3; etc.), and is, therefore, equivalent to כִּפֵּר, which follows as an explanation to prevent every possibility of mistake; hence the Sept. renders correctly, *ἵνα ἀφέλητε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῆς συναγωγῆς*. Less appropriate is the sense, that the priests were to eat of the sin-offering to *bear* the sin of the congregation; so Vulg. "ut portetis iniquitatem multitudinis"; Luth. "dass ihr die Missethat der Gemeinde tragen sollt"; and similarly De Wette, Knobel, Keil, a. o.; or more distinctly Cornelius a Lapide (in loc.) "ut scilicet cum hostiis populi pro peccato simul etiam populi peccata in vos quasi recipiatis, ut illa expietis", Deyling (Observ. Sacr. I. c. 45, §2) "hoc pacto cum ederent, incorporabant quasi peccatum populique reatum in se recipiebant", and Witsius (Miscell. Sacr. II. 761); comp. also *Bähr*, Symb. II. 206; *Keil*, Archäol. I. pp. 234, 235, Comment. Lev. p. 71. It is too vague to declare that our verses are "a Jehovistic addition" (Knobel): it appears, from internal evidence, that they are of an earlier, not of a later date than the main portion of the chapter; the arguments based upon the style are inconclusive. It has been curiously contended that Moses suspected Aaron and his sons of the perverse view that the flesh of the sin-offering ought not to be touched, because it was impure and reminded them of a Typhonic sacrifice (so *Hofmann*, Schriftbeweis, II. 1, p. 281; *Kurtz*, Opfercultus, p. 204); we can find no trace of such suspicion; the words "for it is most holy" are

**such things have befallen me: now *if* I ate the sin-offering to-day, would it be accepted in the sight of the Lord? And Moses heard *it*, and was content.**

not intended to assert the sanctity of the flesh in opposition to a contrary opinion entertained by Aaron, but simply to recall to his mind, that its character was such that the mode of its disposal was not left to Aaron's option and arbitrary decision, but was irrevocably prescribed and enforced. Dathe justly remarks, "Aaron igitur non quidem habitu externo, animo tamen lugens, noluit interesse sacrificialibus." — On הוּבָא אֶת (ver. 18) see Gramm. § 76. 2. If the reading צִוֵּיתִי (ver. 18) is correct, it would lend additional support to our estimate of the character of this passage, as Moses himself had issued the commands (see, however, on VIII. 31). — On the feminine of the plural (ותקראנה...כאלה) to express the neuter, see Gramm. § 84. *c*. The translation "et pareille chose m'est advenue" (Wogue), in the sense, "I have also omitted to eat of the goat" is against the context. — The first י in הַיִּיטַב following the ה *interrogativum* has a *dagesh forte*, though not provided with sh'va; as is also exceptionally the case in הַיֹּרֶדֶת (Eccl. III. 21; see Gramm. § XX. 4. *b*); the *dagesh forte* gives to the question a greater emphasis by increasing the force of the principal word, an emphasis most appropriate in our passage. The supposition that הַיִּיטַב was written, in order to distinguish it from הַאִיטַב, like which הַיִּיטַב is believed to have been sounded (*Luzzatto*, Prolegomeni, p. 201), is untenable, as ייטב and איטב must have been distinguished in the pronunciation.

תֵצְאוּ פֶּן־תָּמֻתוּ כִּי־שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת יְהוָה עֲלֵיכֶם וַיַּעֲשׂוּ כִּדְבַר
מֹשֶׁה: פ 8 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן לֵאמֹר: 9 יַיִן וְשֵׁכָר
אַל־תֵּשְׁתְּ ׀ אַתָּה ׀ וּבָנֶיךָ אִתָּךְ בְּבֹאֲכֶם אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְלֹא
תָמֻתוּ חֻקַּת עוֹלָם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם: 10 וּלְהַבְדִּיל בֵּין הַקֹּדֶשׁ וּבֵין
הַחֹל וּבֵין הַטָּמֵא וּבֵין הַטָּהוֹר: 11 וּלְהוֹרֹת אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
אֵת כָּל־הַחֻקִּים אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֲלֵיהֶם בְּיַד־מֹשֶׁה: פ
12 וַיְדַבֵּר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן וְאֶל־אֶלְעָזָר וְאֶל־אִיתָמָר ׀ בָּנָיו
הַנּוֹתָרִים קְחוּ אֶת־הַמִּנְחָה הַנּוֹתֶרֶת מֵאִשֵּׁי יְהוָה וְאִכְלוּהָ
מַצּוֹת אֵצֶל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ כִּי קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים הִוא: 13 וַאֲכַלְתֶּם
אֹתָהּ בְּמָקוֹם קָדוֹשׁ כִּי חָקְךָ וְחָק־בָּנֶיךָ הִוא מֵאִשֵּׁי יְהוָה
כִּי־כֵן צֻוֵּיתִי: 14 וְאֵת חֲזֵה הַתְּנוּפָה וְאֵת ׀ שׁוֹק הַתְּרוּמָה
תֹּאכְלוּ בְּמָקוֹם טָהוֹר אַתָּה וּבָנֶיךָ וּבְנֹתֶיךָ אִתָּךְ כִּי־חָקְךָ
וְחָק־בָּנֶיךָ נִתְּנוּ מִזִּבְחֵי שַׁלְמֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל: 15 שׁוֹק
הַתְּרוּמָה וַחֲזֵה הַתְּנוּפָה עַל אִשֵּׁי הַחֲלָבִים יָבִיאוּ לְהָנִיף
תְּנוּפָה לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וְהָיָה לְךָ וּלְבָנֶיךָ אִתְּךָ לְחָק־עוֹלָם
כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה: 16 וְאֵת ׀ שְׂעִיר הַחַטָּאת דָּרֹשׁ דָּרַשׁ
מֹשֶׁה וְהִנֵּה שֹׂרָף וַיִּקְצֹף עַל־אֶלְעָזָר וְעַל־אִיתָמָר בְּנֵי
אַהֲרֹן הַנּוֹתָרִם לֵאמֹר: 17 מַדּוּעַ לֹא־אֲכַלְתֶּם אֶת־הַחַטָּאת
בִּמְקוֹם הַקֹּדֶשׁ כִּי קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים הִוא וְאֹתָהּ ׀ נָתַן לָכֶם
לָשֵׂאת אֶת־עֲוֹן הָעֵדָה לְכַפֵּר עֲלֵיהֶם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה: 18 הֵן
לֹא־הוּבָא אֶת־דָּמָהּ אֶל־הַקֹּדֶשׁ פְּנִימָה אָכוֹל תֹּאכְלוּ אֹתָהּ
בַּקֹּדֶשׁ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוֵּיתִי: 19 וַיְדַבֵּר אַהֲרֹן אֶל־מֹשֶׁה הֵן הַיּוֹם
הִקְרִיבוּ אֶת־חַטָּאתָם וְאֶת־עֹלָתָם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וַתִּקְרֶאנָה
אֹתִי כָּאֵלֶּה וְאָכַלְתִּי חַטָּאת הַיּוֹם הַיִּיטַב בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה:
20 וַיִּשְׁמַע מֹשֶׁה וַיִּיטַב בְּעֵינָיו: פ

הַדָּם אֵלָיו וַיִּזְרְקֵהוּ עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב׃ 19 וְאֶת־הַחֲלָבִים
מִן־הַשּׁוֹר וּמִן־הָאַיִל הָאַלְיָה וְהַמְכַסֶּה וְהַכְּלָיֹת וְיֹתֶרֶת
הַכָּבֵד׃ 20 וַיָּשִׂימוּ אֶת־הַחֲלָבִים עַל־הֶחָזוֹת וַיַּקְטֵר הַחֲלָבִים
הַמִּזְבֵּחָה׃ 21 וְאֵת הֶחָזוֹת וְאֵת שׁוֹק הַיָּמִין הֵנִיף אַהֲרֹן
תְּנוּפָה לִפְנֵי יְהוָה כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה מֹשֶׁה׃ 22 וַיִּשָּׂא אַהֲרֹן
אֶת־יָדָו אֶל־הָעָם וַיְבָרְכֵם וַיֵּרֶד מֵעֲשֹׂת הַחַטָּאת וְהָעֹלָה
וְהַשְּׁלָמִים׃ 23 וַיָּבֹא מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וַיֵּצְאוּ
וַיְבָרְכוּ אֶת־הָעָם וַיֵּרָא כְבוֹד־יְהוָה אֶל־כָּל־הָעָם׃ 24 וַתֵּצֵא
אֵשׁ מִלִּפְנֵי יְהוָה וַתֹּאכַל עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֶת־הָעֹלָה וְאֶת־
הַחֲלָבִים וַיַּרְא כָּל־הָעָם וַיָּרֹנּוּ וַיִּפְּלוּ עַל־פְּנֵיהֶם׃

## CHAPTER X.

1 וַיִּקְחוּ בְנֵי־אַהֲרֹן נָדָב וַאֲבִיהוּא אִישׁ מַחְתָּתוֹ וַיִּתְּנוּ
בָהֵן אֵשׁ וַיָּשִׂימוּ עָלֶיהָ קְטֹרֶת וַיַּקְרִיבוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֵשׁ
זָרָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא צִוָּה אֹתָם׃ 2 וַתֵּצֵא אֵשׁ מִלִּפְנֵי יְהוָה וַתֹּאכַל
אוֹתָם וַיָּמֻתוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה׃ 3 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן הוּא
אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר יְהוָה ׀ לֵאמֹר בִּקְרֹבַי אֶקָּדֵשׁ וְעַל־פְּנֵי כָל־הָעָם
אֶכָּבֵד וַיִּדֹּם אַהֲרֹן׃ 4 וַיִּקְרָא מֹשֶׁה אֶל־מִישָׁאֵל וְאֶל אֶלְצָפָן
בְּנֵי עֻזִּיאֵל דֹּד אַהֲרֹן וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם קִרְבוּ שְׂאוּ אֶת־
אֲחֵיכֶם מֵאֵת פְּנֵי־הַקֹּדֶשׁ אֶל־מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה׃ 5 וַיִּקְרְבוּ
וַיִּשָּׂאֻם בְּכֻתֳּנֹתָם אֶל־מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר מֹשֶׁה׃
6 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן וּלְאֶלְעָזָר וּלְאִיתָמָר ׀ בָּנָיו
רָאשֵׁיכֶם אַל־תִּפְרָעוּ ׀ וּבִגְדֵיכֶם לֹא־תִפְרֹמוּ וְלֹא תָמֻתוּ
וְעַל כָּל־הָעֵדָה יִקְצֹף וַאֲחֵיכֶם כָּל־בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל יִבְכּוּ
אֶת־הַשְּׂרֵפָה אֲשֶׁר שָׂרַף יְהוָה׃ 7 וּמִפֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד לֹא

וְאַיִל לְעֹלָה תְּמִימִם וְהַקְרֵב לִפְנֵי יְהוָה׃ 3 וְאֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
תְּדַבֵּר לֵאמֹר קְחוּ שְׂעִיר־עִזִּים לְחַטָּאת וְעֵגֶל וָכֶבֶשׂ בְּנֵי־
שָׁנָה תְּמִימִם לְעֹלָה׃ 4 וְשׁוֹר וָאַיִל לִשְׁלָמִים לִזְבֹּחַ לִפְנֵי
יְהוָה וּמִנְחָה בְּלוּלָה בַשָּׁמֶן כִּי הַיּוֹם יְהוָה נִרְאָה אֲלֵיכֶם׃
5 וַיִּקְחוּ אֵת אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה מֹשֶׁה אֶל־פְּנֵי אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וַיִּקְרְבוּ
כָּל־הָעֵדָה וַיַּעַמְדוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה׃ 6 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה זֶה הַדָּבָר
אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה יְהוָה תַּעֲשׂוּ וְיֵרָא אֲלֵיכֶם כְּבוֹד יְהוָה׃ 7 וַיֹּאמֶר
מֹשֶׁה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן קְרַב אֶל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וַעֲשֵׂה אֶת־חַטָּאתְךָ
וְאֶת־עֹלָתֶךָ וְכַפֵּר בַּעַדְךָ וּבְעַד הָעָם וַעֲשֵׂה אֶת־קָרְבַּן הָעָם
וְכַפֵּר בַּעֲדָם כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה׃ 8 וַיִּקְרַב אַהֲרֹן אֶל־
הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וַיִּשְׁחַט אֶת־עֵגֶל הַחַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ׃ 9 וַיַּקְרִבוּ
בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן אֶת־הַדָּם אֵלָיו וַיִּטְבֹּל אֶצְבָּעוֹ בַּדָּם וַיִּתֵּן עַל־
קַרְנוֹת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְאֶת־הַדָּם יָצַק אֶל־יְסוֹד הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃ 10 וְאֶת־
הַחֵלֶב וְאֶת־הַכְּלָיֹת וְאֶת־הַיֹּתֶרֶת מִן־הַכָּבֵד מִן־הַחַטָּאת
הִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחָה כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה׃ 11 וְאֶת־
הַבָּשָׂר וְאֶת־הָעוֹר שָׂרַף בָּאֵשׁ מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה׃ 12 וַיִּשְׁחַט
אֶת־הָעֹלָה וַיַּמְצִאוּ בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן אֵלָיו אֶת־הַדָּם וַיִּזְרְקֵהוּ
עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב׃ 13 וְאֶת־הָעֹלָה הִמְצִיאוּ אֵלָיו לִנְתָחֶיהָ
וְאֶת־הָרֹאשׁ וַיַּקְטֵר עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃ 14 וַיִּרְחַץ אֶת־הַקֶּרֶב וְאֶת־
הַכְּרָעָיִם וַיַּקְטֵר עַל־הָעֹלָה הַמִּזְבֵּחָה׃ 15 וַיַּקְרֵב אֵת קָרְבַּן
הָעָם וַיִּקַּח אֶת־שְׂעִיר הַחַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר לָעָם וַיִּשְׁחָטֵהוּ
וַיְחַטְּאֵהוּ כָּרִאשׁוֹן׃ 16 וַיַּקְרֵב אֶת־הָעֹלָה וַיַּעֲשֶׂהָ כַּמִּשְׁפָּט׃
17 וַיַּקְרֵב אֶת־הַמִּנְחָה וַיְמַלֵּא כַפּוֹ מִמֶּנָּה וַיַּקְטֵר עַל־
הַמִּזְבֵּחַ מִלְּבַד עֹלַת הַבֹּקֶר׃ 18 וַיִּשְׁחַט אֶת־הַשּׁוֹר וְאֶת־
הָאַיִל זֶבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים אֲשֶׁר לָעָם וַיַּמְצִאוּ בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן אֶת־

לֶ֣חֶם שֶׁ֛מֶן אַחַ֖ת וְרָקִ֣יק אֶחָ֑ד וַיָּ֙שֶׂם֙ עַל־הַ֣חֲלָבִ֔ים וְעַ֖ל
שׁ֥וֹק הַיָּמִֽין׃ 27 וַיִּתֵּ֣ן אֶת־הַכֹּ֔ל עַ֚ל כַּפֵּ֣י אַהֲרֹ֔ן וְעַ֖ל כַּפֵּ֣י
בָנָ֑יו וַיָּ֧נֶף אֹתָ֛ם תְּנוּפָ֖ה לִפְנֵ֥י יְהוָֽה׃ 28 וַיִּקַּ֨ח מֹשֶׁ֤ה
אֹתָם֙ מֵעַ֣ל כַּפֵּיהֶ֔ם וַיַּקְטֵ֥ר הַמִּזְבֵּ֖חָה עַל־הָעֹלָ֑ה מִלֻּאִ֥ים
הֵם֙ לְרֵ֣יחַ נִיחֹ֔חַ אִשֶּׁ֥ה ה֖וּא לַיהוָֽה׃ 29 וַיִּקַּ֤ח מֹשֶׁה֙ אֶת־
הֶ֣חָזֶ֔ה וַיְנִיפֵ֥הוּ תְנוּפָ֖ה לִפְנֵ֣י יְהוָ֑ה מֵאֵ֣יל הַמִּלֻּאִ֗ים לְמֹשֶׁ֤ה
הָיָה֙ לְמָנָ֔ה כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה אֶת־מֹשֶֽׁה׃ 30 וַיִּקַּ֨ח מֹשֶׁ֜ה
מִשֶּׁ֣מֶן הַמִּשְׁחָ֗ה וּמִן־הַדָּם֮ אֲשֶׁ֣ר עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ֒ וַיַּ֤ז עַֽל־אַהֲרֹן֙
עַל־בְּגָדָ֔יו וְעַל־בָּנָ֛יו וְעַל־בִּגְדֵ֥י בָנָ֖יו אִתּ֑וֹ וַיְקַדֵּ֤שׁ אֶת־
אַהֲרֹן֙ אֶת־בְּגָדָ֔יו וְאֶת־בָּנָ֛יו וְאֶת־בִּגְדֵ֥י בָנָ֖יו אִתּֽוֹ׃ 31 וַיֹּ֨אמֶר
מֹשֶׁ֜ה אֶֽל־אַהֲרֹ֣ן וְאֶל־בָּנָ֗יו בַּשְּׁל֣וּ אֶת־הַבָּשָׂר֮ פֶּ֣תַח אֹ֣הֶל
מוֹעֵד֒ וְשָׁם֙ תֹּאכְל֣וּ אֹת֔וֹ וְאֶ֨ת־הַלֶּ֔חֶם אֲשֶׁ֖ר בְּסַ֣ל הַמִּלֻּאִ֑ים
כַּאֲשֶׁ֤ר צִוֵּ֙יתִי֙ לֵאמֹ֔ר אַהֲרֹ֥ן וּבָנָ֖יו יֹאכְלֻֽהוּ׃ 32 וְהַנּוֹתָ֥ר
בַּבָּשָׂ֖ר וּבַלָּ֑חֶם בָּאֵ֖שׁ תִּשְׂרֹֽפוּ׃ 33 וּמִפֶּתַח֩ אֹ֨הֶל מוֹעֵ֜ד לֹ֤א
תֵֽצְאוּ֙ שִׁבְעַ֣ת יָמִ֔ים עַ֚ד י֔וֹם מְלֹ֖את יְמֵ֣י מִלֻּאֵיכֶ֑ם כִּ֚י
שִׁבְעַ֣ת יָמִ֔ים יְמַלֵּ֖א אֶת־יֶדְכֶֽם׃ 34 כַּאֲשֶׁ֥ר עָשָׂ֖ה בַּיּ֣וֹם הַזֶּ֑ה
צִוָּ֧ה יְהוָ֛ה לַעֲשֹׂ֖ת לְכַפֵּ֥ר עֲלֵיכֶֽם׃ 35 וּפֶתַח֩ אֹ֨הֶל מוֹעֵ֜ד
תֵּשְׁב֨וּ יוֹמָ֤ם וָלַ֙יְלָה֙ שִׁבְעַ֣ת יָמִ֔ים וּשְׁמַרְתֶּ֛ם אֶת־מִשְׁמֶ֥רֶת
יְהוָ֖ה וְלֹ֣א תָמ֑וּתוּ כִּי־כֵ֖ן צֻוֵּֽיתִי׃ 36 וַיַּ֥עַשׂ אַהֲרֹ֖ן וּבָנָ֑יו אֵ֚ת
כָּל־הַדְּבָרִ֔ים אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה בְּיַד־מֹשֶֽׁה׃

ס ס ס

## CHAPTER IX.

1 וַיְהִי֙ בַּיּ֣וֹם הַשְּׁמִינִ֔י קָרָ֣א מֹשֶׁ֔ה לְאַהֲרֹ֖ן וּלְבָנָ֑יו וּלְזִקְנֵ֖י
יִשְׂרָאֵֽל׃ 2 וַיֹּ֣אמֶר אֶֽל־אַהֲרֹ֗ן קַח־לְךָ֠ עֵ֣גֶל בֶּן־בָּקָ֧ר לְחַטָּ֛את

צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה׃ 14 וַיַּגֵּשׁ אֵת פַּר הַחַטָּאת וַיִּסְמֹךְ
אַהֲרֹן וּבָנָיו אֶת־יְדֵיהֶם עַל־רֹאשׁ פַּר הַחַטָּאת׃ 15 וַיִּשְׁחָט
וַיִּקַּח מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הַדָּם וַיִּתֵּן עַל־קַרְנוֹת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב
בְּאֶצְבָּעוֹ וַיְחַטֵּא אֶת־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְאֶת־הַדָּם יָצַק אֶל־יְסוֹד
הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וַיְקַדְּשֵׁהוּ לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו׃ 16 וַיִּקַּח אֶת־כָּל־הַחֵלֶב
אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַקֶּרֶב וְאֵת יֹתֶרֶת הַכָּבֵד וְאֶת־שְׁתֵּי הַכְּלָיֹת
וְאֶת־חֶלְבְּהֶן וַיַּקְטֵר מֹשֶׁה הַמִּזְבֵּחָה׃ 17 וְאֶת־הַפָּר וְאֶת־
עֹרוֹ וְאֶת־בְּשָׂרוֹ וְאֶת־פִּרְשׁוֹ שָׂרַף בָּאֵשׁ מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה
כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה׃ 18 וַיַּקְרֵב אֵת אֵיל הָעֹלָה
וַיִּסְמְכוּ אַהֲרֹן וּבָנָיו אֶת־יְדֵיהֶם עַל־רֹאשׁ הָאָיִל׃ 19 וַיִּשְׁחָט
וַיִּזְרֹק מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הַדָּם עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב׃ 20 וְאֶת־הָאַיִל
נִתַּח לִנְתָחָיו וַיַּקְטֵר מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הָרֹאשׁ וְאֶת־הַנְּתָחִים
וְאֶת־הַפָּדֶר׃ 21 וְאֶת־הַקֶּרֶב וְאֶת־הַכְּרָעַיִם רָחַץ בַּמָּיִם
וַיַּקְטֵר מֹשֶׁה אֶת־כָּל־הָאַיִל הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עֹלָה הוּא לְרֵיחַ־
נִיחֹחַ אִשֶּׁה הוּא לַיהוָה כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה׃
22 וַיַּקְרֵב אֶת־הָאַיִל הַשֵּׁנִי אֵיל הַמִּלֻּאִים וַיִּסְמְכוּ אַהֲרֹן
וּבָנָיו אֶת־יְדֵיהֶם עַל־רֹאשׁ הָאָיִל׃ 23 וַיִּשְׁחָט ׀ וַיִּקַּח מֹשֶׁה
מִדָּמוֹ וַיִּתֵּן עַל־תְּנוּךְ אֹזֶן־אַהֲרֹן הַיְמָנִית וְעַל־בֹּהֶן יָדוֹ
הַיְמָנִית וְעַל־בֹּהֶן רַגְלוֹ הַיְמָנִית׃ 24 וַיַּקְרֵב אֶת־בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן
וַיִּתֵּן מֹשֶׁה מִן־הַדָּם עַל־תְּנוּךְ אָזְנָם הַיְמָנִית וְעַל־בֹּהֶן
יָדָם הַיְמָנִית וְעַל־בֹּהֶן רַגְלָם הַיְמָנִית וַיִּזְרֹק מֹשֶׁה אֶת־
הַדָּם עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב׃ 25 וַיִּקַּח אֶת־הַחֵלֶב וְאֶת־הָאַלְיָה
וְאֶת־כָּל־הַחֵלֶב אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַקֶּרֶב וְאֵת יֹתֶרֶת הַכָּבֵד וְאֶת־
שְׁתֵּי הַכְּלָיֹת וְאֶת־חֶלְבְּהֶן וְאֵת שׁוֹק הַיָּמִין׃ 26 וּמִסַּל
הַמַּצּוֹת אֲשֶׁר ׀ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה לָקַח חַלַּת מַצָּה אַחַת וְחַלַּת

לְדֹרֹתָם׃ 37 זֹאת הַתּוֹרָה לָעֹלָה לַמִּנְחָה וְלַחַטָּאת וְלָאָשָׁם
וְלַמִּלּוּאִים וּלְזֶבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים׃ 38 אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה
בְּהַר סִינָי בְּיוֹם צַוֺּתוֹ אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְהַקְרִיב אֶת־
קָרְבְּנֵיהֶם לַיהוָה בְּמִדְבַּר סִינָי׃ פ

## CHAPTER VIII.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 קַח אֶת־אַהֲרֹן וְאֶת־
בָּנָיו אִתּוֹ וְאֵת הַבְּגָדִים וְאֵת שֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה וְאֵת ׀ פַּר
הַחַטָּאת וְאֵת שְׁנֵי הָאֵילִים וְאֵת סַל הַמַּצּוֹת׃ 3 וְאֵת כָּל־
הָעֵדָה הַקְהֵל אֶל־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃ 4 וַיַּעַשׂ מֹשֶׁה כַּאֲשֶׁר
צִוָּה יְהוָה אֹתוֹ וַתִּקָּהֵל הָעֵדָה אֶל־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃
5 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָעֵדָה זֶה הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה יְהוָה
לַעֲשׂוֹת׃ 6 וַיַּקְרֵב מֹשֶׁה אֶת־אַהֲרֹן וְאֶת־בָּנָיו וַיִּרְחַץ אֹתָם
בַּמָּיִם׃ 7 וַיִּתֵּן עָלָיו אֶת־הַכֻּתֹּנֶת וַיַּחְגֹּר אֹתוֹ בָּאַבְנֵט וַיַּלְבֵּשׁ
אֹתוֹ אֶת־הַמְּעִיל וַיִּתֵּן עָלָיו אֶת־הָאֵפֹד וַיַּחְגֹּר אֹתוֹ בְּחֵשֶׁב
הָאֵפֹד וַיֶּאְפֹּד לוֹ בּוֹ׃ 8 וַיָּשֶׂם עָלָיו אֶת־הַחֹשֶׁן וַיִּתֵּן אֶל־
הַחֹשֶׁן אֶת־הָאוּרִים וְאֶת־הַתֻּמִּים׃ 9 וַיָּשֶׂם אֶת־הַמִּצְנֶפֶת
עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ וַיָּשֶׂם עַל־הַמִּצְנֶפֶת אֶל־מוּל פָּנָיו אֵת צִיץ הַזָּהָב
נֵזֶר הַקֹּדֶשׁ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה׃ 10 וַיִּקַּח מֹשֶׁה
אֶת־שֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה וַיִּמְשַׁח אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ
וַיְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתָם׃ 11 וַיַּז מִמֶּנּוּ עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים
וַיִּמְשַׁח אֶת־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָיו וְאֶת־הַכִּיֹּר וְאֶת־כַּנּוֹ
לְקַדְּשָׁם׃ 12 וַיִּצֹק מִשֶּׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה עַל רֹאשׁ אַהֲרֹן וַיִּמְשַׁח
אֹתוֹ לְקַדְּשׁוֹ׃ 13 וַיַּקְרֵב מֹשֶׁה אֶת־בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן וַיַּלְבִּשֵׁם
כֻּתֳּנֹת וַיַּחְגֹּר אֹתָם אַבְנֵט וַיַּחֲבֹשׁ לָהֶם מִגְבָּעוֹת כַּאֲשֶׁר

תֹּאכַל בָּשָׂר מִזֶּבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים אֲשֶׁר לַיהוָה וְטֻמְאָתוֹ עָלָיו
וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא מֵעַמֶּיהָ׃ 21 וְנֶפֶשׁ כִּי־תִגַּע בְּכָל־
טָמֵא בְּטֻמְאַת אָדָם אוֹ ׀ בִּבְהֵמָה טְמֵאָה אוֹ בְּכָל־שֶׁקֶץ
טָמֵא וְאָכַל מִבְּשַׂר־זֶבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים אֲשֶׁר לַיהוָה וְנִכְרְתָה
הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא מֵעַמֶּיהָ׃ 22 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃
23 דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר כָּל־חֵלֶב שׁוֹר וְכֶשֶׂב וָעֵז
לֹא תֹאכֵלוּ׃ 24 וְחֵלֶב נְבֵלָה וְחֵלֶב טְרֵפָה יֵעָשֶׂה לְכָל־
מְלָאכָה וְאָכֹל לֹא תֹאכְלֻהוּ׃ 25 כִּי כָּל־אֹכֵל חֵלֶב מִן־
הַבְּהֵמָה אֲשֶׁר יַקְרִיב מִמֶּנָּה אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ
הָאֹכֶלֶת מֵעַמֶּיהָ׃ 26 וְכָל־דָּם לֹא תֹאכְלוּ בְּכֹל מוֹשְׁבֹתֵיכֶם
לָעוֹף וְלַבְּהֵמָה׃ 27 כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר־תֹּאכַל כָּל־דָּם וְנִכְרְתָה
הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא מֵעַמֶּיהָ׃ פ 28 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה
לֵּאמֹר׃ 29 דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר הַמַּקְרִיב אֶת־זֶבַח
שְׁלָמָיו לַיהוָה יָבִיא אֶת־קָרְבָּנוֹ לַיהוָה מִזֶּבַח שְׁלָמָיו׃
30 יָדָיו תְּבִיאֶינָה אֵת אִשֵּׁי יְהוָה אֶת־הַחֵלֶב עַל־הֶחָזֶה
יְבִיאֶנּוּ אֵת הֶחָזֶה לְהָנִיף אֹתוֹ תְּנוּפָה לִפְנֵי יְהוָה׃ 31 וְהִקְטִיר
הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַחֵלֶב הַמִּזְבֵּחָה וְהָיָה הֶחָזֶה לְאַהֲרֹן וּלְבָנָיו׃
32 וְאֵת שׁוֹק הַיָּמִין תִּתְּנוּ תְרוּמָה לַכֹּהֵן מִזִּבְחֵי שַׁלְמֵיכֶם׃
33 הַמַּקְרִיב אֶת־דַּם הַשְּׁלָמִים וְאֶת־הַחֵלֶב מִבְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן לוֹ
תִהְיֶה שׁוֹק הַיָּמִין לְמָנָה׃ 34 כִּי אֶת־חֲזֵה הַתְּנוּפָה וְאֵת ׀
שׁוֹק הַתְּרוּמָה לָקַחְתִּי מֵאֵת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִזִּבְחֵי שַׁלְמֵיהֶם
וָאֶתֵּן אֹתָם לְאַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן וּלְבָנָיו לְחָק־עוֹלָם מֵאֵת בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ 35 זֹאת מִשְׁחַת אַהֲרֹן וּמִשְׁחַת בָּנָיו מֵאִשֵּׁי יְהוָה
בְּיוֹם הִקְרִיב אֹתָם לְכַהֵן לַיהוָה׃ 36 אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה לָתֵת
לָהֶם בְּיוֹם מָשְׁחוֹ אֹתָם מֵאֵת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל חֻקַּת עוֹלָם

אֵת הָאַלְיָה וְאֶת־הַחֵלֶב הַמְכַסֶּה אֶת־הַקֶּרֶב׃ 4 וְאֵת שְׁתֵּי
הַכְּלָיֹת וְאֶת־הַחֵלֶב אֲשֶׁר עֲלֵיהֶן אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַכְּסָלִים וְאֶת־
הַיֹּתֶרֶת עַל־הַכָּבֵד עַל־הַכְּלָיֹת יְסִירֶנָּה׃ 5 וְהִקְטִיר אֹתָם
הַכֹּהֵן הַמִּזְבֵּחָה אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה אָשָׁם הוּא׃ 6 כָּל־זָכָר בַּכֹּהֲנִים
יֹאכְלֶנּוּ בְּמָקוֹם קָדוֹשׁ יֵאָכֵל קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים הוּא׃ 7 כַּחַטָּאת
כָּאָשָׁם תּוֹרָה אַחַת לָהֶם הַכֹּהֵן אֲשֶׁר יְכַפֶּר־בּוֹ לוֹ יִהְיֶה׃
8 וְהַכֹּהֵן הַמַּקְרִיב אֶת־עֹלַת אִישׁ עוֹר הָעֹלָה אֲשֶׁר הִקְרִיב
לַכֹּהֵן לוֹ יִהְיֶה׃ 9 וְכָל־מִנְחָה אֲשֶׁר תֵּאָפֶה בַּתַּנּוּר וְכָל־
נַעֲשָׂה בַמַּרְחֶשֶׁת וְעַל־מַחֲבַת לַכֹּהֵן הַמַּקְרִיב אֹתָהּ לוֹ
תִהְיֶה׃ 10 וְכָל־מִנְחָה בְלוּלָה־בַשֶּׁמֶן וַחֲרֵבָה לְכָל־בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן
תִּהְיֶה אִישׁ כְּאָחִיו׃ פ 11 וְזֹאת תּוֹרַת זֶבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים
אֲשֶׁר יַקְרִיב לַיהוָה׃ 12 אִם עַל־תּוֹדָה יַקְרִיבֶנּוּ וְהִקְרִיב ׀
עַל־זֶבַח הַתּוֹדָה חַלּוֹת מַצּוֹת בְּלוּלֹת בַּשֶּׁמֶן וּרְקִיקֵי מַצּוֹת
מְשֻׁחִים בַּשָּׁמֶן וְסֹלֶת מֻרְבֶּכֶת חַלֹּת בְּלוּלֹת בַּשָּׁמֶן׃ 13 עַל־
חַלֹּת לֶחֶם חָמֵץ יַקְרִיב קָרְבָּנוֹ עַל־זֶבַח תּוֹדַת שְׁלָמָיו׃
14 וְהִקְרִיב מִמֶּנּוּ אֶחָד מִכָּל־קָרְבָּן תְּרוּמָה לַיהוָה לַכֹּהֵן
הַזֹּרֵק אֶת־דַּם הַשְּׁלָמִים לוֹ יִהְיֶה׃ 15 וּבְשַׂר זֶבַח תּוֹדַת
שְׁלָמָיו בְּיוֹם קָרְבָּנוֹ יֵאָכֵל לֹא־יַנִּיחַ מִמֶּנּוּ עַד־בֹּקֶר׃
16 וְאִם־נֶדֶר ׀ אוֹ נְדָבָה זֶבַח קָרְבָּנוֹ בְּיוֹם הַקְרִיבוֹ אֶת־זִבְחוֹ
יֵאָכֵל וּמִמָּחֳרָת וְהַנּוֹתָר מִמֶּנּוּ יֵאָכֵל׃ 17 וְהַנּוֹתָר מִבְּשַׂר
הַזָּבַח בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי בָּאֵשׁ יִשָּׂרֵף׃ 18 וְאִם הֵאָכֹל יֵאָכֵל
מִבְּשַׂר־זֶבַח שְׁלָמָיו בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי לֹא יֵרָצֶה הַמַּקְרִיב
אֹתוֹ לֹא יֵחָשֵׁב לוֹ פִּגּוּל יִהְיֶה וְהַנֶּפֶשׁ הָאֹכֶלֶת מִמֶּנּוּ עֲוֺנָהּ
תִּשָּׂא׃ 19 וְהַבָּשָׂר אֲשֶׁר יִגַּע בְּכָל־טָמֵא לֹא יֵאָכֵל בָּאֵשׁ
יִשָּׂרֵף וְהַבָּשָׂר כָּל־טָהוֹר יֹאכַל בָּשָׂר׃ 20 וְהַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר־

חֶלְקָם נָתַתִּי אֹתָהּ מֵאִשָּׁי קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים הִוא כַּחַטָּאת
וְכָאָשָׁם׃ 11 כָּל־זָכָר בִּבְנֵי אַהֲרֹן יֹאכְלֶנָּה חָק־עוֹלָם
לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם מֵאִשֵּׁי יְהוָה כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־יִגַּע בָּהֶם יִקְדָּשׁ׃ פ
12 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 13 זֶה קָרְבַּן אַהֲרֹן
וּבָנָיו אֲשֶׁר־יַקְרִיבוּ לַיהוָה בְּיוֹם הִמָּשַׁח אֹתוֹ עֲשִׂירִת הָאֵפָה
סֹלֶת מִנְחָה תָּמִיד מַחֲצִיתָהּ בַּבֹּקֶר וּמַחֲצִיתָהּ בָּעָרֶב׃
14 עַל־מַחֲבַת בַּשֶּׁמֶן תֵּעָשֶׂה מֻרְבֶּכֶת תְּבִיאֶנָּה תֻּפִינֵי מִנְחַת
פִּתִּים תַּקְרִיב רֵיחַ־נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה׃ 15 וְהַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ תַּחְתָּיו
מִבָּנָיו יַעֲשֶׂה אֹתָהּ חָק־עוֹלָם לַיהוָה כָּלִיל תָּקְטָר׃ 16 וְכָל־
מִנְחַת כֹּהֵן כָּלִיל תִּהְיֶה לֹא תֵאָכֵל׃ פ 17 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה
אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 18 דַּבֵּר אֶל־אַהֲרֹן וְאֶל־בָּנָיו לֵאמֹר זֹאת
תּוֹרַת הַחַטָּאת בִּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר תִּשָּׁחֵט הָעֹלָה תִּשָּׁחֵט
הַחַטָּאת לִפְנֵי יְהוָה קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים הִוא׃ 19 הַכֹּהֵן הַמְחַטֵּא
אֹתָהּ יֹאכְלֶנָּה בְּמָקוֹם קָדֹשׁ תֵּאָכֵל בַּחֲצַר אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃
20 כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־יִגַּע בִּבְשָׂרָהּ יִקְדָּשׁ וַאֲשֶׁר יִזֶּה מִדָּמָהּ עַל־
הַבֶּגֶד אֲשֶׁר יִזֶּה עָלֶיהָ תְּכַבֵּס בְּמָקוֹם קָדֹשׁ׃ 21 וּכְלִי־חֶרֶשׂ
אֲשֶׁר תְּבֻשַּׁל־בּוֹ יִשָּׁבֵר וְאִם־בִּכְלִי נְחֹשֶׁת בֻּשָּׁלָה וּמֹרַק
וְשֻׁטַּף בַּמָּיִם׃ 22 כָּל־זָכָר בַּכֹּהֲנִים יֹאכַל אֹתָהּ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים
הִוא׃ 23 וְכָל־חַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר יוּבָא מִדָּמָהּ אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד
לְכַפֵּר בַּקֹּדֶשׁ לֹא תֵאָכֵל בָּאֵשׁ תִּשָּׂרֵף׃ פ

## CHAPTER VII.

1 וְזֹאת תּוֹרַת הָאָשָׁם קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים הוּא׃ 2 בִּמְקוֹם
אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁחֲטוּ אֶת־הָעֹלָה יִשְׁחֲטוּ אֶת־הָאָשָׁם וְאֶת־דָּמוֹ
יִזְרֹק עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב׃ 3 וְאֶת כָּל־חֶלְבּוֹ יַקְרִיב מִמֶּנּוּ

הַפִּקָּדוֹן אֲשֶׁר הָפְקַד אִתּוֹ אוֹ אֶת־הָאֲבֵדָה אֲשֶׁר מָצָא׃
24 אוֹ מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר־יִשָּׁבַע עָלָיו לַשֶּׁקֶר וְשִׁלַּם אֹתוֹ בְּרֹאשׁוֹ
וַחֲמִשִׁתָיו יֹסֵף עָלָיו לַאֲשֶׁר הוּא לוֹ יִתְּנֶנּוּ בְּיוֹם אַשְׁמָתוֹ׃
25 וְאֶת־אֲשָׁמוֹ יָבִיא לַיהוָה אַיִל תָּמִים מִן־הַצֹּאן בְּעֶרְכְּךָ
לְאָשָׁם אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן׃ 26 וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וְנִסְלַח
לוֹ עַל־אַחַת מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה לְאַשְׁמָה בָהּ׃

פ פ פ

## CHAPTER VI.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 צַו אֶת־אַהֲרֹן וְאֶת
בָּנָיו לֵאמֹר זֹאת תּוֹרַת הָעֹלָה הִוא הָעֹלָה עַל מוֹקְדָה עַל־
הַמִּזְבֵּחַ כָּל־הַלַּיְלָה עַד־הַבֹּקֶר וְאֵשׁ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ תּוּקַד בּוֹ׃
3 וְלָבַשׁ הַכֹּהֵן מִדּוֹ בַד וּמִכְנְסֵי בַד יִלְבַּשׁ עַל־בְּשָׂרוֹ וְהֵרִים
אֶת־הַדֶּשֶׁן אֲשֶׁר תֹּאכַל הָאֵשׁ אֶת־הָעֹלָה עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְשָׂמוֹ
אֵצֶל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃ 4 וּפָשַׁט אֶת־בְּגָדָיו וְלָבַשׁ בְּגָדִים אֲחֵרִים
וְהוֹצִיא אֶת־הַדֶּשֶׁן אֶל־מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה אֶל־מָקוֹם טָהוֹר׃
5 וְהָאֵשׁ עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ תּוּקַד־בּוֹ לֹא תִכְבֶּה וּבִעֵר עָלֶיהָ הַכֹּהֵן
עֵצִים בַּבֹּקֶר בַּבֹּקֶר וְעָרַךְ עָלֶיהָ הָעֹלָה וְהִקְטִיר עָלֶיהָ
חֶלְבֵי הַשְּׁלָמִים׃ 6 אֵשׁ תָּמִיד תּוּקַד עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לֹא
תִכְבֶּה׃ ס 7 וְזֹאת תּוֹרַת הַמִּנְחָה הַקְרֵב אֹתָהּ בְּנֵי־
אַהֲרֹן לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֶל־פְּנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃ 8 וְהֵרִים מִמֶּנּוּ בְּקֻמְצוֹ
מִסֹּלֶת הַמִּנְחָה וּמִשַּׁמְנָהּ וְאֵת כָּל־הַלְּבֹנָה אֲשֶׁר עַל־
הַמִּנְחָה וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ אַזְכָּרָתָהּ לַיהוָה׃
9 וְהַנּוֹתֶרֶת מִמֶּנָּה יֹאכְלוּ אַהֲרֹן וּבָנָיו מַצּוֹת תֵּאָכֵל בְּמָקוֹם
קָדֹשׁ בַּחֲצַר אֹהֶל־מוֹעֵד יֹאכְלוּהָ׃ 10 לֹא תֵאָפֶה חָמֵץ

חַטָּאת הֽוּא׃ 10 וְאֶת־הַשֵּׁנִי יַעֲשֶׂה עֹלָה כַּמִּשְׁפָּט וְכִפֶּר
עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן מֵחַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר־חָטָא וְנִסְלַח לוֹ׃ ס 11 וְאִם־לֹא
תַשִּׂיג יָדוֹ לִשְׁתֵּי תֹרִים אוֹ לִשְׁנֵי בְנֵי־יוֹנָה וְהֵבִיא אֶת־
קָרְבָּנוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָטָא עֲשִׂירִת הָאֵפָה סֹלֶת לְחַטָּאת לֹא־
יָשִׂים עָלֶיהָ שֶׁמֶן וְלֹא־יִתֵּן עָלֶיהָ לְבֹנָה כִּי חַטָּאת הִוא׃
12 וֶהֱבִיאָהּ אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן וְקָמַץ הַכֹּהֵן ׀ מִמֶּנָּה מְלוֹא קֻמְצוֹ
אֶת־אַזְכָּרָתָהּ וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עַל אִשֵּׁי יְהוָה חַטָּאת
הִוא׃ 13 וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן עַל־חַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר־חָטָא מֵאַחַת
מֵאֵלֶּה וְנִסְלַח לוֹ וְהָיְתָה לַכֹּהֵן כַּמִּנְחָה׃ ס 14 וַיְדַבֵּר
יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 15 נֶפֶשׁ כִּי־תִמְעֹל מַעַל וְחָטְאָה
בִּשְׁגָגָה מִקָּדְשֵׁי יְהוָה וְהֵבִיא אֶת־אֲשָׁמוֹ לַיהוָה אַיִל תָּמִים
מִן־הַצֹּאן בְּעֶרְכְּךָ כֶּסֶף־שְׁקָלִים בְּשֶׁקֶל־הַקֹּדֶשׁ לְאָשָׁם׃
16 וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר חָטָא מִן־הַקֹּדֶשׁ יְשַׁלֵּם וְאֶת־חֲמִישִׁתוֹ יוֹסֵף
עָלָיו וְנָתַן אֹתוֹ לַכֹּהֵן וְהַכֹּהֵן יְכַפֵּר עָלָיו בְּאֵיל הָאָשָׁם
וְנִסְלַח לוֹ׃ פ 17 וְאִם־נֶפֶשׁ כִּי תֶחֱטָא וְעָשְׂתָה אַחַת
מִכָּל־מִצְוֹת יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא תֵעָשֶׂינָה וְלֹא־יָדַע וְאָשֵׁם
וְנָשָׂא עֲוֺנוֹ׃ 18 וְהֵבִיא אַיִל תָּמִים מִן־הַצֹּאן בְּעֶרְכְּךָ לְאָשָׁם
אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן עַל שִׁגְגָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר־שָׁגָג וְהוּא
לֹא־יָדַע וְנִסְלַח לוֹ׃ 19 אָשָׁם הוּא אָשֹׁם אָשַׁם לַיהוָה׃ פ
20 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 21 נֶפֶשׁ כִּי תֶחֱטָא
וּמָעֲלָה מַעַל בַּיהוָה וְכִחֵשׁ בַּעֲמִיתוֹ בְּפִקָּדוֹן אוֹ־בִתְשׂוּמֶת
יָד אוֹ בְגָזֵל אוֹ עָשַׁק אֶת־עֲמִיתוֹ׃ 22 אוֹ־מָצָא אֲבֵדָה
וְכִחֶשׁ בָּהּ וְנִשְׁבַּע עַל־שָׁקֶר עַל־אַחַת מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה
הָאָדָם לַחֲטֹא בָהֵנָּה׃ 23 וְהָיָה כִּי־יֶחֱטָא וְאָשֵׁם וְהֵשִׁיב
אֶת־הַגְּזֵלָה אֲשֶׁר גָּזָל אוֹ אֶת־הָעֹשֶׁק אֲשֶׁר עָשָׁק אוֹ אֶת־

הַחַטָּאת וְשָׁחַט אֹתָהּ לְחַטָּאת בִּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁחַט אֶת
הָעֹלָה׃ 34 וְלָקַח הַכֹּהֵן מִדַּם הַחַטָּאת בְּאֶצְבָּעוֹ וְנָתַן עַל־
קַרְנֹת מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה וְאֶת־כָּל־דָּמָהּ יִשְׁפֹּךְ אֶל־יְסוֹד הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃
35 וְאֶת־כָּל־חֶלְבָּהּ יָסִיר כַּאֲשֶׁר יוּסַר חֵלֶב הַכֶּשֶׂב מִזֶּבַח
הַשְּׁלָמִים וְהִקְטִיר הַכֹּהֵן אֹתָם הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עַל אִשֵּׁי יְהוָה
וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן עַל־חַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר־חָטָא וְנִסְלַח לוֹ׃ פ

## CHAPTER V.

1 וְנֶפֶשׁ כִּי־תֶחֱטָא וְשָׁמְעָה קוֹל אָלָה וְהוּא עֵד אוֹ רָאָה
אוֹ יָדָע אִם־לוֹא יַגִּיד וְנָשָׂא עֲוֺנוֹ׃ 2 אוֹ נֶפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר תִּגַּע
בְּכָל־דָּבָר טָמֵא אוֹ בְנִבְלַת חַיָּה טְמֵאָה אוֹ בְּנִבְלַת בְּהֵמָה
טְמֵאָה אוֹ בְּנִבְלַת שֶׁרֶץ טָמֵא וְנֶעְלַם מִמֶּנּוּ וְהוּא טָמֵא
וְאָשֵׁם׃ 3 אוֹ כִי יִגַּע בְּטֻמְאַת אָדָם לְכֹל טֻמְאָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר
יִטְמָא בָּהּ וְנֶעְלַם מִמֶּנּוּ וְהוּא יָדַע וְאָשֵׁם׃ 4 אוֹ נֶפֶשׁ כִּי
תִשָּׁבַע לְבַטֵּא בִשְׂפָתַיִם לְהָרַע ׀ אוֹ לְהֵיטִיב לְכֹל אֲשֶׁר
יְבַטֵּא הָאָדָם בִּשְׁבֻעָה וְנֶעְלַם מִמֶּנּוּ וְהוּא־יָדַע וְאָשֵׁם לְאַחַת
מֵאֵלֶּה׃ 5 וְהָיָה כִי־יֶאְשַׁם לְאַחַת מֵאֵלֶּה וְהִתְוַדָּה אֲשֶׁר
חָטָא עָלֶיהָ׃ 6 וְהֵבִיא אֶת־אֲשָׁמוֹ לַיהוָה עַל חַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר
חָטָא נְקֵבָה מִן־הַצֹּאן כִּשְׂבָּה אוֹ־שְׂעִירַת עִזִּים לְחַטָּאת
וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן מֵחַטָּאתוֹ׃ 7 וְאִם־לֹא תַגִּיעַ יָדוֹ דֵּי
שֶׂה וְהֵבִיא אֶת־אֲשָׁמוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָטָא שְׁתֵּי תֹרִים אוֹ־שְׁנֵי
בְנֵי־יוֹנָה לַיהוָה אֶחָד לְחַטָּאת וְאֶחָד לְעֹלָה׃ 8 וְהֵבִיא
אֹתָם אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן וְהִקְרִיב אֶת־אֲשֶׁר לַחַטָּאת רִאשׁוֹנָה וּמָלַק
אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ מִמּוּל עָרְפּוֹ וְלֹא יַבְדִּיל׃ 9 וְהִזָּה מִדַּם הַחַטָּאת
עַל־קִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְהַנִּשְׁאָר בַּדָּם יִמָּצֵה אֶל־יְסוֹד הַמִּזְבֵּחַ

הַדָּם יִשְׁפֹּךְ אֶל־יְסוֹד מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה אֲשֶׁר־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃
19 וְאֵת כָּל־חֶלְבּוֹ יָרִים מִמֶּנּוּ וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחָה׃ 20 וְעָשָׂה
לַפָּר כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לְפַר הַחַטָּאת כֵּן יַעֲשֶׂה־לּוֹ וְכִפֶּר עֲלֵהֶם
הַכֹּהֵן וְנִסְלַח לָהֶם׃ 21 וְהוֹצִיא אֶת־הַפָּר אֶל־מִחוּץ
לַמַּחֲנֶה וְשָׂרַף אֹתוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׂרַף אֵת הַפָּר הָרִאשׁוֹן חַטַּאת
הַקָּהָל הוּא׃ פ 22 אֲשֶׁר נָשִׂיא יֶחֱטָא וְעָשָׂה אַחַת
מִכָּל־מִצְוֹת יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תֵעָשֶׂינָה בִּשְׁגָגָה וְאָשֵׁם׃
23 אוֹ־הוֹדַע אֵלָיו חַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָטָא בָּהּ וְהֵבִיא אֶת־
קָרְבָּנוֹ שְׂעִיר עִזִּים זָכָר תָּמִים׃ 24 וְסָמַךְ יָדוֹ עַל־רֹאשׁ
הַשָּׂעִיר וְשָׁחַט אֹתוֹ בִּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׁחַט אֶת־הָעֹלָה לִפְנֵי
יְהוָה חַטָּאת הוּא׃ 25 וְלָקַח הַכֹּהֵן מִדַּם הַחַטָּאת בְּאֶצְבָּעוֹ
וְנָתַן עַל־קַרְנֹת מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה וְאֶת־דָּמוֹ יִשְׁפֹּךְ אֶל־יְסוֹד
מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה׃ 26 וְאֶת־כָּל־חֶלְבּוֹ יַקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחָה כְּחֵלֶב
זֶבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן מֵחַטָּאתוֹ וְנִסְלַח לוֹ׃ פ
27 וְאִם־נֶפֶשׁ אַחַת תֶּחֱטָא בִשְׁגָגָה מֵעַם הָאָרֶץ בַּעֲשֹׂתָהּ
אַחַת מִמִּצְוֹת יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תֵעָשֶׂינָה וְאָשֵׁם׃ 28 אוֹ
הוֹדַע אֵלָיו חַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָטָא וְהֵבִיא קָרְבָּנוֹ שְׂעִירַת עִזִּים
תְּמִימָה נְקֵבָה עַל־חַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָטָא׃ 29 וְסָמַךְ אֶת־יָדוֹ
עַל רֹאשׁ הַחַטָּאת וְשָׁחַט אֶת־הַחַטָּאת בִּמְקוֹם הָעֹלָה׃
30 וְלָקַח הַכֹּהֵן מִדָּמָהּ בְּאֶצְבָּעוֹ וְנָתַן עַל־קַרְנֹת מִזְבַּח
הָעֹלָה וְאֶת־כָּל־דָּמָהּ יִשְׁפֹּךְ אֶל־יְסוֹד הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃ 31 וְאֶת־
כָּל־חֶלְבָּהּ יָסִיר כַּאֲשֶׁר הוּסַר חֵלֶב מֵעַל זֶבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים
וְהִקְטִיר הַכֹּהֵן הַמִּזְבֵּחָה לְרֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו
הַכֹּהֵן וְנִסְלַח לוֹ׃ פ 32 וְאִם־כֶּבֶשׂ יָבִיא קָרְבָּנוֹ לְחַטָּאת
נְקֵבָה תְמִימָה יְבִיאֶנָּה׃ 33 וְסָמַךְ אֶת־יָדוֹ עַל רֹאשׁ

מוֹעֵד לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וְסָמַךְ אֶת־יָדוֹ עַל־רֹאשׁ הַפָּר וְשָׁחַט אֶת־
הַפָּר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה׃ 5 וְלָקַח הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ מִדַּם הַפָּר וְהֵבִיא
אֹתוֹ אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃ 6 וְטָבַל הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־אֶצְבָּעוֹ בַּדָּם וְהִזָּה
מִן־הַדָּם שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֶת־פְּנֵי פָּרֹכֶת הַקֹּדֶשׁ׃
7 וְנָתַן הַכֹּהֵן מִן־הַדָּם עַל־קַרְנוֹת מִזְבַּח קְטֹרֶת הַסַּמִּים לִפְנֵי
יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר בְּאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְאֵת ׀ כָּל־דַּם הַפָּר יִשְׁפֹּךְ אֶל־יְסוֹד
מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה אֲשֶׁר־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃ 8 וְאֶת־כָּל־חֵלֶב פַּר
הַחַטָּאת יָרִים מִמֶּנּוּ אֶת־הַחֵלֶב הַמְכַסֶּה עַל־הַקֶּרֶב וְאֵת
כָּל־הַחֵלֶב אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַקֶּרֶב׃ 9 וְאֵת שְׁתֵּי הַכְּלָיֹת וְאֶת־הַחֵלֶב
אֲשֶׁר עֲלֵיהֶן אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַכְּסָלִים וְאֶת־הַיֹּתֶרֶת עַל־הַכָּבֵד
עַל־הַכְּלָיוֹת יְסִירֶנָּה׃ 10 כַּאֲשֶׁר יוּרַם מִשּׁוֹר זֶבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים
וְהִקְטִירָם הַכֹּהֵן עַל מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה׃ 11 וְאֶת־עוֹר הַפָּר
וְאֶת־כָּל־בְּשָׂרוֹ עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ וְעַל־כְּרָעָיו וְקִרְבּוֹ וּפִרְשׁוֹ׃
12 וְהוֹצִיא אֶת־כָּל־הַפָּר אֶל־מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה אֶל־מָקוֹם
טָהוֹר אֶל־שֶׁפֶךְ הַדֶּשֶׁן וְשָׂרַף אֹתוֹ עַל־עֵצִים בָּאֵשׁ עַל־
שֶׁפֶךְ הַדֶּשֶׁן יִשָּׂרֵף׃ פ 13 וְאִם כָּל־עֲדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁגּוּ
וְנֶעְלַם דָּבָר מֵעֵינֵי הַקָּהָל וְעָשׂוּ אַחַת מִכָּל־מִצְוֹת יְהוָה
אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תֵעָשֶׂינָה וְאָשֵׁמוּ׃ 14 וְנוֹדְעָה הַחַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר
חָטְאוּ עָלֶיהָ וְהִקְרִיבוּ הַקָּהָל פַּר בֶּן־בָּקָר לְחַטָּאת וְהֵבִיאוּ
אֹתוֹ לִפְנֵי אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃ 15 וְסָמְכוּ זִקְנֵי הָעֵדָה אֶת־יְדֵיהֶם
עַל־רֹאשׁ הַפָּר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וְשָׁחַט אֶת־הַפָּר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה׃
16 וְהֵבִיא הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ מִדַּם הַפָּר אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃
17 וְטָבַל הַכֹּהֵן אֶצְבָּעוֹ מִן־הַדָּם וְהִזָּה שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים לִפְנֵי
יְהוָה אֵת פְּנֵי הַפָּרֹכֶת׃ 18 וּמִן־הַדָּם יִתֵּן ׀ עַל־קַרְנֹת
הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר בְּאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְאֵת כָּל־

7 אִם־כֶּשֶׂב הוּא־מַקְרִיב אֶת־קָרְבָּנוֹ וְהִקְרִיב אֹתוֹ לִפְנֵי
יְהוָה׃ 8 וְסָמַךְ אֶת־יָדוֹ עַל־רֹאשׁ קָרְבָּנוֹ וְשָׁחַט אֹתוֹ
לִפְנֵי אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְזָרְקוּ בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן אֶת־דָּמוֹ עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ
סָבִיב׃ 9 וְהִקְרִיב מִזֶּבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה חֶלְבּוֹ
הָאַלְיָה תְמִימָה לְעֻמַּת הֶעָצֶה יְסִירֶנָּה וְאֶת־הַחֵלֶב הַמְכַסֶּה
אֶת־הַקֶּרֶב וְאֵת כָּל־הַחֵלֶב אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַקֶּרֶב׃ 10 וְאֵת שְׁתֵּי
הַכְּלָיֹת וְאֶת־הַחֵלֶב אֲשֶׁר עֲלֵהֶן אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַכְּסָלִים וְאֶת־
הַיֹּתֶרֶת עַל־הַכָּבֵד עַל־הַכְּלָיֹת יְסִירֶנָּה׃ 11 וְהִקְטִירוֹ הַכֹּהֵן
הַמִּזְבֵּחָה לֶחֶם אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה׃ פ 12 וְאִם־עֵז קָרְבָּנוֹ
וְהִקְרִיבוֹ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה׃ 13 וְסָמַךְ אֶת־יָדוֹ עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ וְשָׁחַט
אֹתוֹ לִפְנֵי אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְזָרְקוּ בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן אֶת־דָּמוֹ עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ
סָבִיב׃ 14 וְהִקְרִיב מִמֶּנּוּ קָרְבָּנוֹ אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה אֶת־הַחֵלֶב
הַמְכַסֶּה אֶת־הַקֶּרֶב וְאֵת כָּל־הַחֵלֶב אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַקֶּרֶב׃ 15 וְאֵת
שְׁתֵּי הַכְּלָיֹת וְאֶת־הַחֵלֶב אֲשֶׁר עֲלֵהֶן אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַכְּסָלִים
וְאֶת־הַיֹּתֶרֶת עַל־הַכָּבֵד עַל־הַכְּלָיֹת יְסִירֶנָּה׃ 16 וְהִקְטִירָם
הַכֹּהֵן הַמִּזְבֵּחָה לֶחֶם אִשֶּׁה לְרֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ כָּל־חֵלֶב לַיהוָה׃
17 חֻקַּת עוֹלָם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם בְּכֹל מוֹשְׁבֹתֵיכֶם כָּל־חֵלֶב וְכָל־דָּם
לֹא תֹאכֵלוּ׃ פ

## CHAPTER IV.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
לֵאמֹר נֶפֶשׁ כִּי־תֶחֱטָא בִשְׁגָגָה מִכֹּל מִצְוֺת יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא
תֵעָשֶׂינָה וְעָשָׂה מֵאַחַת מֵהֵנָּה׃ 3 אִם־הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ יֶחֱטָא
לְאַשְׁמַת הָעָם וְהִקְרִיב עַל חַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָטָא פַּר בֶּן־בָּקָר
תָּמִים לַיהוָה לְחַטָּאת׃ 4 וְהֵבִיא אֶת־הַפָּר אֶל־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל

אִשֵּׁה רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לַֽיהוָֽה׃ 10 וְהַנּוֹתֶרֶת מִן־הַמִּנְחָה לְאַהֲרֹן
וּלְבָנָיו קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים מֵאִשֵּׁי יְהוָֽה׃ 11 כָּל־הַמִּנְחָה אֲשֶׁר
תַּקְרִיבוּ לַֽיהוָה לֹא תֵעָשֶׂה חָמֵץ כִּי כָל־שְׂאֹר וְכָל־דְּבַשׁ
לֹא־תַקְטִירוּ מִמֶּנּוּ אִשֶּׁה לַֽיהוָֽה׃ 12 קָרְבַּן רֵאשִׁית תַּקְרִיבוּ
אֹתָם לַֽיהוָה וְאֶל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לֹא־יַעֲלוּ לְרֵיחַ נִיחֹֽחַ׃ 13 וְכָל־
קָרְבַּן מִנְחָתְךָ בַּמֶּלַח תִּמְלָח וְלֹא תַשְׁבִּית מֶלַח בְּרִית
אֱלֹהֶיךָ מֵעַל מִנְחָתֶךָ עַל כָּל־קָרְבָּנְךָ תַּקְרִיב מֶֽלַח׃ ס
14 וְאִם־תַּקְרִיב מִנְחַת בִּכּוּרִים לַֽיהוָה אָבִיב קָלוּי בָּאֵשׁ
גֶּרֶשׂ כַּרְמֶל תַּקְרִיב אֵת מִנְחַת בִּכּוּרֶֽיךָ׃ 15 וְנָתַתָּ עָלֶיהָ
שֶׁמֶן וְשַׂמְתָּ עָלֶיהָ לְבֹנָה מִנְחָה הִֽוא׃ 16 וְהִקְטִיר
הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־אַזְכָּרָתָהּ מִגִּרְשָׂהּ וּמִשַּׁמְנָהּ עַל כָּל־לְבֹנָתָהּ
אִשֶּׁה לַֽיהוָֽה׃ פ

## CHAPTER III.

1 וְאִם־זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים קָרְבָּנוֹ אִם מִן־הַבָּקָר הוּא מַקְרִיב
אִם־זָכָר אִם־נְקֵבָה תָּמִים יַקְרִיבֶנּוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָֽה׃ 2 וְסָמַךְ
יָדוֹ עַל־רֹאשׁ קָרְבָּנוֹ וּשְׁחָטוֹ פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְזָרְקוּ בְּנֵי
אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֲנִים אֶת־הַדָּם עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִֽיב׃ 3 וְהִקְרִיב
מִזֶּבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים אִשֶּׁה לַֽיהוָה אֶת־הַחֵלֶב הַמְכַסֶּה אֶת
הַקֶּרֶב וְאֵת כָּל־הַחֵלֶב אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַקֶּֽרֶב׃ 4 וְאֵת שְׁתֵּי הַכְּלָיֹת
וְאֶת־הַחֵלֶב אֲשֶׁר עֲלֵהֶן אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַכְּסָלִים וְאֶת־הַיֹּתֶרֶת
עַל־הַכָּבֵד עַל־הַכְּלָיוֹת יְסִירֶֽנָּה׃ 5 וְהִקְטִירוּ אֹתוֹ בְנֵֽי־
אַהֲרֹן הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עַל־הָעֹלָה אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָעֵצִים אֲשֶׁר עַל־
הָאֵשׁ אִשֵּׁה רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לַֽיהוָֽה׃ פ 6 וְאִם־מִן־הַצֹּאן
קָרְבָּנוֹ לְזֶבַח שְׁלָמִים לַֽיהוָה זָכָר אוֹ נְקֵבָה תָּמִים יַקְרִיבֶֽנּוּ׃

עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃ 13 וְהַקֶּרֶב וְהַכְּרָעַיִם יִרְחַץ בַּמָּיִם וְהִקְרִיב
הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַכֹּל וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עֹלָה הוּא אִשֵּׁה רֵיחַ
נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה׃ פ 14 וְאִם מִן־הָעוֹף עֹלָה קָרְבָּנוֹ לַיהוָה
וְהִקְרִיב מִן־הַתֹּרִים אוֹ מִן־בְּנֵי הַיּוֹנָה אֶת־קָרְבָּנוֹ׃ 15 וְהִקְרִיבוֹ
הַכֹּהֵן אֶל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וּמָלַק אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחָה
וְנִמְצָה דָמוֹ עַל קִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃ 16 וְהֵסִיר אֶת־מֻרְאָתוֹ
בְּנֹצָתָהּ וְהִשְׁלִיךְ אֹתָהּ אֵצֶל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ קֵדְמָה אֶל־מְקוֹם
הַדָּשֶׁן׃ 17 וְשִׁסַּע אֹתוֹ בִכְנָפָיו לֹא יַבְדִּיל וְהִקְטִיר אֹתוֹ
הַכֹּהֵן הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עַל־הָעֵצִים אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָאֵשׁ עֹלָה הוּא
אִשֵּׁה רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה׃ ס

## CHAPTER II.

1 וְנֶפֶשׁ כִּי־תַקְרִיב קָרְבַּן מִנְחָה לַיהוָה סֹלֶת יִהְיֶה קָרְבָּנוֹ
וְיָצַק עָלֶיהָ שֶׁמֶן וְנָתַן עָלֶיהָ לְבֹנָה׃ 2 וֶהֱבִיאָהּ אֶל־בְּנֵי
אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֲנִים וְקָמַץ מִשָּׁם מְלֹא קֻמְצוֹ מִסָּלְתָּהּ וּמִשַּׁמְנָהּ
עַל כָּל־לְבֹנָתָהּ וְהִקְטִיר הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־אַזְכָּרָתָהּ הַמִּזְבֵּחָה אִשֵּׁה
רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה׃ 3 וְהַנּוֹתֶרֶת מִן־הַמִּנְחָה לְאַהֲרֹן וּלְבָנָיו
קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים מֵאִשֵּׁי יְהוָה׃ ס 4 וְכִי תַקְרִב קָרְבַּן מִנְחָה
מַאֲפֵה תַנּוּר סֹלֶת חַלּוֹת מַצֹּת בְּלוּלֹת בַּשֶּׁמֶן וּרְקִיקֵי מַצּוֹת
מְשֻׁחִים בַּשָּׁמֶן׃ ס 5 וְאִם־מִנְחָה עַל־הַמַּחֲבַת קָרְבָּנֶךָ סֹלֶת
בְּלוּלָה בַשֶּׁמֶן מַצָּה תִהְיֶה׃ 6 פָּתוֹת אֹתָהּ פִּתִּים וְיָצַקְתָּ
עָלֶיהָ שָׁמֶן מִנְחָה הִוא׃ ס 7 וְאִם־מִנְחַת מַרְחֶשֶׁת קָרְבָּנֶךָ
סֹלֶת בַּשֶּׁמֶן תֵּעָשֶׂה׃ 8 וְהֵבֵאתָ אֶת־הַמִּנְחָה אֲשֶׁר יֵעָשֶׂה
מֵאֵלֶּה לַיהוָה וְהִקְרִיבָהּ אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן וְהִגִּישָׁהּ אֶל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃
9 וְהֵרִים הַכֹּהֵן מִן־הַמִּנְחָה אֶת־אַזְכָּרָתָהּ וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחָה

# LEVITICUS.

## CHAPTER I.

1 וַיִּקְרָא אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֵלָיו מֵאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד
לֵאמֹר׃ 2 דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם אָדָם כִּי־
יַקְרִיב מִכֶּם קָרְבָּן לַיהוָה מִן־הַבְּהֵמָה מִן־הַבָּקָר וּמִן־הַצֹּאן
תַּקְרִיבוּ אֶת־קָרְבַּנְכֶם׃ 3 אִם־עֹלָה קָרְבָּנוֹ מִן־הַבָּקָר זָכָר
תָּמִים יַקְרִיבֶנּוּ אֶל־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד יַקְרִיב אֹתוֹ לִרְצֹנוֹ
לִפְנֵי יְהוָה 4 וְסָמַךְ יָדוֹ עַל רֹאשׁ הָעֹלָה וְנִרְצָה לוֹ לְכַפֵּר
עָלָיו׃ 5 וְשָׁחַט אֶת־בֶּן הַבָּקָר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וְהִקְרִיבוּ בְּנֵי
אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֲנִים אֶת־הַדָּם וְזָרְקוּ אֶת־הַדָּם עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב
אֲשֶׁר־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃ 6 וְהִפְשִׁיט אֶת־הָעֹלָה וְנִתַּח אֹתָהּ
לִנְתָחֶיהָ׃ 7 וְנָתְנוּ בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן אֵשׁ עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְעָרְכוּ
עֵצִים עַל־הָאֵשׁ׃ 8 וְעָרְכוּ בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֲנִים אֵת הַנְּתָחִים
אֶת־הָרֹאשׁ וְאֶת־הַפָּדֶר עַל־הָעֵצִים אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָאֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר
עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃ 9 וְקִרְבּוֹ וּכְרָעָיו יִרְחַץ בַּמָּיִם וְהִקְטִיר הַכֹּהֵן
אֶת־הַכֹּל הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עֹלָה אִשֵּׁה רֵיחַ־נִיחוֹחַ לַיהוָה׃ ס
10 וְאִם־מִן־הַצֹּאן קָרְבָּנוֹ מִן־הַכְּשָׂבִים אוֹ מִן־הָעִזִּים לְעֹלָה
זָכָר תָּמִים יַקְרִיבֶנּוּ׃ 11 וְשָׁחַט אֹתוֹ עַל יֶרֶךְ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ
צָפֹנָה לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וְזָרְקוּ בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֲנִים אֶת־דָּמוֹ עַל־
הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב׃ 12 וְנִתַּח אֹתוֹ לִנְתָחָיו וְאֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ וְאֶת־
פִּדְרוֹ וְעָרַךְ הַכֹּהֵן אֹתָם עַל־הָעֵצִים אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָאֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר

# סֵפֶר

# וַיִּקְרָא׃

---

# THE BOOK

OF

# LEVITICUS.

וִהְיִיתֶם לִי קְדֹשִׁים כִּי קָדוֹשׁ אֲנִי יְהוָֹה
וָאַבְדִּל אֶתְכֶם מִן־הָעַמִּים לִהְיוֹת לִי׃

XX. 26.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND Co.
1867.

# A HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

## LEVITICUS.

## BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

# A
# HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT WITH A NEW TRANSLATION:

Vol. I. Genesis.—Hebrew and English, *price* 18 *shillings;* Abridged or English Edition adapted to the general Reader, *price* 12 *shillings.*

Vol. II. Exodus.—Hebrew and English, *price* 15 *shillings;* Abridged Edition, *price* 12 *shillings.*

---

# A
# HEBREW GRAMMAR

## WITH EXERCISES,

### IN TWO PARTS.

Part I. The Outlines of the Language, with Exercises, being a practical Introduction to the study of Hebrew. Revised Edition. *Price* 12 *sh.* 6 *d.*

Part II. The exceptional Forms and Constructions, preceded by an Essay on the History of Hebrew Grammar. *Price* 12 *sh.* 6 *d.*

A Key to the Exercises of the First Part. *Price* 5 *sh.*

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER.

# COMMENTARY

ON

# LEVITICUS.

## PART II.

## BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

A HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT WITH A NEW TRANSLATION:

Vol. I. GENESIS — Hebrew and English. 18 *s.*
Abridged Edition. 12 *s.*

Vol. II. EXODUS — Hebrew and English. 15 *s.*
Abridged Edition. 12 *s.*

Vol. III. LEVITICUS, PART I — Hebrew and English. 15 *s.*
— Abridged Edition. 8 *s.*

A HEBREW GRAMMAR WITH EXERCISES:

PART I. The Outlines of the Language, with Exercises, being a practical Introduction to the Study of Hebrew. *Revised Edition.* 12 *s.* 6 *d.*

PART II. The exceptional Forms and Constructions, preceded by an Essay on the History of Hebrew Grammar. 12 *s.* 6 *d.*

A KEY to the Exercises of the First Part. 5 *s.*

---

LONDON:

LONGMANS AND CO.

A
# HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY

ON

# THE OLD TESTAMENT,

WITH

## A NEW TRANSLATION,

BY

M. M. KALISCH, Phil. Doc., M. A.

## ויקרא—LEVITICUS.

### PART II.

Containing Chapters XI to XXVII,

With Treatises.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER.
1872.

LEIPZIG, PRINTED BY W. DRUGULIN.

# PREFACE.

Little remains to be added to the introductory observations of the preceding volume. The same mode of treatment has been adopted in this concluding Part of Leviticus. Here also the text has been illustrated in a threefold manner — by explanatory notes from the Biblical point of view, by a critical analysis, and by a survey of the results considered in the light of science and history. These different features prevail, respectively, in the general notes of the Commentary, in the Philological Remarks, and in the Treatises. The conclusions at which the author has arrived, tend to confirm the opinions which he ventured to express before, and which he has here endeavoured to support by fresh proofs and arguments.

He may be permitted to refer especially to the Essays on the laws of Diet, of Matrimony, and the Festivals, and to the remarks on the Sabbatical year and the Year of jubilee.

As in the course of these enquiries he has heen led to discuss and to explain nearly all the legislative portions of the Pentateuch, he hopes to be able to condense the remaining Books of Numbers and Deuteronomy into one volume.

Of this Part also an Abridged Edition is published embodying results, but omitting references and philological criticisms.

Convinced that the strife and confusion of conflicting creeds can only be removed by a careful examination of our religious sources, the author has conscientiously approached the difficulties with which this portion of the Pentateuch abounds; and he would feel amply rewarded, if he should have succeeded, however slightly, in smoothing the path of future investigation.

*London, November* 30, 1871.

# CONTENTS.

## II.

# PRECEPTS RESPECTING PURITY IN DIET AND PERSON.

CHAPTERS XI TO XV.

## A. CLEAN AND UNCLEAN ANIMALS.

CHAPTER XI.

### PRELIMINARY ESSAY.

### ON THE DIETARY LAWS OF THE HEBREWS.

Scattered throughout the Pentateuch, and occasionally in other portions of the Hebrew Canon, are found dietary rules and suggestions not recommended as measures of expediency from considerations of health, but invested with the solemnity of religious observances and the binding power of moral duties. The dietary laws appear, therefore, to be intimately allied to the system of Hebrew theology; indeed both derive light from each other; and it is highly instructive to trace the connection into which spiritual ideas were brought with practical life, and thus to prove how, by wonderful consistency and energy of mind, the distinctive doctrines of "Mosaism" were made a reality by their concrete embodiment in the ordinary course of existence. In surveying this subject, the following questions are forced upon our attention. How far did the ideas prompt the enactments, and to what extent did practice precede the formation of general principles? Did the latter modify the customs, or did the customs influence the teaching? It will, therefore, be necessary to follow the dietary laws from their origin to their complete development in the Hebrew code, and not only to weigh each ordinance as it is set forth in the Pentateuch, but also to search for its reason,

deeper import, and religious bearing; and above all to pursue its history from the beginning down to the time when it was finally fixed and adopted.

Under these different aspects the commands will be viewed in the following treatise; they will, moreover, be carried on through their Talmudic and Rabbinical expansions, and will be compared with analogous laws or habits of the nations of antiquity and of modern times.

## I. THE PROHIBITION OF BLOOD.

The connection between blood and health or life was discovered at an early period; to shed blood and to destroy life soon became equivalent terms; and the maxim was currently and almost proverbially adopted, that "The blood is the soul" or "the life"[1]. From remote ages, therefore, a reluctance was felt to eat the blood of animals, especially as a certain cosmic relation was supposed to exist between man and the animal kingdom[2]. When, fatigued by their pursuit of the defeated Philistines, the Hebrews killed cattle and ate the meat with the blood, Saul reproached them with "sinning against the Lord", and guarded against a repetition of the offence[3]. Nay, according to a thoughtful narrative embodied in the Pentateuch, man, in the primitive time of his innocence, content with vegetables, and unwilling to disturb the harmony of nature by the agonies of death, abstained entirely from animal food[4]; but when, depraved and corrupted by sin, he was, after the Deluge, permitted to kill animals for his subsistence as unreservedly as he had before been permitted to eat all produce of the soil, he was still commanded, "But flesh with its soul, which is its blood, you shall not eat"[5]. So firmly did the teachers of the nation cling to this theory, and so anxious were they to enforce the awe of blood, that they fostered and disseminated the ideal hope, that, as once in the time of Paradise, so also in the age of the Messiah, when peace shall again pervade the world, no creature will bleed and die in the service of man, and that even the animals themselves now fierce and sanguinary, will "eat grass like the ox"[6]. It may be that they deemed, besides, the eating of blood detrimental to gentle-

---

[1] Deut. XII. 23 הדם הוא הנפש; Gen. IX. 4; Lev. XVII. 11 (נפש הבשר בדם), 14 (נפש כל בשר דמו בנפשו הוא and נפש כל בשר דמו הוא); comp. the pagan analogies in Comm. on Levit. I. 126—128.

[2] Comp. Gen. II. 18—20.

[3] 1 Sam. XIV. 32, 33.

[4] Gen. I. 29, 30.

[5] Gen. IX. 3, 4; comp. *Joseph.* Ant. I. III. 8; Comm. on Gen. pp. 78, 79, 215, 216; and *infra* Sect. VIII init.

[6] Issi. XI. 7.

ness and humanity[7], injurious to health[8], and, if taken largely, even dangerous to life; nor is it improbable that they saw with disgust the nefarious abuse made of it by heathens for the sealing of oaths and treaties[9], or for seeking the alliance and aid of demons either by drinking the blood itself, the supposed nourishment of evil spirits, or by consuming the sacrificial meal near the blood, as did the Zabii, who believed that they fraternised with the demons by eating with them at the same table[10]: all these reasons combined may have operated to confirm men of intelligence in their hostility to blood as food. But their efforts remained long unsuccessful; not only was their injunction unheeded in the time of Saul, as has been observed; but even in so late an age as that of Ezekiel, we hear the bitter and well-deserved complaint, "Thus says the Lord God, You eat with the blood[11], and lift up your eyes towards your idols, and shed blood"[12]. Undaunted and by no means discouraged, because too well accustomed to hard struggles with the people's obstinacy, the legislators continued and increased their exertions. For, in the course of time, another motive for the sanctity of blood was added, a motive more powerful and commanding

---

[7] Comp. *Philo*, De Concup. c. 10; *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 49; *Lipmann*, Sepher Nitsachon on Lev. XVII. 10, 11, "If any one eats the blood of an animal, his rational soul takes the nature of that animal"; *Bechai* on Lev. XVII, fol. 46ª ed. 1864, "Our nature should be mild and compassionate, and not cruel, but eating blood would engender in our souls coarseness and ferocity;" therefore the Rabbins made Satan the originator of the custom of eating blood (see *Eisenmenger*, Entdeckt. Judenth. II. 620); comp. also *Trusen*, Sitten, Gebräuche und Krankheiten der alten Hebräer, p. 77, "Bei dem Verbot des Blutes lag die moralische Absicht zu Grunde, dass das Blut als die Quintessenz und das eigentliche Substrat des thierischen Lebens dasselbe unmittelbar in das menschliche Leben übertrüge und den Menschen zum Thiere mache."

[8] Comp. *Galen.* De Aliment. Facult. III. 23, δύσπεπτον δ'ἐστὶ καὶ περιττωματικὸν ἅπαν αἷμα, καθ' ὃν ἂν αὐτὸ τρόπον σκευάσῃ τις; and *Mishn.* Macc. III. 15, הדם שנפשו של אדם קצה ממנו. Similarly the early Greeks seem to have loathed the brains of animals, though some ancient writers thought they abstained from them as being "the seat of nearly all sensation" (διὰ τὸ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἁπάσας ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι); *Athen.* II. 72; *Plut.* Sympos. VII. ix. 3.

[9] Comp. Comm. on Levit. I. 123, 128, 231 note 19. When a Scythian had killed the first enemy, he drank his blood (*Herod.* IV. 64).

[10] *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 46; comp. c. 41; Wisd. XII. 5; *Kimchi* on 1 Sam. XIV. 32, חק הזובחים לשדים שאוכלים סביב הדם אחר שזבחו להם; *Schöttgen*, Hor. Hebr. ad Acts XV. 29; *Deyling*, Obs. Sacr. II. 321—327.

[11] על הדם האכלו.

[12] Ezek. XXXIII. 25; comp. Lev. XIX. 26. Maimonides (Mor. Nev. III. 46) translates לא תאכלו על הדם, questionably, "You shall not eat near the blood, assembling round it for idolatrous purposes" (see *supra*).

than any that had before been felt or urged: the blood was made the centre of sacrifice; it was viewed as the indispensable means of atonement[1]; representing the life of the animal, it was shed and sprinkled for the sinner's life which was thereby saved; it embodied the leading principle of "life for life", on which the holiest sacrifices were founded; the soul, which God had breathed into the animal, was given back to Him in the place of the worshipper's soul, which His stern justice had a right to demand.

Yet these views did not prevail at once, nor so decidedly. The Deuteronomist, writing towards the end of the Hebrew commonwealth, still adhered essentially to the old conception sanctioned by the traditions of preceding centuries. Permitting the slaughter of animals for food at any place where Israelites might reside, he simply repeated what might as well have been enjoined in the patriarchal time of Noah, "Only be firm (חֲזַק) that thou eat not the blood, for the blood is the life, and thou mayest not eat the life with the flesh; thou shalt not eat it; thou shalt pour it upon the earth as water"[2]: his exhortation "to be firm" not less than the persuasive and encouraging promise which he added, "Thou shalt not eat it, that it may be well with thee and with thy children after thee, when thou doest what is right in the eyes of the Lord"[3], prove sufficiently how feeble was his hope of seeing even then the command scrupulously obeyed. Again, in speaking of the sacrifices at the national Sanctuary, he could not well avoid alluding to the disposal of the blood of the altar, but the allusion is so general and indistinct, that it is difficult to discover in it the notion of atonement: "And thou shalt offer thy burnt-offering, the flesh and the blood, upon the altar of the Lord thy God; and the blood of the sacrifices shall be poured upon the altar of the Lord thy God, and thou shalt eat the flesh"[4]. How great is the contrast, if we turn to the injunctions of the later Levitical legislator[5]! He resembles the previous writer in nothing but the rigour with which he denounces the heinousness of eating blood; he almost rises to vehemence, which again and again seeks vent in menaces like these uttered in the name of God, "Whosoever... eats any blood, I will set My face against that soul... and cut him off among his people"; and he repeats both the command and the threat so often and so energetically,

---

[1] אין כפרה אלא בדם; see Comm. on Lev. I. 124 note 4.

[2] Deut. XII. 23, 24; comp. vers. 15, 16; XV. 22, 23.

[3] Deuter. XII. 25.

[4] Ibid. ver. 27.

[5] Lev. XVII. 10—14; see the explanations *in loc.*

that it is evident how far the practice was from being eradicated even at his time[6]; and there are indeed clear proofs of its prevalence at much later periods[7]. But in every other respect he markedly differs from his predecessor. Venturing in his demands to the extreme point of insisting, that every beast required for food shall be killed at the common Sanctuary as a sacrifice, in order that the fat may be burnt and the blood sprinkled on the altar, and branding the slaughtering of such animals at any other place as nothing less than murder certain to be punished by excision[8], he views the blood mainly in its connection with the altar, and in reference to its power of expiation: "The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes an atonement for the soul"[9]. Hence the blood of the victim is simply called "the food of the Lord"[10]. For the atoning attributes of all sacrifices, and of the expiatory offerings in particular, were indeed of later growth, but when once conceived, they soon rose to most prominent importance in the sacrificial system[11]. Again, the Deuteronomist requires nothing more than that the blood of animals killed at home for food, shall "be poured on the earth like water", as he repeatedly states[12]; but the Levitical writer demands that the blood of beasts of the field hunted or caught, and the blood of birds, after having been shed on the ground, shall be "covered with dust"[13], so that it may be removed from the sight of man, and its trace be concealed, since blood exposed to view "cries to heaven"[14]. And lastly, the Deuteronomist addresses the prohibition to

---

6 Lev. XVII. 10, 14; VII. 27; comp. XIX. 26.

7 See Comm. on Levit. I. 189 note 12, the quotation from *Philo*, De Concup. c. 10. Penalty of death would certainly have been contrary to the spirit of the Pentateuch; but "excision" (כרת) is hardly a lenient punishment; it is spiritual and civil death, or utter exclusion from the holy community: it was menaced with reference to blood and fat, not because partaking of either "does not do much harm", nor "because men feel no strong temptation in that respect" (so *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 41).

8 Lev. XVII. 3—9; see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 39.

9 כי הַדם הוא בנפש יכפר.

10 לחם יהוה, Ezek. XLIV. 7, 15.

11 See Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 251 *sqq.*

12 Deut. XII. 16, 24; XV. 23; על הארץ תשפכנו כמים; comp. *Talm.* Pesach. 22[b].

13 Lev. XVII. 13 וכסהו בעפר; comp. *Talm.* Chull. 83[b], and the Rabbinical regulations in *Yor. Deah* § 28.

14 Comp. Gen. IV. 10, 11; Isai. XXI. 26; Ezek. XXIV. 7, 8; Job XVI. 18; Comm. on Lev. I. p. 39. Maimonides supposes that the reason of this command also was "to prevent the Israelites from assembling round the blood in order to hold meals."

the Hebrews only, and his fondest expectations seem realised if he can induce them to act upon his warning; but the author of the Levitical ordinance boldly includes in its operation the non- Israelites who happen to live in the Hebrew territory; he uncompromisingly proclaims the law, "No soul of you shall eat blood, neither shall the stranger that sojourns among you eat blood"; he menaces with excision equally the one and the other in case the command is transgressed [1]; and he declares the obligation binding "as an eternal statute for all generations throughout all dwellings" [2]. The progress in the conception of the law is manifest; it appears natural and organic — provided the relative age of the component parts of the Pentateuch is rightly estimated.

But now a difficulty arose. As according to the Levitical writer, the chief reason for abstaining from blood, was its connection with the work of atonement, the law could consistently apply to the sacrificial animals only, the ox, the sheep, and the goat, the pigeon, and the turtle-dove, since no other served for expiation. This is indeed the logical consequence. But such restriction would have shocked the feeling and consciousness of the nation, which had long since been taught to avoid the blood of every eatable beast, such as the roebuck and the hart [3]; and it would have been abhorred by no one more strongly than by the Levitical author himself; he, therefore, so glaringly ignored the perplexing dilemma into which he had been pressed by his new principle, that immediately after its statement he urged, "You shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh" [4]: he seems indeed to have been aware of the untoward difficulty, since, in order to evade it, and to support the universal injunction, he deemed it necessary to fall back upon the old and time-honoured maxim, "For the life of all flesh is its soul". Yet the Levitical view prevailed so far, that the blood of quadrupeds and birds only, but not the blood of fishes, was prohibited [5], evidently because fishes were never offered as sacrifices [6], though primitively their blood also seems to have been shunned as representing the soul or the life [7]. The Levitical theory obtained still greater force through Jewish tradition which, considering the subject from every aspect, permitted the blood of clean locusts also [8], unconcerned at the palpable violation of the

[1] Lev. XVII. 10, 12, 13.

[2] Lev. III. 17; VII. 26; comp. Exod. XII. 14, 20, 24.

[3] Comp. Deut. XII. 15, 16; XV. 22, 23.

[4] Lev. XVII. 14, דם כל בשר לא תאכלו.

[5] Lev. VII. 26, לעוף ולבהמה.

[6] See the probable reasons in Comm. on Lev. I. p. 81.

[7] Gen. IX. 4; comp. vers. 2, 3.

[8] Lev. XI. 22; comp. *Mishn.* Kerith. v. 1.

fundamental principle that "the blood is the soul"; and starting from the maxim, "The blood by which the life departs atones, the blood by which the life does not depart, does not atone"[9], Talmudism established the distinction, consistent from the later Levitical, untenable from the earlier physical point of view, between "the blood of the soul" and "the blood of the limbs"[10], the former being that which flows out of the killed animal, the latter that which issues from a wound; and it was decreed that eating the one is punishable by excision, but eating the other merely by stripes as a simple trespass (לאו)[11] — which is doubtless against the spirit of the Biblical precept[12].

But Talmudists and Rabbins, measuring the importance of the command by the dread punishment threatened for its neglect, and believing that, in the time of the Temple, even its unintentional transgression required a sin-offering[13], busily compiled rules and devised precautions to preclude the possibility of even the smallest particle of blood being eaten. With this view they saw fit to fix a most precise method of slaughtering, which partially aimed at allowing the blood to flow out freely and fully[14]; they prescribed incredibly minute regulations for soaking and especially for salting the meat, so that the blood might be thoroughly drawn out[15]; and they ordered the veins and blood-vessels of the beast to be most carefully removed[16]. Some Rabbins, shrinking from no excess, forbid certain parts of clean quadrupeds, because the complex ramification and great delicacy of their veins render a complete removal of them difficult. Those who, in our time, insist upon this rigorous demand, impose upon themselves a heavy responsibility, and they blindly provoke a warfare between the past and the present, the issue of which cannot be doubtful; yet their narrow-minded obstinacy promotes progress in spite of them; for it causes educated Jews to feel more strongly, how utterly incompatible the superstitions and pagan traditions of untutored ages are with the demands of a purer civilisation; for to them the blood possesses neither a cosmic nor a religious sanc-

---

[9] דם שהנפש יוצאה בו מכפר דם שאין הנפש יוצאה בו אינו מכפר, *Talm.* Pesach. 65b; *Mishn.* Kerith. v. 1.

[10] דם הנפש and דם האיברים.

[11] See *Maimon.* De Cibis vetitis VI. 4; *Yor. Deah* § 67. 1; *Hottinger*, Ius Hebr. pp. 201, 202.

[12] Comp. in general, Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 121—126.

[13] Comp. *Mishn.* Kerith. I. 1; see Comm. on Lev. I. 270 note 1.

[14] See Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 187, 188.

[15] *Talm.* Chull. 113a, אמר שמואל אין הבשר יוצא מידי דמו אלא אם כן מולחו יפה יפה ומדיחו יפה יפה; see the exceedingly elaborate instructions in *Yoreh Deah* §§ 69—78; comp. also *Maim.* De Cib. vetit. c. VI.

[16] By ניקור.

tity; they attribute to it neither a mysterious connection with the soul of the world, nor the force of atonement.

The Mahommedans, warned by the Koran rigidly to abstain from blood[1], have likewise adopted rules of scrupulous strictness. They eat no animal that dies without a regular effusion of blood, for instance, by a blow, by the throw of a stone, or a fall[2]. A quadruped or bird killed by the point of an arrow or with grape-shot, is lawful; but if killed by an arrow turning round in its flight, it is forbidden. Hence the Turks and Arabs who live in towns, are not partial to game, because they cannot be certain as to the mode of its death[3]. In some parts of Nubia only, Mahommedans unlawfully partake of the blood of animals, especially cows; they place it over the fire till it coagulates, and then mix it with salt and butter[4].

When in the early Church disputes arose as to the obligation of the ceremonial Law for converted heathens, both apostles and elders were indeed unwilling to burthen their new brethren with a needless yoke, such as, in the words of Peter, "neither their fathers nor they were able to bear"[5]; yet they all agreed in including the prohibition of blood among the few ritual ordinances unquestionably to be retained from the Jewish faith[6]. The Christians clung long and tenaciously to the observance. "Let your error," writes Tertullian[7], "blush before us Christians, who do not even consider the blood of animals eatable, and abstain from the meat of strangled beasts and of such as die of themselves, lest we be defiled by blood buried as it were within our entrails". Their heathen persecutors knew their scrupulousness on this point so well, that they employed the eating of blood as a test for discovering their creed[8]. Not before those liberal and anticeremonial views of St. Paul prevailed, to which Christianity mainly owes its unparalleled victories and conquests,

---

1 *Koran* II. 168; V. 4; XVI. 116: in one passage (VI. 146), it is called "blood poured forth" دما مسفوحا, that is, fluid blood, in contradistinction to the liver and the spleen, which were supposed to be blood in a solid state (comp. *Al Beidâwi* in loc.).

2 *Koran* V. 4; etc.; comp. *Mishn.* Chull. III. 1, where among the cases which render a beast unlawful for food, are mentioned נשתברו רוב צלעותיה, and נפלה מן הגג.

3 See *Niebuhr*, Beschreibung von Arabien, pp. 178, 179.

4 *Burckhardt*, Travels in Nubia, p. 546.

5 Acts XV. 10.

6 Acts XV. 20, 29; XXI. 25; see *infra* Sect. IX; Comm. on Gen. pp. 215, 216.

7 Apolog. c. 9.

8 *Tertull.* l. c. Denique inter tentamenta Christianorum botulos etiam cruore distentos admovetis, certissimi scilicet illicitum esse penes illos, per quod exorbitare eos vultis; comp. *Euseb.* Hist. Eccl. V. 1.

did the Christians free themselves from the inherited obligation. Yet it was again enforced in the second "Trullian" synod held at Constantinople under Justinian II (A. C. 692)[9], and is still deemed valid by the Greek Church, and by the Copts, who maintain that the apostolic injunction has never been abrogated[10].

## II. MEAT CUT OUT OF A LIVING ANIMAL (אבר מן החי).

Jewish tradition, on this point in harmony with the spirit of the Law, rigorously forbids the eating of a limb or of raw meat cut out from the living animal (אבר מן החי), whether quadruped or bird[11], not only because it is barbarous[12], but because it is inseparable from consuming blood. The Bible contains no express precept on the subject. But the Jewish doctors, anxious, as was their custom, to support their opinion by a Scriptural text, based the prohibition upon the rule addressed to Noah, "Only flesh with its soul, which is its blood, you shall not eat"[13]; or upon the command in Deuteronomy, "Thou shalt not eat the soul with the flesh"[14] — which texts, however, it need hardly be observed, bear no such construction[15]. The Talmud signifies its horror of the custom by proscribing it among the so-called "seven laws of the children of Noah"[16], which comprised, besides,

---

[9] Between the sixth and seventh Oecumenical Council, and called σύνοδος πενθέκτη or Concilium Quinisextum, but not counted separately, and unrecognised by the Western Church: the 67th canon forbade "the eating of everything strangled under any condition whatever, since the blood is the soul, and he who partakes of it, consumes the soul" (see *Herzog's* Real-Enc. XVI. p. 485).

[10] *Lane*, Modern Egypt, II. 188.

[11] *Talm.* Chull. 101b, אבר מן החי נוהג בבהמה חיה ועוף.

[12] Comp. *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 48, "It accustoms men to cruelty." In Athens a person was punished who had flayed a ram alive (*Plut.* De Esu Carn. I. 7, ὁ πρὸς φιλανθρωπίαν ἐθισμὸς οὐ δοκεῖ θαυμαστὸν εἶναι).

[13] Gen. IX. 4; see *Talm.* Sanh. 57a, 59a; Pesach. 22b.

[14] Deut. XII. 23, ולא תאכל הנפש עם הבשר; *Talm.* Chull. 101b, 102; Sanhedr. 59a; Pesach. 22b; *Maim.* De Cib. vet. V. 1; Sepher Hamitsv. negat. precepts no. 182; *Yoreh Deah* § 62; *Heilpren*, Mitsv. Hashem, no. 453.

[15] Yet some modern writers also derive the command from Gen. IX. 4 (so *Rosenm.* Morgenl. I. 38, 39; comp. our Comm. on Gen. p. 217), and even (as Gramberg does, Rel. Id. I. 330), from 1 Sam. XIV. 32—34 (ויאכל העם על הדם), where it is plainly stated וישחטו ארצה, and where the offence of the Hebrews was simply the eating of the blood with the flesh of the slaughtered animals; comp. *Kimchi* in loc., who justly insists upon the literal sense of the words, in opposition to the Talmudical explanations adopted by Rashi (אוכלים קדשים ועדיין דם במזרק), Ralbag (אצל הדם), a. o.

[16] שבע מצות בני נח or שב' מצ' שקבלו עליהן בני נח, *Talm.* Avod. Zar. 2b.

disobedience to the laws and authorities (דינין), blasphemy (ברכת השם), idolatry (עבודה זרה), incest (גלוי עריות), murder (שפיכות דמים), and plunder (גזל)[1]; these prohibitions, forming a primitive code of natural ethics, were considered to have been binding upon all men even before the Mosaic revelation[2]; and they were also compulsory on the heathen "strangers of the gate" (גרי שער) who lived among the Hebrews[3]. Yet there can be no doubt that the practice was, and is still, indulged in by savage tribes, as those of Abyssinia and Syria, the Esquimaux and Samoiedes, and it prevailed among the Atticoti of ancient Britain, who considered such meat a delicious dainty[4].

The execrable inhumanity of the custom, which can hardly be attributed to the Hebrews at the time of the Elohist, appears from an account of Bruce[5] relating what he witnessed on his journey from Axum to the river Tacazze, an account often disputed and long questioned, but subsequently verified by other trustworthy travellers[6]. "The drivers suddenly tript up the cow, and gave the poor animal

---

[1] *Talm.* Sanh. 56, 57 (where the seven laws are curiously derived from, or are at least, to aid the memory, referred to, the words of Gen. II. 16, ויצו יהוה אלהים על האדם לאמר וכ׳; comp. also Yoma 67[b]; *Beresh. Rabb.* XXXIV. 2; *Cuzari* III. 73; *Bechai* on Gen. II. 16, p. 23[a] ed. Lemb.; *Selden*, de Jure Nat. et Gent. I. 10 (pp. 118—129); VII. 1 (pp. 783, 784); *Heilpren* מצות השם fol. 100, 101; Comm. on Exod. p. 433. Some doctors included in these laws the mere eating of raw flesh with blood (על הדם מן החי), even if the beast had been duly slaughtered; others again advocated additional interdictions, as כלאים, כשפים, and סירוס.

[2] It was supposed that six of them were already enjoined upon Adam, to which the prohibition of אבר מן החי was added in the time of Noah; see *Talm.* Sanh. 56[b]; *Maimon.* De Regib. IX. 1, comp. 10—12; VIII. 10; and in general cc. IX, X; De Cib. vetit. V. 1—9; *Albo*, Ikkar. Part III. c. 14 *init.*

[3] It is difficult to express surprise too strongly at finding even recent writers deduce these Rabbinical subtleties from the text in Genesis (IX. 1—7), and assert that "the seven laws were considered as Noachic already by the narrator" (So, f. i., *Fürst*, Geschichte der Biblischen Literatur, I. 115).

[4] *Hieron.* Adv. Jovinian. II. 7 (II. p. 335 ed. Valarsi): Quid loquar de caeteris nationibus cum ipse adolescentulus in Gallia viderim Atticotos (al. Scotos), gentem Britannicam, humanis vesci carnibus, et cum per silvas porcorum greges et armentorum pecudumque reperiant, pastorum nates et feminarum papillas solere abscindere, et has solas ciborum delicias arbitrari.

[5] Travels, pp. 213, 214, ed. London 1841.

[6] As Antes, Salt, Jones, and others, see *Rosenm.* l. c. pp. 42, 309—311. The currency of the term אבר מן החי in the Talmud is sufficient to prove the existence of the custom; and Maimonides observes (Mor. Nev. III. 48), that in former times "pagan kings acted thus", and that "it was also an idolatrous rite to cut off a certain member of a quadruped and to eat it."

a very rude fall upon the ground... One of them sat upon her neck, holding down her head by the horns, the other twisted the halter about the fore-feet, while the third, who had a knife in his hand, instead of taking her by the throat, got astride upon her belly before her hind-legs, and gave her a very deep wound in the upper part of her buttock;... then they cut out two pieces, thicker and longer than our beef-steaks;... it was done adroitly, and the two pieces were spread upon the outside of one of their shields. One of the men still continued holding the head, while the other two were busied in curing the wound; the skin which had covered the flesh that was taken away, was left entire, and flapped over the wound, and was fastened to the corresponding part by two or more small skewers or pins;... they prepared a cataplasm of clay, with which they covered the wound: they then forced the animal to rise, and drove it on before them to furnish them with a fuller meal in the evening." — To this may be added a short extract from Salt's narrative[7]: "A soldier, attached to the company, proposed 'cutting out the shulada' from one of the cows they were driving before them;... they laid hold of the animal by the horns, threw it down, and proceeded without further ceremony to the operation. This consisted in cutting out two pieces of flesh from the buttock near the tail, which together... might weigh about a pound; the pieces so cut out being called 'shulada', and composing, as far as I could ascertain, part of the two 'glutei maximi' or larger muscles of the thigh[8]. As soon as they had taken these away, they sewed up the wounds, plaistered them over with cow-dung, and drove the animal forwards, while they divided among their party the still reeking steaks." — Formerly, Arab tribes not unfrequently drew blood from a live camel, poured it into a gut, and ate it boiled — a *black* pudding (*moswadd*), which naturally vanished from the list of Arab delicacies in consequence of Mohammed's law against blood[9]. Nor is our own time free from similar horrors: the ingenious Chinese delight in ducks' feet roasted by forcing the wretched birds to walk over red-hot sheets of iron till the feet fall off; civilised France rejoices in frogs' legs torn from of the living animals; in order to enlarge the liver of geese for the Strasbourg pâté de foie gras, the geese are confined in hot ovens; while the Romans sewed up the eyes of cranes and swans which they

---

[7] A Voyage to Abyssinia (1814), pp. 295, 296.

[8] See *Freytag*, Lex. Ar. II. 447.

[9] See *supra* p. 8; comp. *Pococke*, Spicileg. p. 320; *Sale*, Koran, Prelim. Discourse, p. 91.

fattened in dark cells or cages[1]; some English butchers draw, at intervals, small quantities of blood from live calves which during the time suffer agonizing fits, because by this process the flesh becomes more delicately white; some poulterers pluck the feathers from fowls while alive to make the birds appear plumper when sent to market[2]; and lobsters, crabs, and sometimes eels, are boiled alive.

## III. THE PROHIBITION OF FAT.

The fat of victims, being naturally valued among the richest parts, was from early times devoted to the deity on the altar, both by the Hebrews and other nations[3]. Yet among the former, it was for long periods not interdicted as food[4]. The Deuteronomist rejected it by no law: in three different passages, in which he mentions and permits the slaughtering of animals for food away from the national Sanctuary, he denies to the owner the blood only, and nothing else — "only you shall not eat the blood"[5]; and in the last "Song of Moses" fat is even enumerated among the choicest dainties[6]. But in course of time, fat, like blood, was currently believed to represent the life and strength of the animal, and therefore to involve its "soul" or principle of existence. Hence, in the Book of Leviticus, the prohibition of the one was repeatedly joined with that of the other: "You shall eat neither any fat nor blood"[7]. Both were enforced with equal severity, threatened with the same awful punishment of "excision"[8], and ordained as "eternal statutes" to be observed by the Israelites "for their generations throughout all their dwellings"[9]. But here the analogies ended. The prohibition of fat resulted from the consistent development of Levitical theories; it was from the very beginning brought into connection with the advanced sacrificial system; it was never extended to the free and untamed species of

---

[1] *Plut.* De Esu Carn. II. 1; *Plin.* H. N. X. 23 or 30.

[2] The *Times* of April 6, 1868, reporting a conviction for this cruelty, records that one poulterer in Salop alone killed in that way between 5000 and 6000 fowls a week.

[3] 1 Sam. II. 15, 16; comp. Comm. on Levit. I. p. 320.

[4] The opinion of Maimonides that "the fat of the entrails is too nutritious, injures digestion, and produces cold and thick blood" (Mor. Nev. III. 48, comp. 41), was not shared by the ancient world.

[5] Deut. XII. 16, 23; XV. 23.

[6] Deut. XXXII. 14; comp. Comm. on Lev. I. p. 132 note 1.

[7] Lev. III. 17; VII. 23—27.

[8] Lev. VII. 25, ונכרתה הנפש האכלת מעמיה.

[9] Lev. III. 17.

the clean quadrupeds (חיה)[10], but was always restricted to those set apart for lawful victims[11] — to the ox, the sheep, and the goat[12]; it was more especially confined to the fat and the fat parts burnt on the altar as "an offering made by fire of a sweet odour to the Lord"[13], and therefore described more frequently than the blood as "the food of the Lord"[14], namely, the net of fat spreading over the intestines, and the fat found between the guts and easily detached from them, the two kidneys with their fat, the great lobe of the liver, and, of sheep of the kind *ovis laticaudata,* also the fat tail by which that species is distinguished[15]; while the remaining fat, imbedded in the flesh and requiring to be cut out, was probably permitted to be eaten[16], unless the animal had died of itself, or had been torn by wild beasts[17], in which cases the whole carcase was rendered unclean, though the fat could be used for any purpose except food[18]. The apparently universal principle and injunction, "All the fat belongs to the Lord"[19], and "You shall not eat any fat"[20], are not in contradiction to the more limited command, "You shall not eat any fat of ox or of sheep or of goat"[21]; for they cannot be misunderstood in a code which treats exclusively of sacrificial laws. The Levitical writer, content with giving practical reality to his theories, ordered *all* sacrificial animals, even those destined for food, to be killed as victims at the common altar[22], and he declared their fat to be too holy for

---

[10] Comp. *Talm.* Chull. 59b; ***Maimon.*** De Cib. Vet. I. 9; etc.

[11] חלב מן הבהמה אשר יקריב ממנה אשה ליהוה.

[12] Lev. VII. 23, 25.

[13] Lev. III. 5, 11, 16; XVII. 6.

[14] Lev. III. 11, 16; Ezek. XLIV. 7; comp. Comm. on Levit. I. p. 7 notes 22, 23.

[15] Comp. Comm. on Levit. I. pp. 489—493. But Jewish tradition decided, with very questionable justice, that the tail of sheep was "called fat only with respect to sacrifices" (*Yoreh Deah* § 64. 5), but was not interdicted as food, because the tail of no other quadruped was demanded for the altar — an opinion not shared by the Karaites and opposed by the Samaritan codex (which reads in Exod. XXIX. 22 and Lev. VIII. 25 החלב האליה, and not as our text החלב והאליה); see Comm. l. c. p. 494; comp. also *Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. I. 134, 135; *Fürst*, Gesch. des Karäerthums, I. 84, 85. The arguments by which Ebn Ezra (on Lev. VII. 23) professes to have convinced a Karaite of the lawfulness of eating the fat tail, are by no means tenable.

[16] See Comm. on Lev. I. p. 133 note 7.

[17] חלב נבלה וחלב טרפה.

[18] יֵעָשֶׂה לכל מלאכה, Lev. VII. 24; see *infra* Sect. IV, V.

[19] Lev. III. 16, כל חלב ליהוה.

[20] Lev. III. 17, כל חלב לא תאכלו.

[21] Lev. VII. 23, כל חלב שור וכשב ועז לא תאכלו.

[22] Lev. XVII. 3 *sqq.*

human consumption: he left out of sight the fat of other clean animals withdrawn from the control of the priesthood[1].

## IV. MEAT OF ANIMALS THAT DIED OF THEMSELVES (נְבֵלָה).

The aversion generally felt to partaking of the flesh of animals that have died of themselves (נְבֵלָה)[2], is so natural, that we may suppose something like a regular custom to have in this respect been fixed from very early times among most nations that passed beyond the first and ruder stages of culture. Pythagoras taught that, in order to obtain purity (ἁγνεία), it was above all necessary to keep aloof from the flesh of beasts that have died of themselves[3]. The Romans declared, that "Every thing that dies of itself bears the character of sad gloom"[4]; hence their priests were forbidden to wear shoes or sandals made of the skins of animals that had not been regularly slaughtered or sacrificed[5]. Sanitary motives, no doubt, helped to strengthen the antipathy; for the flesh of such beasts is often unwholesome, it was certainly deemed difficult of digestion[6]. But no people embodied and perpetuated their feeling of reluctance so consistently as the Hebrews[7]. As soon as their principal notions with respect to legi-

[1] The subject is more fully discussed in Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 39, 129—133, to which we refer. The infinitesimal Rabbinical regulations, mainly aiming at the removal of certain vessels and skins (חיטין וקרומים), in order to obviate the eating of the very least particle of blood or fat, may be seen in *Yoreh Deah* § 64; comp. *Maimon.* De Cib. vet. c. VII; Mitsv. Hashem fol. 24b, § קמח.

[2] From נבל cognate with נבל (comp. Jer. IX. 21; Ezek. XXIX. 5), and therefore kindred in meaning with מַפֶּלֶת carcase (Judg. XIV. 8; comp. 2 Ki. IX. 37; Lat. mortua pecus); it is rendered by the Septuagint σῶμα, νεκρόν, θνησιμαῖον; by the Vulg. morticinum; the Koran (II. 168; V. 4; etc.) الميتة; Josephus (Ant. III. XI. 2) κρέως τοῦ τεθνηκότος αὐτομάτως ζώου; Pseudo-Phocylides (ver. 139) κτῆνος θνητόν; the Talmud (Chull. 94a, etc.) מתה; Ralbag (on Deut. XIV. 21) נבלה היא הבהמה שמתה; see Comm. on Lev. I. 553; comp. *infra* p. 15 note 9.

[3] *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 33, ἀπέχεσθαι θνησειδίων κρεῶν; *Aelian*, Var. Hist. IV. 17, ἀπέχεσθαι ... τῶν θνησειδίων παντὸς μᾶλλον.

[4] *Festus* sub Mortuae pecudis: sua morte extincta omnia funesta sunt.

[5] *Fest.* l. c. Mortuae pecudis coris calceos aut soleas fieri flaminicis nefas habetur, sed aut occisae alioquin aut immolatae; comp. *Talm.* Chull. 94a, "a man must not sell sandals made from the skin of a beast that died of itself, as if they came from an animal duly killed", etc.; see *Bernays*, Ueber das Phokylideische Gedicht, p. XXIX.

[6] *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 48.

[7] See Lev. XVII. 15, 16; XXII. 8; Deut. XIV. 21; comp. Ezek. IV. 14; XLIV. 31.

timate and forbidden food had been settled, they connected meat of animals that died of themselves, whether quadrupeds or birds[8], with the injunctions relating to blood, and thus clearly marked the meat as condemned by a sacred principle of religion. They considered such animals as suffocated in their blood, which, prevented from flowing out, and settling in the body, precluded the free and normal departure of life[9]. On these grounds the law was no doubt based in earlier times. But gradually, as theocratic views prevailed, it was referred to another principle of even deeper importance and still wider application in the system of Hebrew theology, the principle of the holiness of Israel, the chosen people of a holy God: "You shall not eat of anything that dies of itself, ... for thou art a holy people to the Lord thy God"[10]. The animal dying prematurely of itself no doubt harbours within it the germ of dissolution; even while living it par-

---

[8] Comp. Ezek. XLIV. 31, מן העוף ומן הבהמה.

[9] Hence the New Testament usually expresses נבלה by πνικτόν *suffocated* (Acts XV. 20, 29; XXI. 25); the affinity between נבלה and blood appears clearly in Tertullian (Apol. c. 9): "qui propterea quoque suffocatis et morticinis abstinemus, ne sanguine contaminemur vel intra viscera sepulto"; Pseudo-Clemens (Recogn. IV. 36) even explains "morticinum quod est suffocatum". The Koran (V. 4) includes, therefore, among the forbidden meat that of animals strangled (المنخنقة) and killed by a blow or fall, and the general rule among Mahommedans is, "It is forbidden to eat any quadruped or bird which has shed no blood in dying" (comp. *supra* p. 8; *Niebuhr*, Beschreib. v. Arab. p. 179). From this point of view the Talmud (Pesach. 22[b]) justly classes among נבלה the flesh of the goring ox that has been stoned to death (comp. Exod. XXI. 28, 29); but the flesh was prohibited for food not merely as נבלה, but as that of an animal accursed for having destroyed a human life (comp. *Maim.* De Cib. vet. IV. 22); although considered from another side, the ox may be regarded as טרפה, since it was possibly a healthy animal (see *infra*). However, it appears that the term נבלה was gradually, against its original and etymological meaning, extended to the flesh of all unclean and of all clean beasts that had not been slaughtered in the customary manner, yet not to the flesh of those that had actually been torn by wild beasts (which extension of meaning may be traceable even in the Old Testament itself); while, on the other hand, in the later Talmudical phraseology, the word טרפה is applied to unlawful meat or food of whatever kind, especially to beasts wounded or afflicted with an organic defect (hence the maxim כל שאין כמוה חיה טרפה, *Mishn.* Chullin III. 1; comp. *Talm.* Chull. 42[a], טרפה אינה חיה, see *infra*; *Elias Levit.* Tishb. 39[a], סתם טרפה ... הוא בשר בהמה שנטרפה ... רק רז"ל שמשו בה דרך השאלה לשאר איסורי מאכלות): both words, therefore, approached each other in meaning (comp. *Maim.* De Cib. vetit. IV. 8, 9, 17 *fin.*; Mor. Nev. III. 48, טרפה תחלת נבלה היא), and both were employed to represent all uncleanness in food.

[10] Deut. XIV. 21.

takes of death; and when it expires, it may be considered in a state of unnatural decay. Eating of such flesh was, therefore, nothing less than contamination, sinful for a people which owes allegiance to the God of eternal life. "That which dies of itself... the priest shall not eat to defile himself therewith; I am the Lord"[1]. It was deemed so utterly incompatible with the character of the "kingdom of priests", that the commands were step by step made more stringent and more universal. In Deuteronomy, the law is still limited to the Israelites; and these were permitted to sell the meat of נבלה, nay to offer it for food, to the strangers living within the Hebrew communities themselves[2]. But in Leviticus, the prohibition appears in an infinitely more decided form: it was extended to the stranger, and in every respect equalised with regard to the Hebrew and the non-Hebrew; both were, in cases of transgression, subjected to the same rules of purification and the same penalty. "And every soul that eats that which died of itself,... whether it be one of your own people or a stranger (באזרח ובגר), he shall both wash his garments and bathe himself in water, and be unclean till the evening; then he shall be clean; but if he does not wash them nor bathe his flesh, then he shall bear his iniquity"[3]. This was the case even if the beast was by the Law permitted for consumption[4]. Then such meat was regarded as inherently unclean; its very touch caused defilement, which did not cease before the end of the day, whether the animal belonged to a lawful species[5] or to the prohibited kinds[6]; and carrying the carcase engendered a higher degree of uncleanness, to be removed by washing of the garments.[7] With regard to certain pre-eminently loathsome animals, the Law ordained even more rigorous rules: all objects upon which their dead bodies fell — as vessels of wood or metal, skins, textures of wool or goats' hair — were declared unclean, they were for purification to be placed in water till the evening;

---

[1] Lev. XXII. 8, לטמאה בה; comp. Ezek. IV. 14. Pseudo-Phocylides introduces our command (Μὴ κτήνους θνητοῖο βορὴν κατὰ λίτραν ἕληαι, where Bernays l. c. p. XXVIII proposes to read κατὰ μέτρον) by the solemn warning Ἐγκρατὲς ἦτορ ἔχειν, τῶν λωβητῶν δ'ἀπέχεσθαι (ver. 145). Whether the words האדם מהמת in the 17th line of the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles, imply a similar interdiction with respect to the Carthagenian priests, is more than doubtful (comp. *Movers*, Opferwesen der Karthager, p. 117).

[2] Deut. XIV. 21, לגר אשר בשעריך תתננה ואכלה; comp. *Talm*. Pesach. 21b; Chull. 114b.

[3] Lev. XVII. 15, 16.

[4] Lev. XI. 40; see notes in loc.

[5] Lev. XI. 39.

[6] Lev. XI. 8, 24, 26, 27, 31, 36; Deut. XIV. 8.

[7] Lev. XI. 25, 28.

but if they fell into an unglazed *earthen* vessel, which, from its porous nature, easily absorbs fluids, not only the whole contents of that vessel became unclean, but the vessel itself was to be broken in pieces, lest it be again used; and if by chance a liquid had come into any such utensil, whether earthenware or not, or if moist food had been put into such earthen utensil, the liquid and the food became unclean and unlawful. Ovens or stoves, because made of earthenware, were subjected to injunctions of similar severity; they were to be broken if any part of a carcase had fallen upon them; while other and scrupulously minute ordinances prove the punctilious care with which the matter was treated[8]. Thus any food, though permitted in itself, might be rendered unlawful by contact with impure objects; and the same was the case, if a vessel without lid or covering was allowed to stand in a room in which a man had died within seven days[9]. And as a last step, rigorous Levitism enforced a sin-offering, when unclean carcases had even accidentally and unwittingly been touched, which, in cases of intentional contact, implies the penalty of spiritual excision — an enactment excessive in severity and all but impracticable[10]. That the law concerning נבלה was, not even in the time of the Deuteronomist, prompted by merely sanitary considerations, is evident from the permission granted to sell such meat to the stranger "that he might eat it"[11]: a code evidencing the most considerate humanity towards strangers, and enjoining "Thou shalt love the stranger as thyself"[12], would not have assigned to him food injurious to health, and for this reason to be shunned

---

[8] Lev. XI. 29—38; see notes in loc.

[9] Num. XIX. 14, 15. The food thus contingently disqualified is by the Talmud called אוכלין טמאין, in contradistinction to מאכלות אסורות or food unconditionally forbidden; comp. the analogous laws of the Hindoos (*Yâjnavalkya* I. 167—169; *Manu* IV. 207—211): the Brahmin is to abstain from food that has turned sour, has been touched by a dog, looked at by a fallen beast, or approached by a woman during her menstruation.

[10] See Lev. V. 2, and notes in loc.; also Comm. on Lev. I. 41, 42. It is, therefore, difficult to see how the laws of Leviticus concerning נבלה can be understood as "more lenient" than those of Deuteronomy (*Graf*, Gesch. Büch. des A. T. p. 67; comp. *Riehm* in Stud. u. Krit. 1868, p. 360). Some Karaite authorities, as Anan, taking the term נבלה to mean a complete carcase, but not parts of it, consider defilement to be wrought only by touching the former, but not by touching the latter: otherwise the Karaites are particularly strict with respect to נבלה (see *infra*).

[11] Deut. XIV. 21, ואכלה.

[12] Lev. XIX. 34; comp. *Talm.* Pesach. 21b, כי אתה מצוה להחיותו, derived from Lev. XXV. 35, גר ותושב וחי עמך.

by the Israelites[1]. All who lived in the Promised Land were more and more decidedly included in the holy community, and made to share its attributes and its duties. The "perfect" life in God demanded perfection in every creature that helped to support that life. The prohibition of נבלה was, therefore, repeated by Ezekiel, especially with reference to the priests[2]; it was, by apostolic council, retained in the early Christian Church[3], and adopted by the second "Trullian" synod[4]; it was enforced by Mohammed[5], and laboriously developed by Jewish tradition. The Sadducees, and like them the Samaritans and the Karaites, were particularly scrupulous in neither touching nor applying to useful purposes any kind or part of נבלה and טרפה, such as skins or bones; whence they shrank even from taking up Greek books, because the parchments were made from the skins of unlawfully killed animals[6]. The Pharisees, less strict on these points, limited the interdiction, as a rule, to the flesh only, and like the Koran, permitted even the flesh of animals killed when near their natural death[7], though they indeed considered it meritorious not to hasten the slaughter of such suspected beasts[8]. But they fixed

---

[1] Yet some Rabbins object to selling נבלה or טרפה to a non-Jew, first because the latter might be misled to the belief that it is clean and lawful food, and then because he might sell it again to a Jew (*Talm.* Chull. 94b, אחד מפני שמטעהו ואחד שמא יחזור וימכרנה לישראל אחר); see, however, *Eisenmenger*, Entd. Judenth. II. 632—635, 638.

[2] Ezek. XLIV. 31; comp. IV. 14; see *Talm.* Menach. 45a, where the apparent restriction of the command to the priests is declared hopelessly perplexing (פרשה זו אליהו עתיד לדורשה).

[3] Acts. XV. 20, 29; XXI. 25 (πνιχτόν).

[4] See supra p. 9.

[5] *Koran* II. 168; V. 4; VI. 146; XVI. 116; الميتة. The heathen Arabs were in the habit of eating meat of beasts that had died of themselves, which practice was strongly opposed by the sect of the Hanyfe (comp. *Sprenger*, Leben und Lehre des Mohamm. II. 476).

[6] *Mishn.* Yad. IV. 6; *Talm.* Shabb. 108a.

[7] That is, of מסוכנת "beasts in danger", also called כוס-כוס "kill, kill!"

[8] *Talm.* Chull. 37, 44b; *Syr. Vers.* in Ezek. IV. 14 (מרעא, a sick or weak animal) and XLIV. 31 (משנוא id.); *Maimon.* De Cib. vet. IV. 12. — Later Rabbins specified fearful punishments sure to befall the person eating נבלה, such as the banishment of his soul into the body of a dog or other animals; for they considered both נבלה and טרפה as "stricken by the power of destruction" (כח המשחית), or Satan (*Bechai* on Ex. XI. 7, fol. 31b ed. 1864; comp. *Eisenmenger*, Entd. Judenth. II. 617, 638—640). See *Koran* V. 4 ("except what you kill yourselves", i. e. if the beast was duly killed while still alive"); *Lane*, Mod. Egypt. I. 132 ("when game has been struck down by any weapon, but not killed, its throat must be immediately cut; otherwise it is unlawful food"); *Nieb.* Beschr. v. Arab. p. 180 (fishes also are usually killed by cutting them near the head, before they die of themselves); comp. *Geiger*, Jüd. Zeit-

eighteen defects which were alleged to have been pointed out by God to Moses[9], and which, if discovered at the examination of the slaughtered animal, were supposed to bring it under the category of נבלה, and to render it unlawful for food, in as much as they were deemed sure to cause its death within one year. Those defects are — If the gullet (ושט) is perforated, however small the hole, or the wind-pipe (הגרגרת) is torn crossways for the greater part; if the membranes (the *dura mater* or *pia mater*) of the brain (המוח) or the ventricle (בית חללו) of the heart is pierced; if the spine (השדרה) is broken or its ligaments are torn; if the liver (הכבד) is entirely or nearly wanting; if the lungs (הריאה) are perforated or defective in the lobes; if the stomach, or the gall-bladder (המרה), or any part of the viscera (הדקין), or the abdomen, is perforated, or the outer skin which covers the latter is torn for the greater part; if the paunch (הכסס) and the "fourth stomach" (בית הכוסות)[10] are damaged so that they are visible from without; if the beast has fallen from the roof of a house; if the greater part of its (twenty-two) ribs are broken; and if it has been struck by the claws of a wolf or lion, or, in the case of a fowl, by a bird of prey[11]. In fact, the general rule was established, that "Every animal is unlawful, which is afflicted with a defect of such a nature, that no beast of the same species could live under similar circumstances"[12]. We have enumerated the cases — which of course require revision and correction as the science of pathology advances — because they convey a good notion of the anxious attention bestowed upon this matter by the Jews — a scrupulousness highly laudable in so far as it ensures wholesome meat, and commendable by its undeniable and excellent results in times of epidemics[13], but exaggerated especially by the Talmudical and Rabbinical additions, which increase the number of fatal blemishes to seventy[14], and are practically oppressive by their excess[15]: those who read, for instance, the complicated rules setting forth, how the slaughtered animal must kick and palpitate in order to be lawful[16], will admit that here again

---

schrift II. 21—24; IV. 54; Hechaluz IV. 18 *sqq.*; Zeitschr. der Deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch. XVI. 717 *sqq.*

[9] *Talm.* Chull. 42[a]; see *infra* p. 23.

[10] Ἤνυστρον; comp. *Aristot.* De Part. Anim. III. 14; *Aristoph.* Equit. 356, 1179.

[11] *Mishn.* Chull. III. 1; comp. *Siphra* fol. 48[b] ed. Schlossb.

[12] זה הכלל כל שאין כמוה חיה טרפה.

[13] Comp. *Kayserling*, Die rituale Schlachtfrage, pp. 18, 19.

[14] See the overwhelming details in *Yoreh Deah* §§. 29—60.

[15] Comp. Comm. on Lev. I. p. 188.

[16] *Maim.* De Cib. vet. IV. 13, 14: "The kicking must take place at the end of the slaughtering; at the beginning, it is of no value. Now, of what nature must the palpitation

Jewish tradition defeated a valuable principle by frivolous playfulness[1].

## V. MEAT OF ANIMALS TORN BY WILD BEASTS (טְרֵפָה).

In nearly every respect analogous to the meat of animals that have died of themselves (נְבֵלָה) is, with regard to motive, law, and history, the meat of animals, whether quadrupeds or birds[2], torn by beasts of prey (טְרֵפָה)[3]. Both therefore are repeatedly mentioned and treated of together[4]; for both were primitively avoided partly from an instinctive feeling of disgust, partly from fear of unwholesomeness, men naturally recoiling from "sharing a feast with untameable beasts, and thus becoming almost fellow-revellers in their carnivorous festivals"[5]. Both were proscribed by the religious legislators of the Hebrews with a consistency attempted by no other nation; for the טרפה also was probably rejected because the animal's death was attended with an imperfect efflux of blood; it was, in the Levitical code, likewise regarded as causing defilement[6] and hence deserving detestation from the people of God, "You shall be holy men to Me, and you shall eat no flesh that is torn by beasts in the field, you shall cast it to the dogs"[7]; it was equally prohibited to the native Israe-

---

be? If a small domestic quadruped, or a larger or smaller beast of the forest, stretches a fore-foot forward and draws it back, or if it stretches a hind-foot forward, though it does not draw it back, or if it merely bends a hind-foot, it has kicked in the lawful way, and is permitted for food: but if it only stretches a fore-foot forward and does not draw it back, it is forbidden"; etc. etc.

[1] Comp. *Talm.* Chull. 32[b]; Zevach. 69; *Maim.* De Cib. vet. IV. 1—5, 8 *sqq.*

[2] Ezek. XLIV. 31.

[3] Or more fully בשר בשדה טרפה, Exod. XXII. 30; Sept. less decidedly but uniformly κρέας θηριάλωτον *caught* by wild beasts (Pseudo-Phocylides ver. 147 θηρόβορον, modified for the requirements of the verse), and so Vulg. generally captum a bestia or bestiis; yet in Ezek. IV. 14, laceratum a bestiis; comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 441. — The prohibition was, later, naturally extended to beasts killed at any place and by whatever act of violence (כל הבהמה המוכה מכה המביאה אותה לידי מות); comp. *Hotting.* Jus Hebr. pp. 99—103.

[4] Lev. XVII. 15; XXII. 8; comp. Ezek. IV. 14; XLIV. 31.

[5] Comp. *Philo* De Concupisc. c. 10: τὸ μὲν ὡς οὐ δέον κοινωνεῖν τραπέζας ἀνθρώπων ἀτιθάσσοις θηρίοις, μόνον οὐ συνευωχούμενον ταῖς σαρκοφαγίαις· τὸ δὲ ὡς τάχα μὲν βλαβερὸν καὶ νοσῶδες, ἐναποτεθνηκότος τοῦ ἰχῶρος μετὰ τοῦ αἵματος κτλ.

[6] Lev. XXII. 8; comp. Ezek. IV. 14.

[7] Exod. XXII. 30. This is expressed by Pseudo-Phocylides (vers. 147, 148), Μηδέ τι θηρόβορον δαίσῃ κρέας, ἀργίποσιν δὲ Λείψανα λεῖπε κυσίν, after which he emphatically adds θηρῶν ἄπο θῆρες ἔδονται.

lite and to the heathen stranger; the uncleanness produced by partaking of it was also to be removed by bathing and the washing of garments, and the neglect of these ceremonies was visited with the like menace, "He shall bear his iniquity"[8].

But from this point the precepts diverge; the particular injunctions, so nice in gradation, with respect to touching נבלה or to the defilement of the objects coming into contact with it, are not repeated with regard to טרפה; of the latter evidently a more lenient view was taken in reference to Levitical purity; an animal torn to pieces by another may have been healthy in itself; it may not, like that of נבלה, have harboured within it the seeds of corruption; its carcase, therefore, though impregnated with coagulated blood, and unclean on account of its abnormal or mangled condition, was regarded less as infected with putridity, and therefore less noxious by contact than the carcase of an animal which, even while living, seemed to be in a repulsive state of decomposition[9]. Hence we may understand why some nations, as the Hindoos, were not so strict on this point; for the law of Manu pronounces as pure the flesh of beasts killed by dogs or other carnivorous animals, or by men of the mixed classes[10], who live upon the chase[11]. Yet the first comprehensive decree of the apostles no doubt included in the term "strangled" (πνικτόν) both נבלה and טרפה, and interdicted to the gentile converts the latter as well as the former[12]; this is the more probable, as, in Jewish phraseology, both terms became gradually almost convertible[13]. The Koran expressly prohibits any creature that has been killed by the horns of another, or has been attacked by a wild beast, though it permits the beast for food if it does not actually die during the assault, and is afterwards duly slaughtered[14]. These rules were developed and multiplied by Mahommedan teachers, who enjoined, for instance, that if a dog has tasted of the blood merely of game, the latter is not unlawful (*halâl*), but if of the flesh also, it is prohibited (*harâm*). They distinguished

---

[8] Lev. XVII. 15, 16.

[9] Comp. *Talm.* Chull. 68[b]; Macc. 18[a]; *Maim.* De Cib. vet. IV. 6 *sqq.*; Mitsv. Hashem §. 73. — It is an artificial view to associate in these laws the *death* of the beast and the *sin* of man, the one being the reflex of the other, so that, for instance, נבלה should be avoided in order to remind man of his iniquity and to enhance his detestation of it (so *Keil*, Archaeol. II. 18 *sqq.*; *Baumgart.* Theol. Comm. II. 154, 155; a. o.).

[10] The Chaudalas; *Manu* X. 12, 16.

[11] *Manu* V. 131.

[12] Acts XV. 20, 29; XXI. 25; comp. *Tertull.* Apolog. c. 9. The present Copts "abstain from the flesh of animals that have been strangled" (*Lane*, Mod. Egypt. III. 188).

[13] See p. 15 note 9.

[14] *Koran* V. 4.

two principal modes of killing, one by cutting the throat next the head, when the windpipe, the gullet, and carotid arteries must be thoroughly divided[1]; and the other more approved method, especially employed in killing camels, by spearing the beast in the hollow of the throat near the breast-bone[2]. During the act of slaughter the words, "In the name of God, God is most great" must be pronounced, or some similar terms, but never the phrase, otherwise so common, "In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful," since it is considered cruel mockery to allude to attributes of mercy, while inflicting severe sufferings upon an animal. Tame birds must be killed in the same manner as cattle; the wild species, like the hare, the rabbit, the gazelle, and other game, may be shot, or killed by a dog; but in the latter case, the name of God must be uttered by the person while discharging the arrow or spear, or while slipping the dog[3].

That the Old Testament never prescribes any special mode of slaughtering, needs no repetition in this place[4]. One observation may suffice. Animals killed in the chase, utterly unlawful as טרפה according to the Rabbins, were, according to the Pentateuch, considered lawful, not only by the patriarchs, as Isaac, who before bestowing his prophetic blessing, commanded Esau, "Take, I pray thee, thy weapons, thy quiver, and thy bow, and go out to the field, and hunt for me some venison"[5]; but even by the latest and most advanced Levitical legislator, who merely demanded, that the blood of the hunted animal should be carefully poured upon the ground and covered with dust, without forbidding the game itself[6]. Now those not initiated in Talmudical deductions might well consider it incredible, that a system of most complicated rules should be derived from the text

---

[1] This is termed ذبح.

[2] Termed نحر; and so *Mishn.* Chull. V. 3 (והנוחר); VI. 2; *Talm.* Chull. 17[a]; see *Hamilton's* transl. of The Hedaya or Guide, a comment. on the Musulman's laws, IV. 72.

[3] *Lane*, Modern Egypt. I. 131, 132.

[4] See Comm. on Lev. I. 187—189; comp. *Geiger*, Wissensch. Zeitschr. VI. 67 ("auch die Schlachtregeln haben nicht die geringste Begründung in dem Bibelwort"); Jüd. Zeitschr. I. 171 ("Von dem Schlachten spricht die heilige Schrift mit keiner Sylbe, von den Fehlern, welche sonst zum Genusse erlaubte Thiere und Vögel untauglich machen, mit keiner Sylbe"). Anan and all later Karaites considered the slaughtering ritual as a mere traditionary inheritance (סבל ירושה or העתקה) from their ancestors (comp. *Fürst*, Karäerth. I. 52). Yet even Rabbis of our time have the courage to declare that ritual to be "a law founded in Scripture" (*Kayserling*, Die rituale Schlachtfrage, 1867, p. 93; comp. p. 17, "das mosaische Gesetz, das Thier nach bestimmten rituellen Vorschriften zu schlachten" !).

[5] Gen. XXVII. 3.

[6] Lev. XVII. 13; see *supra* p. 5.

of Deuteronomy, "Thou shalt kill of thy herd and thy flock... *as I have commanded thee*"[7], which words, it is contended, imply that God on mount Sinai taught all those rules orally to Moses, who then explained them to the elders, to be handed down by them to their successors, till they were finally reduced to the written form as now found in the Mishnah and the Talmud[8]. But even the most sceptical will cease to marvel, if they consider that, in another place, the Talmud gravely concludes from the words of Leviticus, "*These are* the beasts which you shall eat"[9], that God actually took up to heaven specimens of each of the clean animals to show them to Moses for his instruction and the guidance of the Hebrews[10]; though the Rabbins should be leniently judged, since they hardly did more than apply a principle sanctioned by the Pentateuch itself, in which we read, that God showed to Moses "on the mountain the pattern of the Tabernacle and the pattern of all its instruments"[11].

It is cheerfully admitted that the rules laid down by Jewish tradition were chiefly suggested by a humane desire of causing death in the easiest and least painful manner, in the shortest time, and with unfailing certainty[12], and that, in these respects, among the three usual methods of slaughtering — viz. stunning or crushing the head by a blow, stabbing the neck in the region of the spine, and cutting the throat — the last named, uniformly employed among the Jews both for small and large cattle, possesses superior claims to recommend it, and

---

[7] Deut. XII. 21, כאשר צויתך.

[8] Comp. *Talm.* Menach. 29[a] (את הלכות שחיטה), leaning on Exod. XXIX. 38, וזה אשר תעשה. It is equally impossible to found a proof upon Exod. XXI. 28, where the words ולא יאכל את בשרו are merely added for emphasis, and do not permit the inference that, under other circumstances, that is, in case of legal slaughtering, the flesh of the ox would be lawful (comp. *Talm.* Pesach. 22[b], איני יודע שהיא נבלה ונבלה אסורה באכילה ומה ת"ל לא יאכל וכ').

[9] Lev. XI. 2, זאת החיה.

[10] See *Talm.* Chull. 42[a], מלמד שתפס הקב"ה מכל מין ומין והראה לו למשה ואמר לו זאת אכול וזאת לא תאכל; Menach. 29[a]; *Midr. Rabb.* Lev. XIII. 1, כמין גלגלת של אש הראה לו הקב"ה למשה מראות בשר הטבח; comp. also *Siphra* fol. 47[b] ed. Schlossb. (משה אוחז בחיה ומראה להם לישראל); *Rashi* on Lev. XI. 2; *Maimon.* Kidd. Hachod. I. 1, with respect to החדש הזה in Exod. XII. 2, "God showed to Moses by prophetic vision (במראה הנבואה) the image of the moon" (comp. *Talm.* Rosh. Hash. 20[a]).

[11] Exod. XXV. 9, 40, ככל אשר אני מראה אותך את תבנית המשכן וכ'; comp. *Talm.* Menach. 29[a], "an ark of fire, and a table of fire, and a candlestick of fire descended from heaven, and Moses saw and copied them."

[12] See *Yorch Deah* §§. 1—27, and the works on שחיטה; *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 26, 48. — Karaites and others believed that the Divine permission of animal food was only given conditionally, on the understanding that the traditional rules be strictly adhered to (comp. *Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. IV. 65).

has indeed been declared free from the reproach of unnecessary cruelty by the highest medical and veterinary authorities[1]. Yet those rules were also partially prompted by a superstitious awe of blood which it was deemed imperative to make flow out rapidly and completely; and feigning to be Divine, they demand implicit observance in the smallest detail and unchangeableness at all times; they brand every other method of killing as an abomination, shut the door to any improvement which experience or science might recommend, and form one of the strongest social barriers between the Jew and his fellow-man.

## VI. THE SCIATIC NERVE (גִּיד הַנָּשֶׁה).

A custom prevailed among the Hebrews, apparently from a very early date, of not eating the sciatic nerve of animals (גִּיד הַנָּשֶׁה)[2]. What was the origin of a practice apparently so curious? The sciatic nerve forms the continuation of a large aggregate of nerves uniting at the hip, and known under the name of *plexus ischiadicus*: issuing from the nether extremity of the hip, it extends, in nume-

---

[1] See the numerous opinions collected by *M. Kayserling* l. c. pp. 29—90, comp. pp. 17 *sqq.*; see also *H. Engelbert*, Ist das Schlachten der Thiere nach jüdischem Ritus wirklich Thierquälerei? 1867; *Frankel's* Monatsschr. 1856 pp. 299—304; 1867 pp. 93—100, 473—476; Ergänzungsblätter II. pp. 247, 248. Many will remember the issue of the complaints raised, in 1855, by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and pronounced invalid by the Lord Mayor's Court, when the judicious decision of Sir Peter Laurie averted great dissatisfaction; comp. the thirtieth annual Report of the Society, pp. 49 *sqq.*, and the daily papers of October 17, 1855.

[2] Or *nervus ischiadicus*: נשה corresponds to the Arabic نسا (the Samaritan codex reads נשא), which Kamuz explains (according to *Freytag*, Lexic. Arab. IV. 277) "nervus seu tendo qui per femur ad talos fertur", and hence took probably, like نسا, the sense of thigh or hip, so that גיד הנשה would be the nerve of the hip. The ancient versions afford little help; they either retain the word (Onkel. and Jonath גידא דנשיא, Saad. عرق النسا, though عرق *vein* is inappropriate), or they venture strange etymological conjectures, as *nervus muliebris*, נשה being curiously connected with נשים and נשתה גבורתם (in Jerem. LI. 30); this interpretation is in some measure countenanced by the renderings of the Sept. and Vulg. τὸ νεῦρον ὃ ἐνάρκησεν and nervus qui emarcuit, that is, the paralysing or spasm-producing nerve, but it derives slight support from the doubtful meaning *to be torpid* attributed to the root נשה; yet it has been adopted by some modern scholars also (comp. *Gesen.* Thesaur. pp. 921, 922). Hence it is easy to estimate the value of translations such as nervus contractionis and oblivionis, resolutus and luxatus; Spannader (Luther); a. o. But more hazardous still

rous ramifications, to the hollow of the knee, and then runs, in new divisions, down to the lower parts of the foot[3]; therefore, if injured, it necessarily causes lameness. Moreover, it is decidedly the largest and thickest nerve not only in the lower limbs, but in the whole body[4]; it was probably the first, and for a long time, perhaps, the only one noticed and examined in its operation. Hence it might, both from its extent and its size, well be taken to represent the chief manifestation of life, or locomotion, which naturally appeared to primitive observers the most decisive characteristic of the animal creation[5]; it was on this account deemed too holy for food, just as blood and fat were excluded because supposed to represent life itself. We thus find ourselves in a familiar circle of ideas — the sanctity of life and its organs — ideas developed with a consistency commensurate with their imagined importance.

But a merely physical reason never satisfied the Hebrew mind long; it was usually strengthened and sanctified by a spiritual notion or a historic event. Now in order to invest the abstinence from the sciatic nerve with a higher sanction, it was traced to an incident in patriarchal history, and it was supported by that fanciful, nay eccentric legend embodied in an Elohistic portion of Genesis[6], which records a remarkable bodily struggle between God and Jacob: a legend so entirely composed of grossly pagan features, that it sounds strange even amidst the miraculous tales of the Pentateuch. Who can read without surprise how God, powerless to overcome His human antagonist, like Zeus in his struggle with Hercules at Olympia[7], at last disabled him by touching his thigh at the sciatic nerve and thus bringing it out of joint; how He then addressed a helpless appeal to Jacob to dismiss Him, to dismiss Him "because the morning dawn rises" — just as in Hindoo and northern mythology spirits who visit the earth by night, hurry away in trembling at the first approach of morning[8]. And yet the

is the Talmudical explanation "the nerve that bounded from its place and rose" (שנשה ממקומו ועלה *Talm.* Chull. 91[a], which words are interpreted by Kimchi s. v. כאילו שכח מקומו ויסר לו משכו; see also *Rashi* on Gen. XXXII. 33); and so Engl. Vers.

[3] Comp. *Wiegand* in Ersch und Gruber's Encycl. II. xi. 398—402; see also the exposition of *Rashi* on Talm. Chull. 76[a].

[4] Therefore Josephus (Antiq. I. xx. 2) expresses it, not inappropriately, if vaguely, by τὸ νεῦρον τὸ πλατύ; and so Jerome (Advers. Jovinian. I. 19, ed. Valarsi II. 268, πλατὺ νεῦρον).

[5] Comp. Gen. IX. 3, where the term רֶמֶשׂ the *moving* beings comprises all animals, and is explained by אשר הוא חי.

[6] Gen. XXXII. 25—33.

[7] See *Nonnus*, Dionys. X. 376, 377.

[8] Compare *Vendid.* XVIII. 36, 40; and the remarks of *Spiegel* on § 52;

legend, or rather the skilful hand that wove it into the narrative, so accurately preserved the designing character of Jacob, that the latter, having gained an advantage over an opponent whose power of bestowing gifts he instinctively felt, insisted upon receiving a blessing, and this was granted to him by the change of his name from *Jacob* (יעקב), the Second and the Deceiver, into *Israel* (ישראל), the First and the Conqueror[1]; so eager were writers of a later age to exalt their national institutions and to glorify their ancestors, regardless of historical impossibilities and difficulties of language[2]. The myth of Jacob's struggle with a supernatural being on his return from Mesopotamia, originated perhaps in Babylon, like the tale of the angelic hosts seen by the patriarch immediately before at Mahanaim[3]; for the regions of the Euphrates and Tigris were the home of hero-fights with gods, an echo of which is discernible in the Biblical story of the tower of Babel: but that myth seems certainly to have obtained a powerful hold upon the Hebrews. It occurs again in the Book of Hosea; there, however, it appears in a modified form; God wrestles with Jacob *through an angel*, and Jacob conquers indeed,

---

see also *Philostratus* Apollon. IV. 16 fin.; *Shakesp.* Hamlet I. I. 157 (it faded on the crowing of the cock); v. 58 (but soft! methinks I scent the morning air; brief let me be); *Bürger* Lenore (Mich dünkt, der Hahn schon ruft . . . Ich wittre Morgenluft); *Göthe* Faust I fin. (Meine Pferde schaudern, der Morgen dämmert auf). The passage *Plaut.* Amphitr. I. III. 35, 36 (Quor me tenes? Tempus est; exire ex urbe prius quam lucescat uolo) is not to the purpose. No wonder that Jewish writers attempted allegorical explanations of the story, which they believed to symbolise the enmity between the Israelites and the heathen nations, and to foreshadow the ultimate victory and glory of the former.

[1] On the meaning and importance of the myth in the economy of Jacob's life, see Commentary on Genesis pp. 568—570.

[2] For the name יִשְׂרָאֵל evidently means "God rules", and is synonymous with שְׂרָיָה and שְׂרָיָהוּ (2 Sam. VIII. 17; Jer. XXXVI. 26); comp. יִזְרְעֶאל *God plants*, יְהוֹיָרִיב, יְהוֹיָקִים, etc., and even in two words, as יִפְתַּח־אֵל *God enlarges*, the name of a valley in Zebulon (Josh XIX. 14, 27); יְהוָה יִרְאֶה (Gen. XXII. 14) etc.; but for the sake of the legend יִשְׂרָאֵל was explained to signify "he combats with God", in which manner (with the simple accus.) the verb שרה is construed nowhere else, except in the parallel passage Hosea XII. 4, וּבְאוֹנוֹ שָׂרָה אֶת־אֱלֹהִים comp. Comm. on Gen. p. 570. Indeed another document simply relates the change of name from Jacob into Israel, without any etymological explanation (Gen. XXXV. 9, 10). Knobel (on Gen. p. 233) observes, "By the Divine contact the sciatic nerve was sanctified, and therefore belonged to God", but this remark does not explain why that nerve was conceived to possess a sanctity which could give rise to a legend concerning the Divine contact.

[3] Gen. XXXII. 2, 3.

but he must entreat for the blessing with tears[4]: thus in the interval between the time of the historian and that of the prophet, some of the more offensive features of the legend had been mitigated[5].

Yet the custom of abstaining from the sciatic nerve was never raised into a law, and it is never again alluded to in the Old Canon; Hosea who mentions the struggle, connects with it no consequences for the person of the patriarch or the life of the Hebrews. The custom possibly fell later into disuse; it therefore found no place in the legislative and moral portions of the Pentateuch, although, as has been pointed out, it might easily have been associated with fundamental and familiar notions; its neglect may have been owing to the progress in accuracy of observation, when it was understood, that the vital functions of movement do not depend upon one nerve, however large and important, but upon the normal action of the whole and complicated tissue of nerves[6]. Indeed, a most material change must have taken place from the time that it was deemed necessary to invent or to employ a very questionable adventure in support of a popular practice, and the period when this practice was, in principle, suppressed or ignored, because it proved to be based upon imperfect knowledge. However, when after the compilation of the Pentateuch, the story of Jacob's wrestling with the angel, together with the writer's observation on its effects, became a part of the Divine Books of Moses, the custom naturally not only regained its old authority, but was surrounded with new dignity and importance; it was by Jewish tradition, busily developing the slightest Biblical suggestion, stamped as an essential ordinance of diet[7], and

---

[4] וישר אל מלאך ויכל בכה ויתחנן לו, Hosea XII. 5.

[5] Josephus also (Ant. I. xx. 2) materially changes the Biblical story: an "apparition" (φάντασμα) wrestles with Jacob, and the name Israel means, "one that struggled with the Divine angel" (τὸν ἀντιστάντα ἀγγέλῳ θείῳ).

[6] Ewald (Alterth. p. 209) observes, "Die Sitte stützte sich wahrscheinlich auf einen alten Glauben, welchen das Gesetz nicht billigen mochte"), and Gramberg (Relig. Id. I. 331), "der Dichter verräth hier vielleicht unwillkürlich einen nicht elohistischen Gebrauch seiner Zeit".

[7] The Septuagint already renders the simple statement of Genesis (לא יאכלו) as a prohibition (ἕνεκεν τούτου οὐ μὴ φάγωσιν υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὸ νεῦρον κτλ.), against the context which proves a simple narrative. Yet that was the traditional Jewish acceptation, which regarded the custom as a sufficient basis for an authoritative law, without ever attempting to assign a special reason for it (comp. *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 41). The Mishnah (Chull. VII. 6), to obviate the difficulty, urges, בסיני נאמר אלא שנכתב במקומו, "the command was given on Sinai, but was written down in its place" (in Genesis). In the system of laws compiled by Maimonides, it is enumerated as the 183rd

was in the Pharisaical schools made the subject of long discussions, which grew into an elaborate section of the Mishnah, to be again enlarged by new and minute comments subsequently embodied in a corresponding portion of the Talmud. The whole of the sciatic nerve in all its ramifications, both of the right and the left thigh, was interdicted to men and women, for all times and countries, in clean domestic, and clean beasts of the forest (בבהמה ובחיה), to the very embryo found fullgrown in the womb; yet not in birds, unless the socket of their hip-bone be round and concave. It was to be extracted even from victims burnt as holocausts, and to be thrown among the ashes of the altar. The slightest transgression was punished with forty, the eating of either nerve with eighty stripes; however, by interpreting the text with literal narrowness, this severe penalty was limited to that part of the sciatic nerve which is just "on the hollow of the thigh" (אשר על כף הירך), whereas eating of the remainder, though forbidden, like all other nerves, was more leniently visited. Yet as "it is tasteless like wood", it was declared not to disqualify the food with which it is boiled; and like the other nerves and the fat, it was permitted for general use or profitable disposal (מותר בהנאה)[1]. Thus tradition at least acknowledged that it neither causes uncleanness nor that it is an "abomination"; that in fact, it rather partakes of a certain sanctity[2]. Modern Rabbinism not only clings to the interdiction, but in some countries tries to uphold it with fanaticism; for as some skill is required to trace the sciatic nerve in all its branches, scrupulous Rabbis boldly forbid the flesh of the whole of the hind-quarters, to the inconvenience of all orthodox Jews, and to the serious annoyance of the intelligent, who would fain bury in oblivion the blasphemous story, in which the custom is alleged to have originated.

## VII. SEETHING THE KID IN ITS MOTHER'S MILK.

Three times we read in the Pentateuch, "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk"[3]. But the import of this precept is so

of the negative precepts (שלא לאכול גיד הנשה), in that of סמ"ק as the 203rd command, of סמ"ג as the 139th prohibition; in the Pentateuch it is the third of the supposed 613 laws (comp. *Talm*. Macc. 23b).

[1] Comp. *Talm*. Pesach. 22a, and *Rashi* ibid.

[2] See *Mishnah* Chullin VII; *Talm*. Chullin 89a—103b; comp. also *Maimon*. De Cib. vet. c. VIII; *Yoreh Deah* §. 65. 5—14; *Hottinger*, Jur. Hebraeor. Leg. (III) pp. 12, 13; Mitsv. Hashem 1b.

[3] לא תבשל גדי בחלב אמו, Exod. XXIII. 19; XXXIV. 26; Deut. XIV. 21.

obscure, that conjecture may fairly claim the field as its own. It was classed by the Jewish doctors among those recondite "statutes" (חקים) or "mysteries" (סתרי התורה), which, like the laws of the "red cow"[4] and of Azazel's goat[5], must not be enquired into by men, but will be revealed and explained by God in the time of the Messiah[6]. It was hopelessly abandoned by so acute a dialectician as Ebn Ezra, who urged that it was needless and futile to search for a reason, and by so earnest a philosopher as Mendelssohn who considered that the benefit of the ordinance does not consist in understanding it, but in its practice[7]. Is it a law of diet or a law of humanity? Is it designed to counteract cruelty or superstition? Is it meant to reform a custom of the Hebrews, or to keep them aloof from one prevalent among the heathens?

The only faint glimmer of light is thrown upon the command by the context in which it is introduced; yet it may be sufficient to lead us to an intelligible conclusion. Twice the precept occurs in this connection, "The first of the firstfruits of thy land thou shalt bring into the House of the Lord thy God: thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk"[8]; and both times this verse is preceded by regulations concerning the three great agricultural festivals of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. Hence it is almost impossible to resist the inference that the precept relates to the produce of the soil, to crops and harvests[9]. But what is the connection? It was, no doubt, at the time when the command was first written down, so obvious to every one, that it seemed to require no word of illustration. We, after the lapse of so many ages, must be content with the general, though by no means untrustworthy reports concerning a custom that flourished among eastern and western cultivators of the soil — the custom of killing, after the ingathering of the fruits and harvests, and at the common assemblies of the shepherds[10], a young goat, boiling it in its mother's milk, and sprinkling the broth, with various ceremonies and prayers, over fields and orchards, trees and gardens, in the firm belief of thereby securing more plentiful crops in the ensuing year[11]. Can it be surprising, that the Hebrew writer,

---

[4] Num. XIX. 2 *sqq.*

[5] Lev. XVI. 8 *sqq.*

[6] Comp. *Bechai* on Lev. XXIII. 19, fol. 88b ed. 1864, לעתיד לבא הקדוש ב"ה מגלה להם לישראל ה.

[7] *Ebn Ezra* on Exod. XXIII. 19; *Biur* ibid., והתועלת היא בעשייתם לא בידיעת סבתם; comp. *August.* Quaest. in Exod. XC, Quomodo intelligatur ad verborum proprietatem nescio utrum possit reperiri.

[8] Exod. ll. cc.

[9] It would be going too far to refer it actually to the feast of Tabernacles, as is done by Abarbanel, Spencer, a. o.

[10] Called *Mesta* (מיס"טה) in Spain.

[11] See especially *Abarbanel* on Exod.

who taught that fruitfulness and sterility are in the hand of God alone, and that He sends the one or the other according to His decrees and the deserts of men, should have looked with severe disapproval upon a heathen usage that attributed reality and effect to vain superstition? That goats played an important part in the worship of idols and the history of demons needs not be repeated in this place [1]. But from very early times the connection between our prohibition and the preceding portions was supposed to relate to the sacrifices offered on the three chief festivals, on which occasions a kid seethed in its mother's milk, such as pagans were perhaps wont to present to their gods, was declared to be an abomination. This view is already found in the Samaritan text [2], it occurs in some copies of the Septua-

---

XIX. 23 fol. 82ª (ed. Amsterdam 1768), שהיה ממעשה עובדי עבודת אלילים בזמן קבוצידהם ... לבשל הגדיים בחלב בזמן אסיפת התבואות להשבם שבזה יתרצו לאלהיהם וכ׳ (though in fol. 130ᵇ, on Exod. XXXIV. 26, he lays stress on *eating* גדיים מבשלים בחלב, adding that eating meat with cheese or milk is the custom of idolators), and *Cudworth*, De vera Notione Coenae Domini, cap. II §. 7 (ed. Moshem. II. p. 849), quoting from an anonymous manuscript work of a Karaite who observes, "Moris erat antiquis populis, qui Deum verum ignorabant, messe prorsus et frugibus omnibus collectis, hoedum in matris suae lacte coquere, et postea magico ritu (דרך כשוף) lacte illo omnes arbores suas, campos, hortos, arboreta aspergere: sperabant enim fore, ut fertiliores inde fierent agri et arbores, plusque fructuum consequenti anno redderent"; and then Grotius, Clericus, Bochart (Hieroz. I. 639, 640), Spencer (Legg. Hebr. Ritt. II. ix. 2, pp. 335—340, who adduces from the work צידה לדרך these words, שמעתי שהיו מבשלין בשר בחלב ובפרט הגדיים וטלאים וכשהיו נוטעין האילנות היו מקטרין בעשן אתו זרע ומוריקין שם מהחלב וכ׳), a. o.; see Comm. on Exod. p. 460. Maimon. also (Mor. Nev. III. 48) remarks, however vaguely, that as our command is, in two passages, joined with that concerning the annual pilgrimages to Jerusalem, it may possibly be somehow connected with idolatry; meat boiled in milk was perhaps eaten at some superstitious ceremony or at one of the pagan festivals; though he admits that he never heard or read anything of a similar abuse.

[1] Comp. Levit. XVII. 7; 2 Chr. XI. 15; Isai. XIII. 21; XXXIV. 14; *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 46 ("certain sects of the Zabii who worshipped demons, believed that these took the form of he-goats which name they, therefore, gave to the demons"); *Spencer* l. c. III. viii. 7; see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 368 notes 1 and 2, and *infra* the treatise on the Day of Atonement: but to identify *Atys*, the god of the sun, with עתוד (*Bochart* l. c. p. 647; *Spencer* l. c. p. 336), is more than precarious (comp. *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. V. 42, Attidem cum nominamus, solem significamus).

[2] It has the following addition after the command in Exod. XXIII, כי עשה זאת כזבח שכח (l. שרץ or שקץ) ועברה היא לאלהי יעקב, "he who does this acts as if he sacrificed a reptile, and this is an offence to the God of Jacob" (Clericus explains שכח, without probability, *inventum nempe cadaver*, which would at least require נשכח; Bochart, for כחש *macrum*; Hottinger

gint[3], and has been adopted by many and even modern interpreters[4]. But irrespective of the extreme doubtfulness and questionable authority of these glosses, the section of which our command forms the conclusion in both passages of Exodus, does not treat of the gifts presented on the festivals, but of the general character of the latter; for the firstfruits might be offered at any other time. It is true that goats were sacrificed by heathen nations on various occasions: the Greeks carried in their processions at the festival of the Dionysia, a pitcher filled with wine, bunches of grapes, and a basket of figs, a goat, and other symbols of fruitfulness[5]; goats were offered by the Athenians once a year to Minerva, and by the Romans commonly to Bacchus, because they damage by their bite the vine and the olive tree, though with all their viciousness they are unable to destroy either the one or the other[6]; and hence at Athens, on the festival of the Ascolia in honour of Bacchus, people showed their contempt by jumping over greased and inflated goats' skins[7], when the spectators delighted in the stumbling or fall of the jumpers[8]; the Romans believed that they gained the favour of Bacchus by slaughtering goats on his altars and thus diminishing the number of his enemies[9]; and a she-goat was at Rome deemed acceptable to Faunus[10]. Again, milk was frequently used for libations, not only to the deities and powers of the nether world[11], but also to the nymphs of the forest[12], to Silvanus after the completion of the harvest[13], to Pales[14] and

*the forgotten sheaf* or שכחה Lev. XIX. 9; Spencer *rem abominandam*, etc.).

3 Ὃς γὰρ ποιεῖ τοῦτο ὡσεὶ ἀσπάλακα θύσει, ὅτι μήνιμά (s. μίασμά) ἐστι τῷ θεῷ Ἰακώβ.

4 So Nic. de Lyra (in Exod. XXIII), Knobel (on Exod. pp. 236, 237), Bevan (in Smith's Diction. of the Bible I. 630), a. o.

5 *Plut.* de Cupidit. Divit. c. 8.

6 Hence the old and cruelly ironical distich, Κῆν με φάγῃς ἐπὶ ῥίζαν, ὅμως δ'ἔτι καρποφορήσω, Ὅσσον ἐπιλεῖψαι σοί, τράγε, θυομένῳ (*Suidas* s. ἀσκός, I. 795 ed. Bernhardy); or similarly Ovid (Fast I. 357, 358, Rode, caper, vitem! tamen hinc cum stabis ad aram, In tua quod spargi cornua possit erit).

7 Which was called ἀσκολιάζειν.

8 *Suidas* l. c.; *Virg.* Georg. II. 384 (unctos saluere per utres).

9 Comp. *Varro*, De Re Rust. I. 2; *Ovid*, Fast I. 349—361; *Virg.* Georg. II. 370—396 (Non aliam ob culpam Baccho caper omnibus aris Caeditur, ver. 380); *Mart.* III. xxiv. 1, 2 (Vite nocens rosa stabat moriturus ad aras Hircus, Bacche, tuis victima grata sacris); *Serv.* ad Virg. Aen. II. 180.

10 *Ovid*, Fast. II. 361, Cornipedi Fauno caesa de more capella.

11 *Aeschyl.* Pers. 611; *Soph.* Electr. 895; *Eurip.* Orest. 115; *Strab.* XV. iii. 14, p. 733; *Sil. Ital.* XIII. 434; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. IV. 20; comp. Comm. on Levit. I. p. 231 note 22, p. 232 note 6.

12 *Longus*, Pastoral. II. 22.

13 *Hor.* Epist. II. i. 143.

14 *Ovid*, Fast. IV. 746.

Priapus [1], and among ruder and poorer tribes to their gods generally [2]. However, all these facts do not bear on the spirit of our command; this centres in the seething of the kid in the milk *of its own mother* (בחלב אמו); it has no parallel or analogy in the history of sacrifices; it relates, in fact, not to offerings, but to some superstitious usage in connection with vegetable produce.

But the aspect of the question is totally altered, if we consider the context in which the precept is introduced for the third time, in Deuteronomy. Here it forms a part of a series of ordinances on lawful and forbidden food, and is supported by the usual principle — "You shall not eat of anything that dies of itself;... for thou art a holy people to the Lord thy God: thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk." Here then it is obviously treated as a law of diet. How is this change to be accounted for? We have before us a most remarkable instance of Levitical development. The brief but pithy command was no doubt faithfully remembered by the nation: it concluded the old "Book of the Covenant", and again a cycle of laws intended as the renewal of that Covenant; but its meaning and motive fell manifestly into oblivion, perhaps because the custom by which it had been prompted died away among the Hebrews, and became less prominent among the Canaanites. Then it was natural that "to seethe" should be understood strictly as to cook for the sake of eating, which sense would indeed suggest itself as most suited to the phrase [3]. Thus the law was incorporated among the dietary precepts. Indeed young goats seem to have been much esteemed as food in Palestine [4] and elsewhere [5]; they were among the ancients recommended

---

[1] *Virg.* Ecl. VII. 33.

[2] *Plin.* Hist. Nat. Praef. 11. — Est etiam ratio, observes Gregorius (quoted by Spencer l. c. p. 341), cur capra et lac caprinum magnifierent in cultu ethnico: nam ipse Jupiter lac caprinum suxit.

[3] Comp. *Talm.* Chull. 114[a] אפקא רחמנא לאכילה בלשון בישול; Pesach. 82[b]; *Maim.* De Cib. vetit. IX. 2; Ralbag on Exod. XXIII. 19, התורה מנעה בבשולו שהוא לתכלית האכילה וכ"ש שמנעה אכילתו; *Bechai* l. c. where the reasons why the Pentateuch uses the word תבשל and not תאכל are summed up in the Rabbinical spirit. Gramberg (Relig. Id. I. 335) supposes that the author of the law may have identified milk with blood; but if so, he would have interdicted milk altogether; as indeed the Hindoo priests were forbidden to drink the milk of all forest beasts, except the buffalo (*Manu* V. 9).

[4] Comp. Gen. XXVII. 9, 14 (מטעמים); Judg. VI. 19; XIII. 15; 1 Sam. XVI. 20; etc.

[5] Comp. *Virg.* Ecl. II. 40—42; *Juven.* XI. 65—69 (Hoedulus . . . qui plus lactis habet quam sanguinis); *Athen.* IX. 66 (ἔριφοι ποικίλως ἐσκευασμένοι . . . οἵτινες οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν ἡδονὴν παρεῖχον ἡμῖν.

as particularly wholesome even to patients and invalids[6]; nay of all young quadrupeds the kid only was deemed fit for consumption on account of its dryness[7], whereas the remainder were avoided on account of their excessive humidity[8]; therefore, the kid only was boiled in milk, "because its flesh is not moist, but warm (חם), even when the animal is very young"[9]; yet it is well known that the Bedouins very rarely boil any meat in water, but, to make it the more tender and palatable, they generally use *labbin* or sour milk[10]; for they by no means deem meat boiled in milk "very heavy food, productive of an excess of blood"[11]. Nor could the compiler experience much difficulty in finding an appropriate reason for prohibiting the flesh of the kid boiled in its mother's milk. He probably regarded it as revolting cruelty to prepare the young beast with the very milk which nature had destined for its nourishment[12], as a perversion of the eternal order of things, and as a culpable contempt of the relation that God ordained to exist between the mother and her young[13]. He,

---

[6] *Ebn Ezra* on Exod. XXIII ("all physicians agree that there is no meat like it for wholesomeness, they permit it, therefore, for sick people; so they do in Spain and Africa, Palestine, Persia, and Babylon"); *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. pp. 633, 634.

[7] *Isidorus* (Etymol. Lib. XII. c. 1, no 13) goes so far as to connect *hoedus* with *edere*, "hoedi ab edendo vocati, parvi enim pinguissimi sunt, et saporis jucundi ... unde et edullium vocatur, quasi appellari mereatur edullium κατ' ἐξοχήν".

[8] *Galen*. De attenuante Vict. Rat. c. 8 (agnorum esus propter insignem humiditatem est fugiendus); *Kimchi* Rad. Lib. sub גדה : מנהגם היה לאכל הגדיים ירי בהחלבא; *Bochart* l. c. p. 637.

[9] *Ebn Ezra* l. c.; thus at present milk is used for basting hares and other game, and veal.

[10] Comp. *Rosenm.* Morgenl. VI. 258.

[11] *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 48.

[12] Comp. *Philo*, De Humanit. c. 18, πάνυ γὰρ ὑπέλαβεν εἶναι δεινὸν τὴν τροφὴν ζῶντος ἥδυσμα γενέσθαι καὶ καράρτυσιν ἀναιρεθέντος κτλ.; *Clem. Alex.* Strom. II. p. 401. (ed. Sylburg), μὴ γὰρ γινέσθω ἡ τοῦ ζῶντος τροφὴ ἥδυσμα τοῦ ἀναιρεθέντος ζώου, μηδὲ τὸ τῆς ζωῆς αἴτιον συνεργὸν τῇ τοῦ σώματος καταναλώσει γινέσθω; *Theodoret.* Quaest. in Exod. XXIII. 19, saepius admonui, quod per omnia doceat illos humanitatem; *Ebn Ezra* l. c. אולי היה כי אכזריות לב הוא לבשל הגדי בחלב אמו; *Nachman.* on Deut. XIV. 21; *Abarban.* l. c. ועקר טעם המצוה הזאת הוא להסיר מדת האכזריות; *Bechai*, l. c. "it hardens the heart, since the milk is formed of blood, and therefore engenders cruelty and an evil disposition of the soul, the more so as it does not change and assimilate in the body like other food" etc.; *Aramah* עקדת יצחק on Exod. XXIII (fol. 34[a], ed. Frankf. a,O. 1785); comp. also *Bochart* l. c. p. 638, whose remarks and historical illustrations anticipate and refute the dogmatic and one-sided assertion of Spencer (l. c. II. ix. 1, p. 334), "haec omnia rhetorem magis quam logicum decent... cum animal occisum nullo sensu tangatur, quacunque ratione carnes illius elixentur".

[13] Comp. *Philo* l. c. τὴν δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀκρασίαν τοσοῦτον ἐπιβῆναι,

therefore, denounced the practice as abhorrent to the aspirations of the Israelites, who were to be "a holy people to the Lord their God." The solemnity of this appeal proves also that he was not merely guided by sanitary motives [1]; he did not "forbid the eating of so tender an animal as unwholesome food" [2], for in the opinion of the Arabs a kid seethed in its mother's milk is particularly tender and savoury [3]. But it cannot be doubted, that the only possible translation of the Hebrew words is, "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk." Many other renderings have been proposed, of which it may suffice here to adduce a few. "Thou shalt not seethe the kid which should still be in its mother's womb and nourished by her milk" [4]: this refers to the iniquitous usage of causing abortion, especially of the sow, by striking her womb and dugs with the heels, "in order to mix together, in the moment of labour, blood, milk, and the mash of the crushed litter, and then to consume the most inflamed parts of the animal" [5]; but that usage existed, as far as we know, only in Rome at the time of its utmost degeneracy. Or, "Thou shalt not seethe a kid during the first seven days after its birth" [6], or "as long as it is sucking its mother's milk" [7]; or, by way

---

ὡς τῷ τῆς ζωῆς αἰτίῳ καταχρήσασθαι καὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ὑπολοίπου σώματος ἀνάλωσιν; *Spencer* l. c. p. 336, quid enim ab ordine naturae magis alienum fingi potest quam ut mater ad foetus sui perditionem instrumentum administrare . . . cogeretur; see also *Keil* on Exod. p. 485; Archäol. §§. 99 (note 8), 156.

1 Comp. Targ. Jonath. who adds דלא יתקף רוגזי ואיבשיל עיבוריכון דגנא וקשא תריהון כחדא וכ׳, "lest My anger wax strong, and I boil your food, corn and chaff both together"; which gloss may conceal a reference to that fruitfulness which was vainly expected from the kid seethed in its mother's milk.

2 As Vater believes.

3 On Ex. XXIII שהתולדת שוה אז הוא יותר ערב; comp. *Nachman.* on Deut. XIV. 21, איננו מאכל נתעב.

4 *Clem. Alex.* l. c., comp. *Ebn Ezra* l. c., ובעבור שאין מנהג אדם לאכל בשר חי אסור לבשל הגדי בחלב אמו; *Aramah* l. c. fol. 33b.

5 *Plut.* De Esu Carn. II. 1, οἱ δ' οὔθασι συῶν ἐπιτόκων ἐναλλόμενοι καὶ λακτίζοντες, ἵνα αἷμα καὶ γάλα καὶ λύθρον ἐμβρύων ὁμοῦ συμφθαρέντων ἐν ὠδῖσιν ἀναδεύσαντες κτλ.; *Clem. Alex.* l. c., ἵνα δὴ γάλακτι ἀνακεκραμένην σάρκα θοινάζωνται, τάφον τῶν κυοφορουμένων, τὴν εἰς γένεσιν κτισθεῖσαν μήτραν πεποιήκασι. This barbarousness of gluttony, which was perpetrated simultaneously with another one of thrusting a red-hot spit into the throats of pigs, "that the blood, all extinguished and diffused into the body by the intrusion of the iron, might render the meat softer and more tender" (*Plut.* l. c.), recalls the no less shocking modern practices above alluded to (pp. 11, 12).

6 Junius, Piscator, a. o., after the analogy of Exod. XXII. 29, שבעת ימים יהיה עם אמו.

7 Luther; that is, kids for three months and lambs for four; comp. *Varro* R. R. II. 1, fere ad quatuor menses a mamma non dijunguntur agni, hoedi tres, porci duo — whether

of hypallage, "Thou shalt not seethe the kid together with its mother", so that it would be kindred in spirit to the prohibition of slaughtering a beast and her young on the same day [8], or of taking a bird and her young ones together from a nest [9]. But all these interpretations would involve an ellipsis or construction without parallel in Hebrew, while others are too fanciful to be entertained even for a moment. [10] Quadrupeds were indeed considered unfit for sacrifice before their eighth day [11], yet in earlier times they were even offered as holocausts while still nourished by their mothers; thus Samuel presented as an acceptable burnt-offering a sucking lamb [12], although this is in opposition to the later Levitical regulation [13].

These were the vicissitudes of the ordinance within the time and compass of the Pentateuch; but they were infinitely multiplied by later Judaism. "The kid" was understood merely as an instance or illus-

---

the flesh was considered unwholesome, or the practice cruel.

[8] Lev. XXII. 28.

[9] Deut. XXII. 6, 7; comp. *Theodor.* Quaest. in Exod. XXIII. 19, "nam hac ratione videtur quodam modo matrem etiam coquere".

[10] As the typical explanations proposed or quoted by St. Augustine (Quaest. XC in Exod.) with reference to the child Christ, whom Herod sought to kill when he was still at his mother's breast, or who suffered — was "seethed" — at Passover, the same season of the year when he was conceived ("dicuntur enim feminae ex quo conceperint lac colligere"!); or the mystical view of Bechai (l. c. 88[b], הבשר והחלב דוגמי ורמז כנגד למזל וכ'), or the moral one of Aramah (l. c. fol. 33[a]); or the metaphorical one of the Karaites alluded to by Abarbanel (l. c. 82[b]), "thou shalt not make grow (בשול הגדי גידול, comp. Gen. XL. 10) the kid by its mother's milk", that is, thou shalt not allow the firstborn animal to suck beyond the seventh day, but offer it on the eighth (שלא יתעכב הבכור עם המניקה) — an explanation which Abarbanel justly characterises הבל ומעשה תעתועים, though he is far too confident with regard to the traditional view (דרך קבלת הז"ל הוא האמת הגמור). No less strange is the conjecture mentioned and refuted by Ebn Ezra (l. c.), that גדי is kindred with מֶגֶד, which was understood to mean *fruit* (Vulg. always *poma*), whereas it signifies a *precious* gift or object (comp. Deut. XXXIII. 13, 16; Cant. IV. 16; VII. 14); Michaelis (Mos. R. IV. §. 205) indeed understands the precept to be directed "against cooking or roasting meat with butter", but defends his conceit that it was intended to encourage among the Hebrews the use of olive oil instead of butter, to promote the careful cultivation of the olive-tree in Palestine, and thereby at once to endear to them their own home which so plentifully provides them with such a delicacy, and to counteract their possible desire of returning to Egypt! (see also §. 191, and De legg. Mos. Israelitis Palaestinam caram facturis §. 10, in Commentt. Soc. Reg. Gott. IV).

[11] See Comm. on Lev. I. p. 98.

[12] טלה חלב, 1 Sam. VII. 9, 10; comp. Sir. XLVI. 16, 17.

[13] See Comm. on Lev. I. p. 36.

stration, because representing the most common case[1], in the same manner as, in other passages, the ox[2] or the ass[3] is used; especially as goats are distinguished by abundance of milk[4], which does not fail even in climes of excessive heat and drought fatal to nearly every other animal[5]. It was contended, that the word *kid* (גדי) includes throughout the calf and the lamb also[6], or at least the latter[7], nay that it signifies "any young animal of tender age"[8] (an unfounded assertion)[9], and that, therefore, the law applies to clean animals in general[10]. Indeed, one doctor of the Mishnah, R. Jose of Galilee, wished to restrict the prohibition to mammals, and not to extend it to birds, because these "have no mother's milk"[11]; another, Rabbi Akiva, desired to exclude the clean animals of the forest (חיות), as stags and roes, because the threefold and distinct exemplification of the kid appeared to him to confine the law to clean domestic quadrupeds[12]; but the arguments both of the one and the other were overruled; and the principle prevailed, "If one teacher and many differ, the law is in conformity with the opinion of the many"[13]. It was certainly admitted, that milk, boiled and eaten with the flesh of birds and clean beasts of the forest, was not forbidden by the law of the Pentateuch; but it was

---

[1] *Ebn Ezra* l. c. מנהג התורה לדבר על ההוה; *Kimchi* Rad. Lib. s. גדה; etc.

[2] Exod. XXI. 35.

[3] Exod. XIII. 13; XXIII. 5.

[4] *Kimchi* l. c. לפי שהחלב עזים הוא המרובה בו דבר הכתוב על ההוה; comp. Prov. XXVII. 27; *Talm.* Shabb. $19^b$ (עז לחלבה ורחל לגיזתה וכו׳); Bab. Mets. $64^a$.

[5] Comp. *Talm.* Bezah $25^b$ (ג׳ עזין הן . . . אף עז בבהמה דקה); *Voigt*, Lehrbuch der Zoologie, I. 416. The fresh milk of goats, especially of the white species, was considered a remedy for consumption (see *Talmud* Temur. $15^b$; Shabb. $109^b$).

[6] *Talm.* Chull. $113^b$, כל מקום שנאמר גדי סתם אפילו פרה ורחל במשמע.

[7] *Kimchi* l. c., הקטן יקרא גדי בין מן העזים בין מן הכבשים שהרי סמך גדי לעזים; the Septuagint renders גדי in all three passages under consideration ἄρνα, and not as usual ἔριφον, and so consequently is the word taken by Philo (De Humanit. c. 18; comp. *ibid.* ὥστε ἀφθονίας ὑπαρχούσης τῶν ἀρνῶν ἢ ἐρίφων κτλ.); comp. also *Spencer*, l. c. II. ix. p. 333 (Hebraeorum גדי hoedum simul et agnum notat).

[8] *Rashi* on Exod. XXIII. 19, שאין גדי אלא לשון ולד רך, and on Exod. XXXIV. 26, כל ולד רך במשמע ואף עגל וכבש; *Nachman.* on Deut. XIV. 21, כל מנקת תקרא אם וכל יונק יקרא גדי.

[9] Comp. *Ebn Ezra* l. c., גדי is only used of goats as in Arabic (جدى) and of no other species; see also *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. p. 632.

[10] It was supposed that the author specified a *young* animal (גדי), because an older one cannot well be seethed together with milk, which boils rapidly; comp. *Ebn Ezra* l. c., והבשר לא יתבשל רק בזמן רב והחלב אינו כן; *Kimchi* l. c. expresses this more explicitly.

[11] *Mishn.* Chull. VIII. 4 (יצא עוף שאין לו חלב אם); *Talm.* Chull. $116^a$; Shabb. $130^a$; *Rashi* on Exod. XXXIV. 26.

[12] *Mishn.* Chull. VIII. 4, שנאמר לא תבשל גדי שלש פעמים פרט לחיה ולעוף ובהמה טמאה.

[13] יחיד ורבים הלכה כרבים.

prohibited by the "command of the scribes" or the Rabbins[14], ever watchful to "make a fence to the Law"[15], till the Law was impenetrably hedged in and made all but inaccessible[16]. "Our sages", observes Abarbanel[17], "have prohibited every and any kind of meat mixed with milk, in order to prevent sinners from saying, 'What is the difference between the one and the other?'" Again, it was gravely urged that most people do not keep their own cattle, but buy their milk in the market; thus a person might purchase the milk of the very animal whose young he intends to cook and to dress[18]; therefore, in order to exclude any chance and possibility of such a contingency, the Jews were strictly enjoined not to boil together any milk and meat whatsoever[19].

Yet this view was but very gradually adopted. It is remarkable that it was not known or entertained by Philo, who wrote at Alexandria about the beginning of the Christian era: for after denouncing the unnatural barbarity of using the mother's milk for the preparation of her own young, he observes, "But if any one should desire to dress flesh with milk[20], let him do so without inhumanity and without impiety; there are everywhere innumerable herds of cattle, that are each day milked by the shepherds, . . . so that the man who seethes the flesh of any beast in its own mother's milk, exhibits a heinous perversity of disposition, and an utter want of that feeling which of all others is most indispensable to a rational soul — as it is most nearly akin to it — compassion"[21]. Philo, therefore, objecting to meat boiled with the milk of the animal's mother, but not with milk in general, still adhered to the plain sense of the precept as probably conveyed in Deuteronomy[22]. But already the Targum which bears the name of Onkelos, and which was commenced only a few generations later, though completed centuries afterwards in the schools of Babylonia[23], explained rather than translated that command, "You shall not eat meat with milk"[24]: it is uncertain whether this meaning had been

---

14 מדברי סופרים or מדרבנן.

15 *Mishn.* Avoth I. 1, עשה סיג לתורה; comp. III. 13, מסורת סייג לתורה.

16 Comp. *Talm.* Chull. 113 *sqq.*

17 L. c. fol. 82ª.

18 Comp. *Ebn Ezra* l. c.

19 Would not consistency have required the prohibition of eating or preparing fowls with eggs, since the eggs might be those of the birds which they are employed to make more palatable?

20 Εἰ δὲ τὰ ἐν γάλακτι κρέα συνέψειν ἀξιοῖ.

21 *Philo* De Humanit. c. 18.

22 So also Symmach. οὐ σκευάσεις ἔριφον διὰ γάλακτος μητρὸς αὐτοῦ; Ar. Erp., a. o.

23 Comp. *Geiger*, Urschrift, pp. 162—166.

24 לא תיכלון בשר בחלב (comp. ספר לחם ושמלה, fol. 24ᵇ, 25ª); so many later Jewish writers.

developed in the interval between Philo and Onkelos, or whether it had, in Philo's time, not yet reached the Egyptian Jews from the chief seats of Hebrew learning in Palestine and Babylonia. Now we cannot be surprised at the explicit paraphrase of Pseudo-Jonathan, "You are not permitted either to cook or to eat meat and milk mixed together", and at the fearful punishments which that Targum attaches to any transgression of the law [1]. And then the doctors of Mishnah and Talmud discovered, by marvellous feats of interpretation, that the prohibition applies both to the flesh of clean domestic and untamed quadrupeds and of birds [2]; and laying down the rules "the words of the scribes are weightier than the words of the Law" [3], and "God concluded a covenant with Israel, not on the conditions of the written but of the oral Law" [4], they decreed that the threefold repetition of the command forbids, for all ages and for all countries, the cooking, eating, and the profiting by, any mixture of both substances in what form soever [5]; they delighted in accumulating "pre-

---

[1] See *supra* p. 34, note 1.

[2] בהמה, חיה, and עוף, though not of fishes or clean locusts.

[3] *Mishn.* Sanh. XI. 3, חומר בדברי סופרים מדברי תורה; comp. *Talm.* Chagig. 10[a], "if a man appeals from the decision of the Talmudists (מדבר הלכה) to the Scriptures, he has no peace".

[4] *Talm.* Gitt. 60[b], לא כרת הקב״ה ברית עם ישראל אלא בשביל דברים שבעל פה; comp. Bab. Mets. 33[a], "those who study the Law do something that is meritorious and not meritorious; those who study the Mishnah, perform a meritorious act, for which they are rewarded; but those who study the Gemara do something that is the greatest of all merits" (אין לך מדה גדולה מזו; also in Derech. Er. Sut. 25[b]). The Law was compared to water, the Mishnah to wine, and the Talmud to spiced wine (קונדיטון, conditum); or the one to salt, the other to pepper, and the third to spices (בשמים; *Talm.* Sopher. c. 15, fol. 16[b]); till at last it was declared, that a person who neglects the Talmud and studies the Law only ought to be shunned (*Bechai* Kad Hakkem. fol. 77), nay that "he is without God" (כמי שאין לו אלוה, Shaar-Zedek fol. 9), and that "even the common talk of the sages (שיחת חולין שלהן) is equivalent to the whole Law" (*Midr.* Prov.).

[5] ג׳ פעמים אחד לאסור אכילה ואחד לאסור הנאה ואחד לאסור בשול, *Talm.* Chull. 115[b], and compare in general *Mishn.* Chull. VIII; *Talm.* Chull. 104—117; Kiddush. 57[b]; Pesach. 24, 25; and the very numerous midrashic interpretations in *Mechilta* on Exod. XXIII. 19 (fol. 108, 109[a] ed. Weiss), also *Siphre* on Deut. XIV. 21 (fol. 95 ed. Friedmann); *Talm.* Sanhedr. 4[b]; Nazir 37[a]; Comm. on Exod. pp. 460—462. But it was conceded that those kinds of "meat with milk" not forbidden in the Pentateuch but only by the Rabbins (see *supra* p. 36) were not withdrawn from profitable disposal (כל בשר וחלב שאינו אסור מן התורה מותר בהנאה). Maimonides, in his Sepher Hammitsvoth, enumerates the law as the 186th and 187th prohibition (שלא לאכל בשר בחלב and שלא לבשל בשר בחלב), deriving the latter, like Ebn Ezra, from Deut. XIV. 21, in accordance with tradition (מפי השמועה למדו)

cept upon precept, rule upon rule," though not "here a little and there a little", but everywhere and with full hands, till they encompassed the whole life of the Jews with bonds and fetters, burdened it with oppressive restrictions, and rendered hospitable intercourse with non-Jews all but impossible; and in doing this they supposed that they secured to their people the means of salvation and of God's special favour[6]. Any one may judge for himself by reading, in the original or in a literal translation, a few chapters of that book, which has been universally adopted by orthodox Judaism as the unalterable and eternal rule of practice, the *Schulchan Aruch* (שלחן ערוך), a digest of the laws and decisions of Mishnah, Talmud, and Geonim, and of their early commentators[7], compiled by R. Joseph ben Ephraim Karo[8], augmented not long afterwards by glosses, mostly recommending greater severity, by R. Mose ben Israel[9], and superseding all previous attempts at codifying the vast and ever accumulating materials — those of Simon of Kahira[10] and R. Hai Gaon[11], of R. Isaac ben Jacob Alfasi[12], and even of Maimonides, whose stupendous work, Yad Chazakah, though surpassing all others in lucidity, order, and compactness, authoritatively states the laws without proofs and reference to sources, and of R. Jacob ben Asher[13], whose arrangement in *four divisions* (ארבע טורים) in many respects remained the foundation of Karo's work. A few pages of this *Shulchan Aruch* on the subject under discussion will show the reader at a glance the fruits of Talmudical exegesis[14]; he will probably find that a Biblical ordinance, which originally bore no reference whatever to the laws of food, and later but a very slight one, was made to yield a mass of hairsplitting minutiae, which it is difficult to survey without

---

and including הנאה in אכילה. In מצות הסמ it is the 92nd and 114th precept (שלא לאכל בשר שנתבשל בחלב). — All later Rabbis also permitted to cook and eat fishes and clean locusts with milk.

[6] Comp. *Mishn.* Macc. III. 16, "God desired to save and favour (לזכות) Israel, therefore He multiplied their laws."

[7] With the exception, however, of those ordinances which ceased to be applicable after the destruction of the Temple.

[8] Born A. C. 1388, died 1475.

[9] Called Isserels or רמ״א, died 1573.

[10] About A. C. 900, author of Halachoth Gedoloth.

[11] From 969 to 1038.

[12] Born 1013.

[13] From 1280 to 1340.

[14] See *Yoreh Deah* (forming the second division — טור — of the Shulchan Aruch) §§. 87—97; comp. *Maimon.* Issur. Maach. ch. IX. XIV. XV; also *R. Isaac* of *Düren* שערי דורא, with the comments of *R. Israel Isserlein* הגהות שערי דורא; *R. Mos. Isserels* תורת חטאת; *Salomon ben Adereth* תורת הבית; *Buxtorf*, Synag. Jud. c. 26.

mingled amazement, pity, and regret, and in which religion, if its mission be truth and love, has certainly no share.

## VIII. CLEAN AND UNCLEAN ANIMALS.

If we follow the oldest Hebrew sources, man, like the rest of the animal creation, lived originally upon vegetable food only [1]. To what extent and during what periods this was really the case, we have no means of ascertaining even approximately. As far as historical accounts enable us to judge, the statements in Genesis would seem to have simply resulted from a religious or philosophical theory of a primitive state of human innocence in a Golden Age, or a Paradise, free from the pangs of death and the sin of bloodshed, and embracing the entire animate creation in a bond of common concord [2]; a theory which found its counterpart in the hope of an ultimate Messianic time expected to realise a similar condition of universal harmony [3]. It is indeed a *mythos* in the strictest sense; it recalls the analogous belief of the Parsees, that men, in their original state of moral perfection, did not eat at all, and that at the end of all things they will return to the same absolute freedom from physical wants [4].

It is true, the idea of a higher purity attaching to vegetable nourishment is discoverable in various well-founded facts: it is manifest in the preference given, in some instances, to bloodless over animal sacrifices [5], and in the reluctance evinced by several ancient sects to animal food. But the practice was in both respects so unsettled or rather so inconsistent, that a positive conclusion, even within a very limited sphere, would be entirely unwarranted.

With regard to the first point—the bloodless and animal sacrifices—the fluctuations, almost amounting to confusion, have been pointed out in another place [6]. The Parsees alone seem, as a rule, to have presented none but bloodless oblations [7], and when they exceptionally

---

1 Gen. I. 29, 30; comp. II. 5, 6, 15, 16; III. 17, 18.

2 Comp. *Hesiod*, Op. et D. 108—119; *Theocr*. XXIV. 85, 86; *Virg*. Georg. I. 125—159; Ecl. IV; V. 60, 61; *Hor*. Epod. XVI. 41—62; *Ovid*. Metam. I. 89—112; XV. 96—103; *Tibull*. I. iii. 35—50; *Plut*. Sympos. VIII. viii. 3; *Lactant*. Instit. VII. 24, οὐ δὲ λύκοι σὺν ἄρνεσ' ἐν οὔρεσιν ἀμιλλοῦνται κτλ. etc.

3 Comp. Isai. XI. 6—8; LXV. 25; see Comm. on Genes. pp. 78, 79.

4 Comp. *Bundehesh* c. XXXI *init.*; *Spiegel*, Avesta, I. 34, 234.

5 See Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 11, 12.

6 L. c. pp. 11—13.

7 See *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. p. LXXI; comp., however, *Rhode*, Heilige Sage der Baktrer etc. pp. 506—508; Herodotus (I. 140) observes, "The Magi kill animals of all kinds with their own hands, excepting dogs and men."

sacrificed animals, they devoted to the gods no portion of them whatever: but this arose from tenets peculiar to the Zend religion, and was unconnected with notions of the inviolability of animal life; for the victims could fitly neither be creatures of Ormuzd, under whose protecting care they stood, nor much less the detested productions of the evil and dangerous Ahriman.

But as regards the second point — abstinence from animal food — it will suffice briefly to allude to the vague and conflicting doctrines of the Hindoos and the Pythagoreans. Among the former, it would, at the first glance appear, that the "twice-born" at least, or the members of the two highest castes, were expected to live merely upon "pure fruits and roots and such corn as hermits eat"[8], and strictly to avoid all flesh, both of quadrupeds and birds, and all fishes[9]. The broad principle was established that, as flesh-meat cannot be procured without injury to animals, and "the slaughter of beasts obstructs the path to beatitude", man should abstain from flesh-meat[10]; a principle which, if it did not originate in, derived strength from, the belief in the migration after death of human souls into the bodies of animals, yet also into plants and minerals[11]. That rule was almost enlarged into a comprehensive system: "He who consents to the death of a beast, he who kills it, and he who cuts it to pieces, he who buys it and he who sells it, he who dresses, serves, and eats it — these are the eight chief associates of murder"[12]. It was subsequently extended with such rigour to the meanest animals by a portion of the Hindoos, as those of the Oswal tribe, that their priests carried besoms to sweep the ground, and covered their mouths with gauze, lest they crushed or inhaled an insect possibly harbouring a human intelligence. A Brahmin who had by design, or even by accident, killed a cat, a dog, or an ichneumon, a frog or lizard, an owl or a crow, was obliged to perform the ordinary penance required for the death of a sudra; though in the second alternative lighter acts of expiation were permitted in cases of illness or debility[13]. For the murder of other animals, a heavy fine or multiplied restitution was ordained[14]. Eating meat was considered the act of a "bloodthirsty demon", abstaining from it, a pledge of prosperity and a safeguard against disease[15]; the punishment of the former was that of being

---

[8] *Manu* V. 54.

[9] *Manu* V. 15; *Yâjnavalkya* ed. Stenzler, I. 175.

[10] *Manu* V. 48; comp. *Yâjnav.* I. 33.

[11] *Manu* I. 50; IV. 243; V. 49.

[12] *Ibid.* V. 51.

[13] *Ibid.* XI. 132, 133.

[14] *Ibid.* cc. 134—138.

[15] *Ibid.* V. 50; comp. 31.

devoured in the next world by the animals whose flesh had been eaten in this[1]; the merit of the latter was looked upon as not less glorious than the annual offering, during a hundred years, of the greatest and noblest of all gifts, the Aswamedha[2] or the horse-sacrifice[3]. Thus the prohibition of animal food might be supposed positive and absolute, nay it was curiously enjoined, that if a man should feel an irresistible desire after such food, he should conquer and expiate it by shaping the image of the longed for animal out of dough or of clarified and compressed butter[4].

However, on the other hand, the Hindoo codes permit or imply so many exceptions, that the ordinances are not only valueless as laws, but almost too wavering for customs. A number of precepts, marking an intermediate stage, are qualified or circumscribed by cautions and restrictions. Some kinds of fish and some parts of all fishes, were lawfully placed before the guests at repasts in honour of the gods or of departed souls[5]. The eating of flesh was held to be a rule of "gigantic demons", not under all circumstances, but only if indulged in unconnected with sacrifice, while in the latter case it was deemed a godly practice[6]. He who, after showing due veneration to the gods and the departed spirits, ate flesh, whether acquired by purchase or received as a present, was held free from sin[7]. A man was threatened with destruction, in the next world, by the beasts he had eaten in this, not unconditionally, but if he had eaten the flesh without paying reverential worship to the gods or shades, or without having been compelled by "urgent distress"[8]. "Flesh-meat, the food of gods", was to be shunned — unless it had previously been touched during the recital of holy texts, or been blessed and sanctified by prayers (mantras) from the holy Vedas[9]; but it was to be eaten once only, and at the bidding of a priest, and if there was danger of life[10]. "As many hairs as grow on the body of the beast, so many deaths shall the slayer of it endure in the next world from birth to birth" — yet only if he slew it "for his own satisfaction" or "against the ordinance", that is, not in association with holy observances[11]; just as, according to Herodotus[12], the

---

1 *Manu* V. 55; this idea was even traced to the etymology of the word *mansa* flesh; comp. V. 33; XI. 216.

2 See Comm. on Lev. I. 89 note 7.

3 *Manu* V. 53, comp. 54; II. 118 and *Jones* in loc.; *Yâjnav.* I. 181.

4 *Ibid.* V. 37.

5 *Ibid.* V. 16.

6 *Ibid.* V. 31, 34; comp. Lev. XVII. 3, 4.

7 *Manu* V. 32, 52; comp. *Yâjnav.* I. 179.

8 *Manu* V. 33.

9 *Ibid.* V. 7, 36.

10 *Ibid.* V. 27.

11 *Ibid.* V. 38; *Yâjnav.* I. 180.

12 *Herod.* I. 140.

Egyptian priests made it a point of religion "not to kill any animals except those which they offered in sacrifice". Beasts were not to be injured — except in the cases sanctioned by the sacred writings.[13] There was no disgrace in eating animal food — in accordance with the law, though a virtuous abstinence from it ensured signal rewards[14].

But other permissive precepts are more and more unrestricted, and others again entirely unconditional. The "twiceborn" were to avoid, not all meat in general, but meat kept at a slaughter-house, dried meat, and the meat of certain distinct classes of birds and quadrupeds, with the exception again of those species expressly allowed by the Vedas or otherwise sanctioned by lawgivers and sages, or by weighty precedent[15]. The maxims were proclaimed that Brahmah brought forth the entire animal and vegetable kingdom for the sustenance of the spirit of life, and that this spirit is entitled to consume everything whether it moves or is motionless[16]. Whoever regulates his diet according to the law, commits no sin, were he even every day to eat the flesh of animals which are allowed to be eaten, since both these animals and the persons who feed upon them were created by the great Bramah[17]. Nay passing to an extreme, the law of Manu declared, that whosoever refuses to eat meat at a solemn feast in honour of a guest or in connection with sacrifices or other sacred ceremonies performed for the gods or the departed souls, will in the other world be degraded into the state of a beast for twenty-one births; while he who partakes of meat on such occasions only, and who understands the meaning and the principles of the Veda, "elevates both himself and the cattle to the summit of beatitude"[18].

Therefore, all facts point to the conclusion that the Hindoos, for long periods partaking of all food indifferently, only began to look upon vegetable sustenance as more commendable, when they developed their theological systems of metempsychosis, and that hence abstinence from meat, at all times but very partially adhered to, and only by the more rigid sects[19], was suggested by subtle and refined speculations of a later age.

Quite analogous were the doctrines and the practice of Pythagoras, as far as inferences can be drawn from our available sources.

---

13 *Manu* V. 43.

14 *Ibid.* V. 56.

15 *Ibid.* V. 11—14, 17, 18, 22, 23.

16 *Ibid.* V. 28.

17 *Ibid.* V. 30.

18 *Ibid.* V. 35, 41, 42.

19 Comp. *Colebrooke*, Relig. Cerem. of the Hindoos, in Asiat. Res. VII. 271 ("others not only eat meat at obsequies and solemn sacrifices, but make it their common diet, in direct breach of the institutes of their religion"); *Bohlen*, Altes Indien, II. 160 — 163.

On the one hand, we have a few isolated statements, that he enjoined upon his followers, absolutely to abstain, as he himself did, from all animate beings whatsoever[1]. But on the other hand, we have more copious testimonies of much less decided principles. According to one authority[2], he permitted the slaughter, for food, of all animals, with the exception only of rams, and of oxen used in agriculture[3]; according to another, he recommended total abstinence only to those who aspired to philosophic speculation, while to the rest he allowed certain animals, though not the heart and the brain, because these are the organs of life and intelligence[4]. He taught that man "should avoid *too much flesh*"[5]; he allowed meat to others, and even recommended it to those desirous of excelling in bodily strength, though he himself avoided it, being content with honey and honeycomb, bread and vegetables boiled or raw[6]; yet he sometimes ate fish[7], only shunning "those that were holy"[8], since he deemed it unbecoming to serve up the same animals before both gods and men; moreover, he singled out as objectionable certain species of fish and birds, as the mullet and the white cock, and certain parts of quadrupeds, as the heart and the paunches[9]. Though he practised divination by means of frank-incense and not by burnt-offerings[10], yet according to some

---

1 Ἔμψυχον οὐδὲν ἐσθίοντες παντελῶς, *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 37; comp. *Jamblich.* De Vit. Pythag. 68 (ἐμψύχων ἀποχὴν πάντων); *Ovid*, Metam. XV. 75—142 (Parcite, mortales, dapibus temerare nefandis Corpora etc.); *Lucian*, Vitarum Auctio c. 6 (ψυχήϊον μὲν οὐδὲ ἓν σιτέομαι, τὰ δ' ἄλλα πλὴν κυάμων); *Aelian*, Nat. An. V. 11 (the bee which tastes no meat οὐ δεῖται Πυθαγόρου συμβούλου οὐδὲ ἕν); IX. 10 (the Jupiter-eagle Πυθαγόρου τοῦ Σαμίου διακούσας οὐδὲν, ὅμως ἐμψύχων ἀπέχεται); *Porph.* De Abst. III. 26 (ἡ γὰρ φυγὴ τῆς ἐμψύχου τροφῆς φυγὴ ἦν τῶν περὶ τὴν τροφὴν ἀδικημάτων); *Clem. Alex.* Strom. VII. pp. 717, 718 ed. Sylburg.

2 That of Aristoxenus.

3 *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 20; see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 97 notes 17—20; comp. also *Plut.* De Es. Carn. II. 4, Οἱ πρῶτοι κακοεργὸν ἐχαλκεύσαντο μάχαιραν Εἰνοδίην πρῶτοι δὲ βοῶν ἐπάσαντ' ἀροτήρων; *Herod.* II. 41; *Porph.* Abst. II. 11; IV. 7; *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 30, 46. Confucius also forbade men to hurt the ploughing ox (comp. *J. Cramer*, Confucius und Mencius, pp. 178, 179).

4 *Jamblich.* Vit. Pyth. c. XXIV (§. 109).

5 Φεύγειν σαρκῶν πλεονασμόν, Diog. Laert. VIII. 23.

6 *Ibid.* VIII. 44, αὐτὸς ἔφα μὲν οὐκ ἀδικεῖν, ἄλλους δ' αὐτὸς ἔα γ' ἀδικεῖν; *Porph.* Abst. I. 26. The Talmud also acknowledges the higher nutritiousness of meat in the words כל כבש משיב נפש (Berach. 44b).

7 *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 19.

8 *Ibid.* VIII. 34, τῶν ἰχθύων μὴ ἅπτεσθαι ὅσοι ἱεροί.

9 *Ibid.* VIII. 19, 34 ("he also forbade white poultry, because a cock of that colour was sacred to the god Month, and a cock indicates the time"); *Aelian*, Var. Hist. IV. 17.

10 See Comm. on Lev. I. 11 note 9; comp. also *Porphyr.* De Abst. II. 5.

accounts, he sacrificed cocks, sucking kids, and young pigs, and sometimes lambs[11]. Many who called themselves his strict votaries, indeed scrupulously kept aloof from fish, denouncing especially those caught with the hook, because the hook might not have been clean, or might before have wounded a sacred fish[12]; but they imposed upon themselves no restrictions whatever with respect to the meat of quadrupeds, whether in connection with sacrifices or not[13]. In fact, Gellius declared that the old and often repeated opinion, that Pythagoras did not eat flesh, was an undoubted fallacy[14], and he confirmed this statement by unmistakeable quotations from previous writers of authority[15]. The predilection shown in favour of vegetable food by the Pythagoreans and the Neo-Platonicians, the elder Karaites and some Mahommedan sects (as the "Brethren of Purity"), was due to cosmic views and speculations analogous to those which led to the same dietary principles among the Hindoos; that predilection originated, therefore, among those schools also, not in notions usual in the earliest age of untutored simplicity, but in conceits and subtleties peculiar to periods of advanced intellectual culture.

Let us corroborate this opinion by one illustration. It is well known, that not only Pythagoreans, but also Egyptians, Syrians, and Greeks, abstained from fishes during the time of lustration (ἀγνεία), and the Egyptian priests did so with such rigid consistency, that on a certain festival (on the ninth day of the first month), when every other citizen consumed a fried fish before the door of his house as a religious act, they burnt theirs instead of eating them[16]. Now, why were fishes avoided? Are the motives plain and obvious, and are they uniform among different nations, or among the various writers of the same nation? The following are the principal reasons given. Fishes are distinguished by "taciturnity" (ἐχεμυθία), which was held to be a chief, nay a divine virtue among the Pythagoreans. They do not, like land animals, endanger the property or curtail the produce of man, however they may multiply, so that all "fishing with rods or nets — a luxurious and reckless pursuit — is in reality prompted

---

11 *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 20; comp. *Porphyr.* De Abst. I. 26, αὐτοὺς ἅπτεσθαι τῶν ἐμψύχων τοὺς Πυθαγορείους, ὅτε θύοιεν θεοῖς.

12 Comp. *Ael.* N. A. X. 46.

13 *Plut.* Symp. VIII. VIII. 1, 3; comp. *Hom.* Od. II. 327—332.

14 *Gell.* Noct. Att. IV. XI. 1, opinio vetus falsa occupavit et convaluit Pythagoram philosophum non esitavisse ex animalibus.

15 As Aristotle and Plutarch: "Plutarchus quoque ... Aristotelem scripsit eadem ipsa de Pythagoricis scripsisse, quod non abstinuerint edundis animalibus, nisi pauca carne quadam."

16 *Plut.* Is. c. 7.

by greed and daintiness, disturbing the sea and diving into its depths without a shadow of justice?[1]. Poseidon was supposed to have been born from the sea, whence his priests in some parts of Greece deemed it sacrilegious to eat fish. The sea, the birth-place and abode of fishes, is "dissimilar and strange to us, and in fact repugnant to human nature", whence it was considered "neither a part of the world nor an element, but foreign, corrupt, and diseased dregs"[2]; it was called "the tear of Saturn", as the salt was termed "the froth of Typhon"; and captains of ships were passed unsaluted, because they obtain their livelihood from the sea[3]. Again, fishes, it was said, produce humid flesh, since they do not, like quadrupeds and birds, inhale our common air[4]. They are no necessity but a superfluous luxury. They live upon each other, whence a fish was the hieroglyphic for wickedness and impiety[5]. Yet, on the other hand, Pythagoras himself, in releasing and throwing back into the sea a netful of fishes which he had bought for that purpose, is by this act supposed to have signified that the fishes are our kindred friends for whom it behoved him to pay a ransom. Anaximander went so far as to make the fishes the ancestors of the human race. The Syrians considered them to derive their origin from the water, like men; looked upon them as divine, because the goddess Derceto, the mother of Juno, had partially the form of a fish[6]; neither ate them themselves nor allowed visitors in their country to taste them, and firmly believed that whosoever partook of them would be afflicted with ulcers, collapse of the bowels, and other fearful diseases[7]; they therefore kept and fed in a deep pond near the temple of Hierapolis, dedicated to Derceto, a large quantity of tame fishes, some of which were furnished with costly golden ornaments[8], and to which annually the pious repaired in solemn processions[9]; and similar rites were observed near the temple of Venus at Paphos, where also, as at

---

[1] *Plut.* l. c.

[2] *Plut.* l. c.: οὐδὲ μέρος οὐδὲ στοιχεῖον ἀλλὰ ἀλλοῖον περίττωμα διεφθορὸς καὶ νοσῶδες.

[3] *Plut.* Symp. VIII. viii. 2.

[4] Comp. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. VII. p. 718 ed. Sylb.

[5] *Horapoll.* I. 44, ἀθέμιτον δηλοῦντες ἢ καὶ μῦσον, ἰχθὺν ζωγραφοῦσι . . . κενοποιὸν γὰρ ἰχθὺς πᾶς καὶ ἀλληλοφάγον; comp. also Comm. on Lev. I. 81.

[6] *Xen.* Anab. I. iv. 9; *Porph.* Abst. II. 61; *Diod. Sic.* II. 4; *Lucian*, Syr. Dea c. 14; *Cic.* Nat. Deor. III. 15, §. 39; comp. *Ovid*, Fast. II. 473, 474, Inde nefas ducunt genus hoc imponere mensis Nec violant timidi piscibus ora Syri.

[7] *Plut.* De Superst. c. 10; *Porph.* Abst. IV. 15; *Mart.* IV. xliii. 7 (Juro per Syrios tibi tumores).

[8] *Lucian*, Syr. Dea 45; *Plin.* H. N. XXXII. 2 or 8.

[9] *Lucian* l. c. 46; comp. c. 14.

Hierapolis, the doctrine of the origin of the world from water was taught[10]. So artificial and so contradictory were the reasons assigned for a practice that was never carried out with any degree of consistency!

Advanced schools of Greek philosophy, in recommending reverence for all tame and harmless beasts not calling for man's self-defence, aimed at a regeneration of paganism by a nobler and purer life, such as is only suggested by matured and almost ideal aspirations. Indeed they enjoined abstinence from animal food "not upon all men alike but only upon philosophers, and among these upon such only as seek their felicity in God and in the imitation of His nature"[11]. After the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, many Jewish enthusiasts scrupled to eat meat, as they refused to drink wine, because the animal could no longer be killed at the holy altar, and the priests no longer received their portions[12]. Some of the older Karaites believed it to be a duty of the Jews not to eat meat in the countries of their dispersion[13]; and the later leaders of the same sect, from conviction and inclination averse to the slaughter of animals, and yet finding it sanctioned by Divine permission, attempted an escape from this dilemma by the supposition, gradually raised into an article of faith, that God grants to the killed beast "compensation" (תמור) for its pain and premature death; and this recalls the conception of those North-Americans who attribute a rational soul to the beaver, and of the South-Americans who regard the llama in the same light; the people of Kamschatka solemnly apologise to the animals they kill for the liberty they take with them; and the Mahommedans in Egypt, when about to slaughter an animal, usually say, "May God give thee patience to endure the affliction which He has allotted to thee"[14]. The Japanese, it is well known, are averse to the chase; they refrain from killing or eating animals, although

---

[10] Comp. *Münter*, Der Tempel der heiligen Göttin zu Paphos, p. 28. The Egyptians held sacred to the Nile the lepidotus (a scaly fish, probably the benny, cyprinus lepidotus) and the eel (phagrus), besides the oxyrhynchus, a species of sturgeon fabled to have been produced from the blood of the wounded Osiris; the people of Latopolis worshipped the latus, and the inhabitants of Elephantine the maeotes; comp. *Herod.* II. 72; *Strab.* XVII. p. 812; *Ael.* Nat. An. X. 46; XII. 2; XVII. 32; *Plut.* Is. 72; *Clem. Alex.* Admon. ad Gent. p. 25 ed. Sylb.; *Selden*, De Diis Syr. pp. 268—272.

[11] *Porph.* Abst. II. 3.

[12] *Talm.* Bab. Bathr. $60^b$, רבו פרושין בישראל שלא לאכול בשר וכ'.

[13] Comp. Eshkol Hakofer §. 236; Mivchar on Lev. XVII. 3 and Deut. XII. 21; etc.

[14] *Lane*, Mod. Eg. I. 132.

they place meat unreservedly before their foreign guests; and they look upon butchers as men who are permanently in an unclean state and ought to be excluded from the society of other classes: but all this is a result of their highly developed and humane "religion of the spirits" or "Kami"[1].

Indeed the thoughtful and philosophic minds among the Greeks and Romans themselves give an account of the first stages of mankind, which materially differs from that furnished by poets and imaginative writers; they forcibly describe the struggles and hardships, the rude fierceness and indomitable violence of the earliest generations; and they lay due stress upon the hot and desperate warfare unceasingly carried on against noxious and rapacious beasts[2]. That similar convictions were entertained by the ablest men among the Hebrews, before their clear sense of historic truth was dimmed by the love of religious myths, could hardly be doubted, even if the Bible did not, in the very story of Eden, allude to garments of *skins*[3].

It may then be supposed that the early Hebrews, as they advanced in experience, availed themselves of animal food like every other nation[4]; and it appears that for long periods they consumed the flesh of all eatable animals indifferently, unawed by any religious restriction, and knowing no limits beyond individual dislike and sanitary precaution. This stage in the history of animal diet is embodied in the command attributed to God at the time of Noah: "Every

---

[1] Comp. *Herod.* II. 37; Anthol. Gr. (ed. Lips. 1829) III. p. 77 no. 348, ὦ θηρῶν βροτὲ μᾶλλον ἀνήμερε, πάντα σε μισεῖ κτλ.; *Porphyr*. De Abstin. *passim*, esp. II. 3; IV. 7; *Plut.* De Esu Carn. *passim* (comp. I. 5, 6); Is. et Os. cc. 7, 31; Symp. VIII. viii. 1—4; *Clem. Alex.* l. c. pp. 149, 389, 406; *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 9 *sqq.*; *Fürst*, Geschichte des Karäerthums, I. 30; *F. Dieterici*, Der Streit zwischen Mensch und Thier, ein arab. Mährchen aus den Schriften der lauteren Brüder übersetzt, Berlin 1858; *Meiners* l. c. p. 220; *Ersch und Gruber* Encycl. II. xiv. 375; *F. A. Lühdorf*, Acht Monate in Japan nach Abschluss des Vertrages zu Kanagawa, Bremen 1857.

[2] Comp. *Diod. Sic.* I. 8; *Lucret.* V. 923 *sqq.*, 963 *sqq.*; *Plato*, Republ. II. 11 (see *Aristot.* Polit. IV. 3, 4); etc.

[3] Gen. III. 21. According to the Talmud (Sanh. 59[b]), "angels roasted meat for Adam in Paradise", to which Rashi observes, that Adam was consequently permitted to eat the flesh of בהמות and חיות. The Midrash suggests that the skin of the serpent furnished the first garments, or that these were originally "light" (אור) changed, after the fall, into "skins" (עור); comp. *Yalk. Chad.* 1[a] §§ 10, 11; ד[b] § 29.

[4] In the desert, they murmured against the manna which gave them no strength (Num. XI. 6), and longed for the rich fleshpots and the fishes of Egypt, though also for its excellent vegetables (Exod. XVI. 3; Num. XI. 4, 5).

moving thing that lives shall belong to you for food; just as the green herb I give you all things"[5]; and in harmony with this universal permission, the older or Elohistic document never, throughout the history of the Deluge, classifies the animals in reference to purity[6].

But gradually we find unmistakeable though not very striking distinctions made between clean and unclean food. Manoah's wife was commanded by the angel who announced to her the birth of her son Samson, not to eat any "unclean thing"[7], and to avoid wine and strong drink (שכר). What were the "unclean" things referred to? If the passage does not enable us to answer this question, it is highly instructive from a historical point of view. It proves that in Manoah's time the rules of clean and unclean were still in a rudimentary stage; that they were not binding upon all Israelites, but like abstinence from wine and strong drink, they were recommended only to persons in an exceptional state of holiness[8]; that, in fact, the universal and complicated dietary laws of the Pentateuch did not yet exist, and were certainly not promulgated or acknowledged: would it else have been necessary specially to caution the mother of a Nazarite against food which all Hebrews alike were taught to shun as an abomination?

Yet it could not fail, on the one hand, that the aversion to "unclean" meat spread, in the course of time, among all classes of the people, and on the other hand, that the notions of clean and unclean food were more clearly and more elaborately defined. The prophet Hosea (B. C. 750) declared that the Israelites, as a just punishment for their iniquity, should "return to Egypt, and eat unclean things in Assyria"[9]; and the Jehovistic writer of Genesis advisedly and consistently introduced in the narrative of the Deluge that distinction between "clean and unclean animals", which in the interval that had elapsed since the age of the Elohist, had been established and eagerly developed[10]. Now the usage, taking deeper root, was more and more surrounded with religious sanctity, so that the Deuteronomist could venture to attempt a systematic classification on broad and precise principles, which, still later, the compilers of Leviticus were able to employ as main pillars of their theocratic edifice[11]. The criteria fixed upon were indeed capricious and fanciful: for granting that rumin-

---

[5] Gen. IX. 3, כל רמש...נתתי לכם את כל

[6] Comp. Gen. VI. 19, 20; VII. 14—16, 21—23; VIII. 1, 17, 19; IX. 10.

[7] כל טָמֵא or כל טֻמְאָה, Judg. XIII. 4, 7, 14.

[8] Comp. Com. on Lev. I. 700—702.

[9] Hos. IX. 3, ובאשור טמא יאכלו.

[10] Comp. Gen. VII. 2, 8; VIII. 20; see Comm. on Gen. pp. 183, 184.

[11] Deut. XIV. 3—21; Lev. XI. 2—47.

ants digest and assimilate their food in the completest manner[1], and supposing that fishes with both fins and scales are the most healthy for some physiological reason[2]; on what natural principle can preeminent purity be attributed to insects provided with springing legs[3]? Yet as these criteria, on the whole, included the animals sanctioned by usage as clean, and proscribed those long and popularly held to be unclean, they were welcomed as lending an appearance of scientific order to a variety of isolated instances thus speciously raised into a law.

For the whole animal creation[4] was commonly divided into three principal groups: (1) the inhabitants of the firm land, (2) of the water, and (3) of the air[5]. Each of these three groups was again divided into two large classes, (*a*) one including (not consisting of) the species which struck the Hebrews as "clean", and were held by them to be fit for food; and (*b*) one consisting of the species which, with one single exception, were considered unclean and unfit for food, and were designated by the general term of "creeping things"[6]. Now (1) the inhabitants of the *firm land* belonging (*a*) to the first class, included the large land-animals or Quadrupeds[7], and were subdivided into the tame or domesticated "cattle", and the free or wild "beasts of the field"[8]. Those belonging (*b*) to the second class or "the creeping things"[9], comprised those animals also that live

---

[1] See notes on XI. 2—8.

[2] See notes on XI. 9—12.

[3] Deut. XIV. 6, 9, 10; Lev. XI. 3, 9, 10, 12, 21. See notes on XI. 2—8.

[4] Designated as כל החיה (Gen. VIII. 17, 19; Lev. XI. 27, 47; comp. *Sifra* fol. 48[a]; *Talm.* Chull. 70[b], 71[a] — הבהמה בכלל חיה); or חית הארץ (Gen. IX. 10); or נפש חיה (Gen. I. 24; II. 19; IX. 10, comp. ver. 16); or כל הבהמה (Lev. XI. 2; Ps. XXXVI. 7; comp. *Sifra*, *Talm.* ll. cc.; Chull. 59[a] — חיה בכלל בהמה); or כל רמש על הארץ (Gen. VIII. 19); or כל רמש אשר הוא חי (Gen. IX. 3); or כל בשר הרמש על הארץ (Gen. VII. 21).

[5] Gen. I. 28, דגת הים, חיה הרמשת על הארץ, and עוף השמים.

[6] רֶמֶשׂ or שֶׁרֶץ.

[7] בהמה (Gen. I. 24, 26, etc.; 1 Ki. V. 13), or חית הארץ (Gen. I. 30; IX. 2); also חית השדה (Gen. II. 19).

[8] בהמה and חיה (see Gen. VIII. 1; Isai. XLVI. 1; Lev. XVII. 3; comp. *Galen.* De Alim. Facult. III. 14, ἥμερα καὶ ἄγρια ζῶα); the latter are also termed חית הארץ or חיתו ארץ (Gen. I. 24, 25), or חית השדה (Exod. XXIII. 11; Lev. XXVI. 22; Deut. VII. 22; Hos. II. 14; etc.), or חיתו יער (Ps. CIV. 20) or חיתו ביער (Isai. LVI. 9), and poetically בהמות שדי (Ps. VIII. 8). Yet in Is. LVI. 9, חיתו שדי is freely used for the tame cattle, in contradistinction to חיתו ביער.

[9] רמש (Gen. I. 24; 1 Ki. V. 13); or רמש האדמה (Gen. I. 25; VI. 20; VII. 23); or כל אשר רומש על האדמה (Gen. VII. 8); or הרמש הרמש על הארץ (Gen. I. 26, 30; VIII. 17; comp. IX. 2); or שרץ (Lev. XI. 43); or השרץ השרץ על הארץ (Gen. VII. 21; XI. 29, 41, 42); or נפש השרצת על הארץ (Lev. XI. 46).

or work *under* the earth or in darkness, and therefore included the Insectivora, as the hedgehog, the pigmy shrew, and the mole; the Rodentia, as the rat, the mouse, the hamster, and the porcupine; and the Edentata, as the sloth and armadillo; the wingless Insects, as the ants; many Serpents and Worms (esp. earth-worms), Mollusks and Radiata, Reptiles, Crustacea (as the land-crab and dog-crab), and Spiders [10]. — (2) The habitants of the *water* included (*a*) in the first class, were the Fishes and some larger aquatic animals, as the Whaletribe (cetacea) [11]. Those belonging (*b*) to the second class or the "creeping things of the water" [12] embraced probably several species of the Rodentia with natant membranous hind-feet, as the beaver and otter; perhaps the Seal-tribe (pinnipeda), which, however, range under the mammalia [13]; nearly all the Worms, and most of the Mollusks, whether they are provided with a shell or not, and whether that shell is one entire piece or consists of two parts; and other invertebrates of lower organisation — the Radiata, the Acalepha or sea-nettles, and the Infusoria. — And (3) the habitants of the *air* belonging (*a*) to the first class comprised the Birds [14], among which the Bat-tribe (cheiroptera) was numbered [15]. Those belonging (*b*) to the second class or the "winged creeping things" [16] were the Insects. — A complete enumeration of the animal kingdom comprehended, therefore, the following seven classes — the domesticated cattle (בהמה); the untamed quadrupeds (חיה); birds (עוף); fishes (דגת הים); the "creeping things" of the earth (שרץ הארץ); of the water (שרץ המים); and of the air (שרץ העוף); though the last three were generally mentioned by the collective term "creeping things (שרץ)" [17]. This division is represented in the following table.

---

[10] The land animals consisted, therefore, of three kinds — בהמה, חית הארץ, and רמש; Gen. I. 24, 25.

[11] דגים or דגת הים or דגי הים, or נפש החיה הרמשת אשר שרצו המים, or נ׳ ח׳ ה׳ במים (Gen. I. 21, 26, 28; IX. 2; Lev. XI. 46; 1 Ki. V. 13). The ancients, it is well known, generally classed the whale among the fishes (see *Aristot.* Hist. An. V. iv. 2; *Plin.* IX. 24 or 40, 50 or 74; *Galen.* De Aliment. Facult. III. 37).

[12] נפש החיה הרמשת במים or אשר שרצו המים, Lev. XI. 46; Gen. I. 21; although these terms comprise, like דגה and דגים, the clean fishes also, Gen. I. 26, 28; IX. 2; comp. Ex. VII. 18.

[13] Comp. *Maim.* De Cib. Vet. II. 12, 13.

[14] עוף or עוף כנף or עוף השמים, or צפור or צפור כנף (Gen. I. 21, 26, 28, 30; VI. 20; VII. 14; 1 Ki. V. 13; Ps. CIV. 17).

[15] Lev. XI. 19, עֲטַלֵּף.

[16] שרץ העוף, Lev. XI. 20 23; see the notes *in loc.*

[17] See Gen. I. 24, 25; II. 20; VII. 14, 21; IX. 10; 1 Ki. V. 13; comp. Ps. VIII. 8, 9; CIV. 11, 12, 14; Comm. on Lev. I. p. 78 note 4.

E 2

**ANIMAL CREATION**
**(כל החיה)**

- **Habitants of the Land** (חיה הרמשת על הארץ)
  - Quadrupeds (בהמה)
    - Cattle (בהמה)
    - Wild Beasts (חיה)
  - Creeping Things (רמש האדמה)
- **Habitants of the Water** (דגת הים)
  - Fishes and larger Aquatics (דגת הים)
  - Creeping Things of the Water (שרץ המים)
- **Habitants of the Air** (עוף השמים)
  - Birds (עוף)
  - Winged creeping Things (שרץ העוף)

But the "creeping things" were, from another point of view, namely from their mode of locomotion, also divided into the four following orders: (1) "Those that go upon four feet"[1], including many of the fourfooted *Reptiles*, viz. Turtles (chelonia), Lizards (sauria), and Frogs (batrachia); (2) "Those that have many feet"[2], among which were reckoned the *Crustacea*, as crab and lobster, shrimp and prawn, the *Myriopoda*, and the *Spiders* (Arachnida), with the scorpions and mites; (3) "The winged creeping things"[3] or *Insects*; and (4) "Those that go upon the belly"[4], comprising the *Serpent-tribe* and *Worms* (Annelida); the *Mollusks*, which move or crawl, either by means of flexible and expansive muscles[5], or by a peculiar kind of feelers[6], or by wing-like organs[7]; the *Radiata*, which are enabled to move along by singular tufts or tentacula; and the *Entozoa*, those wormlike, troublesome, and often dangerous intestinal parasites.

Is it necessary to point out the very rudimentary and imperfect nature of all these classifications? Each of the three great groups, nay even two of the classes of "creeping things" include mammalia; there is no trace of an analysis of structure or organisation; and superficial appearance was the only guide.

Now, out of the first two of the seven classes (בהמה and חיה), the ox, the sheep, and the goat, of supreme importance to a nation of shepherds and agriculturists, and the stag and the roebuck, formed the ordinary staple of animal food; they were, therefore, set down as the normal clean beasts; from them the qualifications for all lawful quadrupeds were deduced; and thus the chewing of the cud and cloven feet became indispensable criteria. Of fishes, certain kinds, mostly fresh-water fish, were probably eaten without reluctance, while other aquatic animals, repulsive and unsightly, as the serpent- or lizard-like creatures, the slimy cetacea and testacea, and similar, par-

---

1 הולך על ארבע, Lev. XI. 42.
2 מרבה רגלים, *ibid.*
3 שרץ העוף, see *supra*.
4 הולך על גחון, Lev. XI. 42.
5 Gasteropoda, as the snails.
6 Cephalopoda, as the sepia or cuttle fish.
7 Pteropoda, as the whale mussel or clio.

ticularly marine species, were held in aversion, though we have no detailed information on the subject[8]; and as it was found that the former only are provided with both scales and fins, and the latter not— as the shark, the ray, and the sun-fish, which are destitute of scales, or the seal and walrus which were supposed to have no fins[9] — scales and fins were made the tests of clean aquatics. Of the class of שרץ, a few kinds of locusts only were eaten, and hence springing legs were made the necessary qualification for permitted insects. With respect to birds, no common criteria seem to have been discovered, none at least were set forth by the legislators, who preferred to give a full enumeration of the unclean species, from which it is easy to conclude, as far as the names can be identified, that they considered as unclean all birds of prey, those that feed upon carcass, and those that shun the light of day[10].

This being the natural and historic process by which the criteria were arrived at, we can hardly be surprised at the singular mistakes which meet us at every step, both in the general laws and in the details. Let us first examine the principal rule concerning quadrupeds. In a series of precepts headed, "And the Lord spoke to Moses and to Aaron saying", we read, "Whatsoever is hoofed and is clovenfooted"[11], or "whatever is hoofed and has a *two*-cleft hoof", as the Deuteronomist more distinctly expresses it[12], "and chews the cud, among the beasts, that you may eat"[13]. From these words it would appear that there are ruminants not bisulcate, and that there are bisulcates not ruminant; indeed the text dispels every doubt by adducing alleged instances both of the one and the other kind of quadruped. Yet such animals do not exist. It is a zoological fact, which an authority like Cuvier called "as certain as any other in physics or morals", that "all ruminants have the foot cleft, and that they only have it"[14]. What are the obvious conclusions to be drawn from this fact? First, that the Biblical rule concerning clean and unclean quadrupeds is illusory; for there are not two independent or separate criteria, but there is only one; the formation of the stomach is decisive for that of the foot; all ruminants are bisulcate, and all

[8] See *infra*.

[9] See, however, *infra*.

[10] See notes on XI. 15—19; comp. also *Philo*, De Concup. c. 9; *Porph.* Abst. IV. 7, πτηνῶν δὲ ὅσα σαρκοφάγα (ἀπείχοντο οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ἱερεῖς). On the criteria attempted by later Jewish tradition see the notes on XI. 13—19.

[11] ושסעת שסע פרסות.

[12] ושסעת שסע שתי פרסות, i. e. and is *bisulcate*.

[13] Lev. XI. 3; Deut. XIV. 6.

[14] See *Cuvier*, Ossemens fossiles, ed. 4$^{me}$, I. 164.

bisulcates are ruminant. And secondly, every one of the four instances or illustrations brought forward by the Biblical writer is necessarily erroneous; any attempt at defending them implies an impotent struggle against science: the camel, which the Bible admits to ruminate, is *eo ipso* cloven-footed; the hyrax and the hare, which the Bible admits to be devoid of a two-cleft hoof, are *eo ipso* no ruminants; and the pig, which the Bible admits to be no ruminant, can *eo ipso* have no two-cleft hoof.

We may now briefly glance at the individual cases. The hare is described as a ruminant[1], because, in eating, it makes with the lips a playful and twitching movement which has the appearance as if the animal were chewing the cud, just as the squirrel and other rodentia are even in modern times occasionally represented as ruminants, and for the same reason[2]. Yet it needs not be elaborately proved, that the haie is no ruminant, but belongs to the rodents (*glires*). It has a simple stomach, the structure of which, like that of the intestines, is totally distinct from that of ruminants[3]; and its teeth are so arranged that they appear in the upper jaw also, whereas those of ruminants seem to be in the lower jaw only[4]. It is futile to appeal to the vague testimonies of uneducated gamekeepers in support of a view which could prevail only in an unscientific age[5]. The flesh of the hare was

---

[1] Deut. XIV. 7; Lev. XI. 6. The reading of some codices of the Septuagint ὅτι οὐκ ἀνάγει μηρυκισμόν, is a transparent and very unhappy emendation, since the animals introduced as illustrations are supposed to have at least one of the two criteria (comp. ver. 4, where Michaelis renders the sense correctly, though not the words, "folgendes aber das *entweder* wiederkäuet *oder* einen gespaltenen Fuss hat").

[2] Comp. *Goldsmith*, History of the Earth and Animated Nature, III. 5, "the rhinoceros, the camel, the horse, the rabbit, the marmotte, and the squirrel, all chew the cud by intervals; . . . among birds, the pelican, the stork, the heron, the pigeon, and the turtle; . . . among fishes, the lobsters, crabs, the dorado, the salmon; of insects, the ruminating tribe is still larger; the cricket, the wasp, the drone, the bee, the grashopper, and the beetle: all these animals either actually chew the cud or seem at least to ruminate;... but not these alone; men themselves have been often known to ruminate, and some even with pleasure"; see also *Ovid*, Halieut. 119, scarus epastas solus qui ruminat escas.

[3] *Brehm*, Illustrirtes Thierleben II. 60, "the stomach of the rodents is simple, though occasionally separated into two parts by contraction"; one division serves as a crop-like receptacle for food; comp. Naturforscher, II. 391.

[4] Comp. *Talm*. Chull. 59[a] שפן וארנבת ...יש להן שינים למעלה; *Rabe* on *Mishn*. Chull. III. 1, p. 101; see *infra* p. 70.

[5] Comp. the wavering remarks of *Michaelis* in his notes on XI. 6, and the inaccurate ones of *Rosenmüller* in Schol. ad Lev. XI. 6, and Bibl. Na-

indeed permitted to the Hindoo priests[6], and was eaten by the Greeks and Romans and some Eastern nations, as the Arabs, who still extensively partake of it. But the Hebrews, like many others — as the Parsees, who consider the hare the most unclean of all beasts[7], the Turks, the Armenian Christians warned by Pope Zechariah[8], and the ancient Britons[9], — were accustomed to shun that flesh, which is soft and tasteless in the East[10]; perhaps they believed it to be unwholesome as engendering thick blood and somnolence[11], or they detested the hare on account of the loathsome disorders to which it is subject, it may be in consequence of its lasciviousness and its capacity of superfetation[12]. Therefore the Hebrew legislator, having no other object but to sanction a national custom, forbade the hare on account of the structure of its feet[13], though he erroneously believed it to answer to the second assumed criterion of clean quadrupeds. Utterly untenable, therefore, are all apologetic subterfuges; for instance, that the author merely desired to decide, "which animal was, for the interpretation of the Law and *in jure*, to be considered as chewing the cud or as having divided hoofs", without influencing the convictions of naturalists[14]; or that "the usage of language follows external appearance rather than the searching analysis of the philosopher"[15]: as if the criteria were not meant to point to some peculiar organisation affecting the very nature of the animals[16].

Again, the camel which was forbidden on the plea that "it does

---

turgesch. II. 212; also *Lewysohn*, Zool. des Talm. p. 109.

[6] *Manu* V. 18; *Yâjnav.* I. 177.

[7] *Niebuhr*, Reisebeschreib. II. 47.

[8] Epist. XII. ad Bonifacium.

[9] Comp. *Caes.* Bell. Gall. V. 12, leporem et gallinam et anserem gustare — Britannici — fas non putant.

[10] *Sauveboeuf*, Trav. II. 91; *Pruner*, Krankheiten des Orients, p. 52; both quoted by Knobel on Levit. p. 445.

[11] *Plin.* XXVIII. 19 or 79; *Galen.* De Aliment. Facult. III. 2, ἡ τῶν λαγωῶν σὰρξ αἵματος παχυτέρου γεννητική; though he recommends hare soup and the blood of the hare as comparatively healthy (loc. cit. c. 23).

[12] Comp. *Herod.* III. 108 (ἐπικυίσκεται μοῦνον πάντων θηρίων); *Aristot.* Hist. An. VI. xxviii. 3 (ἐπικυΐσκονται ὅταν κύωσι); Gener. An. IV. 5; *Plin.* VIII. 55 or 81 (solus praeter dasypodem superfetat); *Ael.* Nat. An. II. 12; *Xenoph.* Cyneg. V. 6, 13 (συνδυάζεται μὲν ἀεὶ, πολύγονον δ' ἐστὶν οὕτως ὥστε τὰ μὲν τέτοκε, τὰ δὲ τίκτει, τὰ δὲ κύει; *Athen.* IX. 63; *Plut.* Sympos. IV. v. 2, 3, speaking of the Jews ὡς μυσαρὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον δυσχεραίνοντας τὸ ζῶον); esp. *Clem. Alex.* Paedag. II. pp. 188, 190, 191: on the prodigious fruitfulness of the hare see *Athen.* l. c.

[13] Which are not simply divided into two parts, the forefeet having five, the hindfeet four toes.

[14] *Michaelis*, Mos. R. § 204.

[15] *Brentano* on Lev. XI. 6.

[16] Nearly all that has here been remarked of the hare, applies also to the rock-badger or hyrax (שָׁפָן).

not divide the hoof"[1], has in reality cloven feet; the division extends over the entire depth of the foot, and is often wide enough to allow the hand to be passed through[2]: however, the toes, affording no flattened surface for the limb to bear upon, are lengthened, tipped with small hoofs only, and rest upon a large and pulpy sole or elastic pad, as upon a cushion, on which the camel treads[3]; and on account of this unessential peculiarity it was declared to have undivided feet. And why? Simply because it was necessary to find a reason, in accordance with the criteria set forth, for prohibiting camel's flesh, which, though eaten by the Persians[4] and many Arab tribes [5], and lawful among the Mahommedans[6], was avoided as food by many eastern nations, as the Hindoos, the Zabii, and Egyptians[7], as it is still disdained by the Copts[8]; for it was supposed to be heating and to engender cruelty and revengefulness[9], which latter quality was commonly attributed to the camel itself[10]. But in reality there is no reason for the exclusion of the camel from the number of clean ani-

---

1 Lev. XI. 4.

2 *Arist.* Hist. An. II. ii. 6, ἔστι δὲ δίχηλον (and then he gives a very full, but somewhat indistinct description of the foot); *Plin.* XI. 45 or 105, est enim bisulcum, adding however discrimine exiguo.

3 *Aristot.* l. c. ὁ δὲ πούς ἐστι κάτωθεν σαρκώδης, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ τῶν ἄρκτων.

4 *Herod.* I. 133; *Athen.* IV. 6; *Anquetil du Perron*, Boundehesch c. XIV, see *infra*.

5 *Diod. Sic.* II. 54, αἱ μὲν γάλα παρεχόμεναι καὶ κρεοφαγούμεναι πολλὴν παρέχονται τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις δαψίλειαν; comp. III. 43; *Arist.* Hist. An. VI. 25, ἔχει δὲ καὶ τὰ κρέα καὶ τὰ γάλα ἥδιστα πάντων; *Leo Africanus*, Africae Descr. lib. I. p. 48 ed. Elzevir, jubet mactare omnium generum camelos; *Volney* and *Seetzen*, *Pococke*, *Russell*, and others, in *Rosenmüller's* Morgenland, I. 161, 162; II. 163, 164; *Sonnini*, Voyage, II. 125 (les Arabes et les habitants de l'Egypte, autres que les chrétiens, regardent sa chair comme un aliment de choix, et même comme une nourriture saine); *Burckhardt*, Beduinen, p. 50 (Germ. Transl.); *Rosenm.* Alterth. IV. ii. 9, 14—16.

6 *Koran* VI. 145; comp. *Sale*, Koran, pp. 42, 47, 113 notes.

7 *Manu* V. 18; *Hotting.* Hist. Orient. p. 186; comp. *Porph.* Abst. I. 14.

8 *Lane*, Mod. Egypt. III. 188, ed. 1846. Galenus (De Aliment. Facult. III. 2, comp. I. 2) remarks sarcastically, that the flesh of camels and asses is eaten by people "who both in body and mind are asinine and camel-like". It is unwarranted to speak of the "doubtful state of the matter", and utterly untenable to suppose that the camel was forbidden to the Hebrews in order to promote their separation and estrangement from the Arabs (*Michael.* l. c. p. 139 and on Lev. XI. 4; similarly also *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 206).

9 Comp. *Rosenm.* Alterth. IV. ii. 16.

10 Comp. *Talm.* Shabb. 51b; Sanh. 37b; גָּמָל was derived from גָּמַל in the sense of *retaliating*, *Boch.* Hieroz. I. 74, 75; comp., however, *Gesen.* Thes. p. 293.

mals; it shares most of their characteristics with respect to food, and the formation of the teeth [11] and the stomach; that it is a ruminant, has never been disputed; it is indeed distinguished from all other cloven-footed quadrupeds by the absence of frontal horns [12], but this difference ought to be an additional motive for counting it among the tame and clean animals [13].

And lastly, the swine is described as "hoofed and cloven-footed, but not chewing the cud" [14]. This statement has hitherto remained so entirely unquestioned by critics, that apologists saw no necessity for devising a specious defence. And yet it is no less fallacious than the description of the hare and the camel. The feet of swine are *not* two-cleft (bisulcous), and their structure does *not* resemble that of the clean quadrupeds, such as the ox and the sheep, the stag and the hart. It suffices to remark that, while some species of swine are provided with a solid hoof [15], the feet of the Pig-tribe generally (belonging to the group Pachydermata ordinaria) have *four* toes inclosed in separate hoofs; but as the two central ones are much the largest, and are divided by a deep cleft, the swine was considered to have a two-cleft foot. Thus, in this instance also, illusory appearance took the place of knowledge.

It is, therefore, indeed surprising to hear the "Mosaic" division of animals described as "easy and natural", "systematic and admirable", "beautifully simple and scientific", "useful still in our time and even to scholars" [16].

Mistakes similar to those which the Bible made in fixing the law, were made by the later Jews in applying and interpreting it, and for the same reason. It is well known that fins, forming substitutes for imperfectly developed limbs, are found in *all* fishes as indispensable organs. "Median fins are very characteristic of fishes, and it is questionable if any fish exists altogether devoid of the system of median fin-rays and their supports" [17]. But

---

[11] Comp. *Talm.* Chull. 59ª; *Aristot.* Hist. An. II. III. 8, ἔστι δ' ἔνια οὐκ ἀμφώδοντα καὶ ἀκέρατα οἷον κάμηλος; *Plin.* VIII. 17 or 26 (dentium superiore ordine carent ut boves); XI. 37 or 62; see *infra.*

[12] Comp. *Aristot.* Hist. An. II. II. 9, τὰ μὲν οὖν πλεῖστα τῶν ἐχόντων κέρατα δίχηλα κατὰ φύσιν ἐστίν; *Plin.* XI. 45 or 105, solidas habent ungulas quae non sunt cornigera, igitur pro his telum ungulae ictus est illis.

[13] Comp. *Aristot.* De Part. Anim. III. II.

[14] Lev. XI. 7; comp. Deut. XIV. 8.

[15] *Aristot.* Hist. An. II. II. 8, εἰσὶ γὰρ ἐν Ἰλλυριοῖς καὶ ἐν Παιονίᾳ καὶ ἄλλοθι μώνυχες ὕες; *Plin.* XI. 46 or 106.

[16] *Michaelis* l. c.; *Kitto* on XI. 3 and 47.

[17] *Huxley*, Lectures on the Elements of Comparative Anatomy, p. 63.

the Mishnah propounded this rule — "All fishes with scales have invariably fins also; but fishes that have fins, have not always scales"[1]: hence Jewish tradition permitted unconditionally all fishes with scales, but declared that those which have fins must be carefully examined with respect to scales[2]. Not the presence or absence of fins is characteristic, but their nature or position; it is these that decide the various subdivisions of the class, and determine their higher or lower place. It is, therefore, a strange tautology to speak of "fishes that have fins"; but as in some species, the fins are partially small and concealed, finless fishes were assumed and deemed possible. Nor were the Rabbins happier in classifying the fishes destitute of scales, for they included among them, and therefore prohibited, the eel[3], which, however, undoubtedly has scales, though these are hidden in the thick skin and delicately fine: they may have disdained the eel on account of its serpent-like appearance, since its fins also are very small and fewer than the normal number[4]; they possibly detested it because it was revered as a most holy deity among the Egyptians[5]; they may, besides, have regarded it unwholesome food[6], as it is still regarded by the best medical authorities[7]; but they had not to make new statutes, but to expound existing laws, and they would not have ventured to forbid the eel, had they considered it to possess the Biblical criteria of a clean fish.

But even granting the propriety and correctness of the tests, the artificial character of the law is manifest from the arrangement of the details. The number *ten* prevails in the enumeration of the species: the Deuteronomist mentions *ten* clean kinds of quadrupeds[8], and

---

[1] *Mishn.* Nidd. VI. 9.

[2] *Talm.* Nidd. 51[b]; Avod. Zar. 40[a]; *Yor. Deah* § 83. 3.

[3] Comp. *Talm.* Avod. Zar. 39[a] צלופחא, which Rashi explains by אנגילא, anguille; *Origen.* Hom. in Levit. VII. c. 8; comp. *Aruch* sub צלבחא, "an unclean fish, thin, long, round, snake-like, slippery"; Arab. also צלבחא, though the common Arabic name for eel is انكليس, corresponding to the Greek ἔγχελυς.

[4] Comp. *Athen.* VII. 90.

[5] *Herod.* II. 72; *Athen.* VII. 55.

[6] Comp. *Galen.* De Aliment. Facult. III. 30, μοχθηροτάτη δ' εὑρίσκεται καὶ τῆς σμυραίνης ἡ σάρξ κτλ.

[7] Comp. *Burdach* in Ersch und Gruber's Encycl. I. I. 15, 16, "The eel is rather nutritious, but difficult of digestion; on account of its fatness, it resists the gastric juices, and slackens the activity of the stomach; therefore, it easily engenders diseases of the stomach and the intestinal canal; it must be eaten cautiously and moderately", etc.

[8] The ox, the sheep, and the goat, the hart (אַיָּל, Sept. and *Philo*, De Concup. c. 5, ἔλαφος stag, Vulg. cervus, Luther and De Wette Hirsch), the roebuck (צְבִי, Sept. δορκάς gazelle, Vulg. caprea, Luther Reh, De Wette, Knobel Gaselle) and the fallow-deer (יַחְמוּר, Sept.

Leviticus *twenty* unclean birds[9]; the peculiar significance attributed throughout the Pentateuch to that number, needs not be pointed out again[10]; it was acknowledged by the later Jews, especially when they became familiar with the views of the Pythagoreans and Neo-Platonicians[11]; and it is, in reference to our law, expressly urged by Philo in these terms: "Ten of the quadrupeds are clean... For Moses always adhered to that arithmetical theory which, as he originally devised it with the minutest accuracy possible, he extends to all existing things, so that he establishes no ordinances, whether important or unimportant, without employing, and as it were adapting, this number as peculiar to the regulations which he is ordaining[12]; since of all the numbers, beginning from the unit, the most perfect is the number ten, and, as Moses says, the most sacred of all and a holy number"[13]. Therefore, both the criteria and the lists of the animals are the result of a studied and deliberate plan meant to classify and to group a mass of given facts and instances. Nor is even here the progress wanting which, in all similar ordinances, the Book of Leviticus exhibits if compared with Deuteronomy. The former not only repeats the old objections to all "creeping things" (שרץ), and introduces a new distinction between clean and unclean insects with the view of sanctioning the edible locusts characterised by the peculiar structure of their feet[14], but it insists upon the religious or rather Levitical aspect of the dietary laws with a fulness and an intense earnestness, which leave no doubt whatever as to the

---

βούβαλος buffalo, Vulg. bubalus, Luther Büffel, De Wette, Knobel Dammhirsch), the wild goat (אקּו, Sept. τραγέλαφος bearded deer, Vulg. tragelaphus, Luther and De Wette Steinbock), the pygarg (דִּישֹׁן, Sept. πύγαργος pygarg, Luther Tendle), the wild ox (תְּאוֹ, Sept. ὄρυξ a kind of antelope, Vulg. oryx, Luther Auerochs), and the chamois (זֶמֶר, Sept καμηλοπάρδαλις giraffe, Vulg. camelopardalus, Luther Elend). The identity and nature of these animals will be discussed in the notes on Deut. XIV. 4, 5.

9 The eagle, the ossifrage, and the vulture, the falcon, the kite, and the raven, the ostrich, the *tachmas*, the sea-gull, and the hawk, the eared owl, the frigate bird, and the night owl, the cormorant, the pelican, and the *racham*, the heron, the ibis, the hoopoe and the bat (Lev. XI. 13—19; see notes *in loc.*). On the number of *twenty-one* birds specified in Deuteronomy (XIV. 12, 18) see *ibid.*

10 See Comm. on Gen. p. 157.

11 Comp. *Lucian*, Vitar. Auct. c. IV, ἃ σὺ δοκέεις τέσσαρα, ταῦτα δέκα ἐστὶ καὶ τρίγωνον ἐντελὲς καὶ ἡμέτερον ὅρκιον; *Plut.* Symp. IX. III. 1, 2; etc.

12 Καὶ ὥσπερ ἐφαρμόσας τὸν οἰκεῖον τοῖς νομοθετουμένοις.

13 *Philo*, De Concup. c. 5, ἀριθμῶν τῶν ἀπὸ μονάδος τελειότατος ἡ δεκὰς καὶ, ὥς φησι Μωσῆς, ἱερώτατός τε καὶ ἅγιος.

14 Lev. XI. 20—23. See notes on XI. 1.

direction in which the Hebrew mind had advanced[1]. And this leads us to the important enquiry — Which were the motives that originally prompted abstinence from certain animals? and what rules guided the authors of the Pentateuch in confirming and enforcing the traditional customs?

Some of the answers given hardly deserve serious consideration. The legislator, it has been maintained, followed no definite or intelligible principles, but fixed arbitrary ordinances and restrictions at pleasure, merely in order to train the Hebrews in obedience[2], if not, as the Koran curiously contends, to punish them for their disobedience[3]; the former view would annul at a stroke all rational study of the Bible; the latter is a fair specimen of Mohammed's knowledge and interpretation of the Old Testament.

Again it has been supposed that the dietary laws were framed with the object of allegorically conveying certain truths, or of securing the practice of certain virtues; for it was held that, in themselves and in their literal sense, those laws are unworthy of God, disgraceful to His worshippers, and less rational and judicious than those of the heathens[4]. A few instances of this allegorical acceptation will suffice. Cloven-footed quadrupeds only must be eaten: this "is a symbol that we should act with *discernment* and *discretion*." In eating the flesh of animals that chew the cud, men are to *remember* their transitory life and human condition. The weasel, the mouse, and other mischievous or destructive animals are meant as a warning against inconsiderate rashness and thoughtlessness; the weasel has, besides, a peculiar significance — "it conceives with the ears and brings forth its young through the mouth" (!)[5]; therefore, it teaches

---

[1] See *infra*, and notes on XI. 1.

[2] Comp. *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. c. 44 init.; Lev. c. 13 init., לא נתנו המצות לישראל אלא לצרף בהן את הבריות; comp. *Midr. Tanchum* Shemini 7 (p. 394 ed. Stettin); *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 26; *Talm.* Yom. 67[b]; Berach. 5[a], 40[a]; Sanh. 101[a]; *Rashi* on Exod. XV. 26, Num. XIX. 2.

[3] *Koran* VI. 147 ("we did them no injury, but they injured their own souls"); XVI. 115, 119.

[4] *Origen*. Hom. VII. in Lev. c. 5; similarly Tertullian, Novatianus, Barnabas, Lactantius (Instit. IV. 17, universa praecepta Judaicae legis ad exhibendam justitiam spectant, quoniam per ambagem data sunt, ut per carnalium figuram spiritualia noscerentur), a. o.; comp. *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. I. VII. *init.*, p. 115.

[5] This monstrous fiction appears elsewhere also, e. g. *Ep. Barnab.* 10, "for this animal — the weasel — conceives with the mouth"; and *Aristot.* De Gener. Anim. III. 6; it is mentioned by Plutarch (Is. c. 74) with regard to the cat, to explain the veneration bestowed by the Egyptians upon that animal which they considered as "a type of the origin of speech, since the cat conceives through the ear and brings forth through the mouth"

that "those are wicked who, to injure others, embody in words what passes into their ears"[6]. The Hebrews, graciously selected to receive the Divine Law, and bound to practise justice and truth, ought to imitate the clean birds, which "live upon plants, and abstain from rapine", and not to act with violence or, relying upon their superior power, to oppress the weak. According to Philo, who naturally indulges in very elaborate analogies, Moses forbade "the most fleshy and fattest animals", because they tend to excite treacherous pleasure, and produce insatiable greed; the most tempting and most delicate creatures, in order to lead the Israelites to the exercise of virtue by frugality and abstinence; wild beasts, because a gentle meal is becoming the gentle soul; the carnivora, in order not to foster anger and ferocity; and, in fact, some kinds of each description of animal, in order "to take away, as it were, fuel from the fire, and to cause the extinction of appetite." Chewing the cud and parting the hoof are "symbols of instruction and of the most scientific learning"[7]; for man cannot acquire knowledge unless he revolve what he has learnt again and again in his mind, and retain it by the aid of memory; and he can aspire to wisdom only by a clear distinction between right and wrong. The fishes destitute either of fins or of scales, or of both, are pressed down by the current and unable to resist its force; while fishes provided with those organs can defy and effectually oppose the stream; the former are "emblems of a soul devoted to pleasure, the latter of a mind loving perseverance and temperance", the one leading to a perilous gulf, the other to heaven and immortality. The reptiles, lastly, "prefigure those who are devoted to their bellies", and are continually offering up tribute to their unappeasable appetites; the animals with many feet denote "the miserable slaves not of one single passion, but of all the passions"; while the clean reptiles that have springing feet express "the manners and habits of the rational soul which, so far from being dragged down by the weight of the body, springs up from the earth and all mean things, to the air and the periodical revolutions of the heavens"[8]. Nearly identical

(κατὰ τὸ οὖς ὀχευομένην, τῷ δὲ στόματι τίκτουσαν); while the Talmud contends that the raven emits semen through the mouth (*Talm.* Sanh. 108[b] ברוק, explained by Rashi רוקק זרע בפיה של נקבה; comp. *Midr. Tanch.* c. 12, fol. 21[a] ed. Stett.

[6] *Aristeas*, in Frankel's Monatsschrift 1858, pp. 250, 281—283.

[7] Σύμβολα διδασκαλίας καὶ μαθήσεως ἐπιστημονικωτάτης.

[8] See *Philo*, De Concup. cc. 4—9; and De Migrat. Abrah. c. 12; de Agricult. c. 30; comp. also *Joseph.* De Maccab. c. 5, σωφροσύνην τε γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐκδιδάσκει, ὥστε πασῶν τῶν ἡδονῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμιῶν κρατεῖν, καὶ ἀνδρείαν ἐξασκεῖν κτλ.

with these explanations are the conceits of Origen. "From the food", he declares, "which is mentioned as a shadow, we must ascend to that which, through the spirit, is true food"[1]; he "ruminates" who is intent upon knowledge, and meditates on the word of God day and night[2], and he is wise who regulates his actions upon "the distinction" between this and the future world; those placed in the sea of life must strive not to remain in the depth of the water, as the fishes without fins do, and they must ever be ready to lay off their old habits, like fishes with scales; while the birds of prey "point to those who eagerly look forward to the death of others, and artfully or fraudulently forge wills"[3]! Maimonides, interpreting not more happily or profoundly, believes that the dietary regulations are intended "to check the greedy who are bent upon dainties, and to prevent men from looking upon luxurious eating and drinking as the end of their lives"[4]; he goes so far as to assert that the laws of prohibited food, like most other ceremonials and even many moral precepts, are meant to provide excessive exercises for the discipline of the heart and mind, in order to lead man, by the practice of extremes, more safely to the mean road of moderation and temperance[5] — a pernicious principle which robs the laws of all intrinsic significance, and transforms them into mere instruments or "medical cures" serving extraneous ends: though such a view was natural in a Jewish scholar of the middle ages, imbued with Aristotelic tenets, it ought not to be forced upon the old Hebrew legislators, in whose eyes the ceremonies had meaning and truth for their own sakes, and who, therefore, declared them to be eternal and immutable, and strove with their utmost energy thoroughly to amalgamate them with the main ideas of their religious system[6]. Nor have even recent writers refrained from typical subtleties. One avers that all unclean animals "bear upon them the stamp of sin, death, and corruption", which pervade alike mankind and nature, though he abandons the hope of ever being able to point out these ominous signs in

---

[1] De cibis qui per umbram dicuntur, adscendamus ad eos qui per spiritum veri sunt cibi; Homil. VII. in Levit. c. 4 (edit. de la Rue et Lommatzsch vol. IX. p. 300); comp. 1 Cor. X. 3, 4; Col. II. 16, 17.

[2] Comp. Josh. I. 8; Ps. I. 2; CXIX. *passim*; etc.

[3] L. c. cc. 4—8, pp. 300—312; see also Selecta in Levit. *ibid.* pp. 166, 167. — Lactantius sees in the prohibition of pork a warning to men "ne vitam porcorum imitarentur, qui ad solam mortem nutriuntur" (Instit. IV. 17); and Clemens Alexandrin. observes with regard to the hare, τὴν κώλυσιν τῆς ἐδωδῆς τοῦ λαγὼ παιδεραστίας ἐμφαίνειν ἀποτροπήν (Paed. II. p. 188).

[4] *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 35.

[5] Shemon. Perak. c. 4, to which he refers in Mor. Nev. l. c.

[6] Comp. also Comm. on Lev. I. p. 56.

each individual animal, because "man's degeneracy" or his "ungodly and unnatural civilisation" has vitiated and darkened his "Divine consciousness", and has "blunted his natural aversions"[7]. Another alludes to "the thoughtful chewing of the cud" as an emblem of reflection, and to "the coarse and insolent one-hoofed foot"[8]. One calls the unclean animals the "images of sin", by shunning which men were to be educated to shun sin itself[9]; and another, supposing the forbidden animals to represent the heathen, the clean ones Israel, urges that the distinction between both must appear in "their spiritual life or ways" and "their spiritual food", the one typified by the cloven foot, the other by the chewing of the cud[10]! These and similar singularities which it would be unprofitable to quote at greater length, share the usual defects of all allegorical and moralising interpretations[11].

Then the question recurs — Why were certain animals set down in the Pentateuch as clean, others as unclean? Very little is gained for the real explanation of the problem by assuming, that the Hebrews, influenced by their eastern neighbours, or arriving of themselves at the same ideas, declared the creatures of the good deity Ormuzd as lawful, and prohibited those of the evil god Ahriman as obnoxious[12]; for it would still remain to be accounted for, *why* the Parsees were led to trace certain creatures to the empire of Ormuzd,

---

7 *Keil*, Archaeologie, II. 19—21; Comm. on Lev. pp. 83, 84; comp. *Leyrer* in Herzog's Real-Enc. XIV. 597, 598, 610, 613.

8 *Baumgarten*, Theolog. Comm. II. 155, comp. p. 154.

9 *Gerlach* on Lev. XI. pp. 404, 408 on ver. 46.

10 *Kurtz*, Opfercultus, pp. 9—12, 58, strangely supporting his view by Lev. XX. 24—26.

11 See Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 142 *sqq.*; *Epist. Barnab.* 10 ("thou shalt not associate with men who resemble ungrateful pigs or rapacious birds, or the accursed fishes that live in darkness; thou shalt not be incestuous and debauched like the hare, nor adulterous like the hyena, nor of unclean mouth like the weasel" — see *supra* — etc.); *Clem. Alex.* Paedag. II. p. 149 (διὰ Μωσέως αἰτίας προσάπτων κεκρυμμένας μὲν τὰς πνευματικάς κτλ.); Strom. VII. p. 718 ed. Sylb.; *Theodoret.* Quaest. XI ad Lev. (quod piscibus est squama, hoc hominibus est fides, etc.); *Bechai* on Lev. XI fol. 27b (the permitted birds are to teach us "that God hates wickedness and cruelty, and loves kindness and humanity"; or the camel, the hyrax, the hare, and the pig represent the four empires which successively enslaved Israel, etc.); also *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. p. 699 (natura sua porcus tam mundus erat quam agnus, sed significatio fuit diversa); *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. I. vii. pp. 115 *sqq.*; *Michaelis*, Typ. Gottesgel. § 34; *Knobel*, Lev. pp. 441, 442.

12 Comp. *Rhode*, Heil. Sage der Baktrer etc. pp. 214—228, 422; *Bleek* in Stud. und Krit. 1831, pp. 498, 499; *Bohlen*, Genes. pp. 88, 89; *De Wette*, Archaeol. § 188.

and others to the dominion of Ahriman. But even if this could be proved in every individual instance, we should not be aided in our enquiry, from the simple fact, often carelessly ignored[1], that the clean and unclean animals of the Hebrews do not coincide with those of the Parsees. This will be evident from a brief survey of the ordinances contained on the subject in the *Bundehesh*; we shall confine ourselves to plain facts, and pass over all speculations[2].

When the primitive bull died, Ormuzd formed of his purified semen first two animals of the same kind, one male and one female, and out of these he created a couple of every other clean species, and placed them in Iran-vedj, where they multiplied and spread — first the goat and ram, then the camel and ox, and afterwards the horse and the ass, which animals were brought forth "for the use of the pure"; in the next place, the hart and the roe-buck, birds (among which are specified the eagle and the crow, the owl and the raven), fishes and other aquatic animals[3], the dog[4] and the civet-cat[5], and ten kinds of rats white from head to tail[6]; and it is maintained that all these creatures were produced in so many distinct varieties that they finally amounted to 282 species; for instance, the goat and ram comprised 5 species each, one of which is the unicorn, the bull 15, the dog 10 species, as beaver, fox, and weasel, glutton, hedgehog[7], and musc-deer, sable-marten, ermine, and others of the same class. Now, in examining these animals held pure by the Parsees, we find that a very considerable number of them are unclean according to the Pentateuch, as the camel, the horse, and the ass, the eagle and crow, the dog and the civet-cat, the beaver, the fox, and the rat, the weasel and the like, the birds of prey and the fishes without fins and scales. Even the pig, though feeding on *kharfesters* or detested creatures of Ahriman, could be rendered a clean animal if it was prevented from eating impure things during one year, when its flesh became lawful food[8]. The Parsees may, from their point of view, have had good reasons for their classification; they were in-

---

[1] *Rhode* l. c.; *Bohlen* l. c.

[2] Comp. *Anquetil du Perron*, Zend-Avesta, II. ch. 14, pp. 371—376; also *Rhode*, l. c. pp. 528—531; *Sommer*, Biblische Abhandlungen, I. 197, 198.

[3] The statement of Plutarch, therefore, that the Persians counted all aquatic animals (ἐνύδρους) among the creations of Ahriman (De Is. et Os. c. 46 *fin.*), is erroneous.

[4] Comp. *Plut.* l. c.; also *Khorda-Avesta* XLV. 17 (Spiegel p. 212), where the dog is mentioned as a creature of Ormuzd, side by side with the stars, the sun, and the moon.

[5] Mehka ferokh.

[6] *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. 229.

[7] Comp. *Plut.* l. c. χερσαίους ἐχίνους.

[8] Comp. *Vendidad* VII. 189 *sqq.*; *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. p. XLIII.

duced to attribute animals so useful as the camel, the horse, and the ass, to the god of light; they believed that, at his request, Airyaman, the protector of health, in order to counteract the scourges and diseases sent by the serpent Ahriman (or Agramainyus), created nine species of male horses and nine of male camels, besides as many of oxen and sheep[9]; they regarded with veneration the green wood-pecker, which largely destroys locusts; the white falcon, because it was supposed to kill serpents with its wings, and the wild bull and wild ass, which devour reptiles; the weasel, bent upon lizards, and attacking them successfully; the hedge-hog, since it is dangerous to the corn-consuming ants[10]; and even the rapacious and destructive fox, because it annihilates voracious insects by a curious peculiarity[11]. But the Hebrews were not guided by any such considerations; they did not acknowledge the maxim that "every pure animal, whether beast of the forest, or bird, or fish, is at war with a particular *kharfester*"; they were strangers to the doctrine that the principle of darkness produces poisonous plants and bloodthirsty or venomous animals, destined to carry on an implacable and internecine struggle against the good and useful creations of the god of light[12]; they deemed it, therefore, no necessary part of a pious life "to kill noxious beasts to their utmost power"[13]. Though long familiar with the worship of Apis and other forms of Egyptian idolatry, there is no trace of their teachers ever having acknowledged the independent power of Typhon or the existence of a Typhonic creation[14], though in later periods, the people inclined towards similar views[15]. They must have been aware that, in Egypt, reverence was shown to certain kinds of serpents[16], to the cat[17], the dog[18], the shrew-mouse[19], and

[9] *Vendid.* XXII. 53—58.

[10] Comp. *Bundehesh* c. 19; *Rhode* l. c. p. 532.

[11] *Anquetil du Perron* l. c., "Deux de ces espèces urinent dans les trous, l'une le renard, l'autre la belette; le zozeké, qui a des épines au dos, urine aussi et copieusement dans les trous des insectes."

[12] Comp. Comm. on Gen. pp. 87, 88; *Winer*, Real-Wört. II. 491.

[13] Comp. *Herod.* I. 140 (ἀγώνισμα τοῦτο μέγα ποιεῦνται — οἱ Μάγοι — κτείνοντες ὁμοίως μύρμηκάς τε καὶ ὄφις κτλ.); *Plut.* Is. c. 46 (διὸ καὶ τὸν κτείνοντα πλείστους εὐδαιμονίζουσιν); *Meiners*, Gesch. der Relig. I. 231—233; *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. p. CXVII.

[14] Comp. also *Jablonski*, Panth. Aeg. III. 67 *sqq.; Hengstenberg*, Die Bücher Moses, pp. 190—193. It is not surprising to find that Ghillany (Menschenopfer p. 465) declares the Hebrews to have abhorred the pig and the ass as Typhonic animals, and to have from them deduced the criteria for all unclean creatures.

[15] See the Treatise before chapt. XVI, on Angels and Spirits, sect. 2.

[16] *Ael.* Nat. An. X. 31, θέρμουθιν ἀσπίδα; *Herod.* II. 74; *Plut.* Is. c. 74.

[17] *Her.* II. 66, 67; *Plut.* Is. c. 74; *Strab.* XVII. I. 40, p. 812; *Athen.* VII. 55.

[18] *Herod.* l. c.; *Strab.* l. c.; *Plut.* Is. 11, 44, 75; *Ael.* N. A. XI. 20; *Athen.* l. c.

[19] Μυγαλῆ, *Athen.* l. c.

the beetle[1], because these creatures were considered to reflect "dark images of the power of the gods, as the drop of water reflects the sun"[2]; and they must have known that homage was paid to the ichneumon, which destroys crocodiles and their eggs[3], to the ibis, since it kills greedy worms[4], and to the stork, because it is fatal to young snakes[5]: yet, though they may have been disposed to acknowledge the utility of these animals, they were never tempted to raise them into divinities. Though forbidden to cut down or to injure fruit-trees even in a hostile country[6], they never invested trees or any other vegetable production with inviolable sanctity; they did not imitate the Egyptians who considered the onion, leek, and garlic so holy[7] that they often invoked them as deities in taking oaths[8]; nor did they, on the other hand, share the prejudices of the Hindoos, who were taught by their religious laws, that "the twice-born man who intentionally eat a mushroom, ... a leek, an onion, or garlic, is immediately degraded", while partaking of these vegetables undesignedly requires atonement by rigorous penance[9]. They were free from the irrational dislike of both Egyptians and Pythagoreans against several kinds of pulse, among which beans were deemed too unclean to be even looked upon by priests, for futile reasons such as these: — beans are all seed; if skinned when still green, they resemble the male member, or the gates of hell, being without parts; if cooked, and allowed to stand exposed to moonshine for a certain number of nights, they turn to blood; their flowers seem to exhibit the letters of mourning, namely, the two black spots on the outer wings; like other pulses, they are used for funeral repasts and offerings to the dead; they excite amorous desires, are flatulent, and produce an excess of humours, necessitating constant purging; hence they render sleep disturbed and fitful, and are unfavourable for philosophic meditation and prophetic dreams[10]; the intensely strong smell which the Egyp-

---

1 Κάνθαρος, *Plut.* Is. c. 74; *Horapoll.* I. 10.

2 *Plut.* l. c.

3 *Strabo* XVII. I. 39; *Ael.* Nat. An. X. 47.

4 *Herod.* II. 67; *Plut.* Is. c. 75; *Strabo* XVII. I. 40; *Athen.* l. c.; *Amm. Marc.* XXII. xv. 25.

5 *Plut.* Is. c. 74. In Thessaly, the killing of a stork was punished with exile; in Lemnos, the jack-daw (κόρυδος, graculus) was similarly protected, because it flies to meet the locusts and kills them in great numbers (*Plut.* l. c.; *Plin.* XI. 29 or 35); comp. also *Minuc. Felix* c. 28 (§§ 8, 9) ed. Halm.

6 Deut. XX. 19.

7 Comp. *Plut.* Is. 8; *Juven.* XV. 9.

8 *Plin.* XIX. 6 or 32.

9 *Manu* V. 19—21; comp. also 6—10; *Yâjnav.* I. 171. According to Dubois (Moeurs des Indes, I. 258), the Hindoos reject all vegetables the root or head of which is round.

10 Comp. *Jamblich.* Pythag. c. XXIV

tian beans exhale when in flower, was deemed injurious to health[11]; and they serve as a warning against courting public offices, since in Athens they were used at the election of magistrates! It should, however, be remembered that beans were freely eaten not only by the Hebrews, the Greeks, the Romans, and by most eastern nations[12], but according to some ancient authorities, by Pythagoras himself, who is said to have partaken of no vegetable more frequently, since he considered beans light food and conducive to digestion, and who, in interdicting κυάμους, intended to forbid, not beans, but lasciviousness and intemperance[13]: it seems, therefore, to be an unfounded legend invented at a later time, that he and many of his followers were killed in Crotona, because, when flying from their pursuers, they shrank from crossing a bean field that lay in their way[14]. The Hebrews could not fall into the errors of the old Germans, who honoured the thunder-oak in connection with the worship of Thor or Donar, nor into those of the Gauls, who, as is well known, paid reverence to the mistletoe, which, when cut with a golden sickle by a white-robed priest, after having sacrificed two white bulls, was regarded as a remedy for barrenness and an antidote against all poisons[15]: for the Hebrews did not, like the Pythagoreans and many others, look upon plants as animated beings "partaking of the principle of heat"[16], nor did they adopt the less popular doctrine that the souls of men "pass not only into animals, but also into plants"[17]. If they declared the ass an unclean animal, as

(§§ 106, 107), "Pyth. disapproved in general of all food that is flatulant or difficult of digestion, injurious to purity of the soul, chastity, and soberness," etc.

11 *De Pauw*, Recherches sur les Egyptiens et les Chin. pp. 124, 125; comp. *Galen*. l. c. c. 20; *Mishn.* Shabb. IX. 7; Sheviith II. 9 (פול המצרי).

12 Comp. 2 Sam. XVII. 28; Ezek. IV. 9; *Plin.* XVIII. 12 or 30 (inter quae — sc. legumina — maximus honos fabae, quippe ex qua temptatus sit etiam panis; . . . frumento etiam miscetur apud plerasque gentis etc.); *Hor.* Sat. II. III. 182; *Strabo* XVII. II. 4, p. 823; *Hotting.* Hist. Orient. p. 186, with respect to the Zabii, ex germinibus nihil nisi faba et allium conceditur.

13 Κυάμους testiculos significare . . . quod sint εἰς τὸ κυεῖν δεινοὶ καὶ αἴτιοι τοῦ κυεῖν; *Gell.* IV. XI. 10.

14 *Herod.* II. 37; *Plut.* Quaest. Rom. 95; Symp. VIII. VIII. 2; *Diod. Sic.* I. 89; *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 19, 24, 33, 34, 39, 45; *Lucian*, Vitar. Auct. 6; *Ael.* Var. Hist. II. 24; *Porph.* Abst. IV. 6; *Jamblich.* Pythag. c. XXIV (109); *Cic.* De Divin. I. 30; II. 119; *Gell.* IV. XI. 3; X. XV. 12; *Juven.* XV. 174; *Plin.* XVIII. 12 or 30; *Festus* s. faba; *Galen.* De Aliment. Fac. I. 19.

15 *Plin.* XVI. 44 or 95.

16 *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 28, διὸ καὶ τὰ φυτὰ ζῷα εἶναι.

17 *Diog. Laert.* l. c. 4. "Die Talapoinen dehnen das Gebot: tödte und verletze nicht, über Pflanzen und den Saamen oder die Keime von Pflanzen aus, . . . weil sie glauben, dass alles was lebe auch beseelt sei" etc.

the later Mahommedans also did [1], they were not prompted to do so by the similarity of its colour to that of the fabled demon [2]; they commonly employed the ass as a beast of burden, and in times of urgent distress did not scruple to eat its flesh [3]; indeed in earlier periods, and certainly in the time of the Judges, the ass seems, together with the ox and the sheep, to have been their ordinary animal food [4], just as it was eaten in Persia [5], and in some neighbouring districts, where it was even sacrificed to the god of war [6], in northern Africa [7], in Greece, in Italy, especially by the poorer classes [8], and in Rome, where at the time of Augustus young asses were considered particularly palatable [9]; though Galen maintains that asses' flesh, notorious for bad humours and difficult to cook, is injurious to the stomach and tough to the taste, and he denounces those who eat it with almost vehement irony [10]. And when, after the Babylonian exile, the Jews became familiar with the dualism of the Persians, their leaders opposed it with the clearest and strongest emphasis. "I am the Lord, and there is none else", wrote the second Isaiah, "I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I the Lord do all these things" [11]; they did not shrink from tracing to God evil and darkness also, because they were convinced that, under His care and direction, the evil produces blessings, and darkness serves beneficent ends [12].

(*Meiners*, Geschichte der Religionen, I. 215).

[1] See *Weil*, Mohammed der Prophet, p. 188; comp. *Rückert*, Erbaul. und Beschaul. II. 31, "Wenn ihr hört einen Esel schreien, Er hat gesehen böse Feien; bittet Gott, dass er euch behüte."

[2] חמור, from חמר to be red, the *reddish* animal; comp. also *Sonnini*, Voyage, II. 361, 362.

[3] 2 Ki. VI. 25; comp. *Plut.* Vit. Artax. 24.

[4] See Judges VI. 4.

[5] *Herod.* I. 133.

[6] *Strabo* XV. II. 14, p. 727.

[7] *Galen.* De Alim. Facult. I. 2.

[8] *Apuleius*, Metam. VII. p. 349 ed. Nisard.

[9] *Plin.* VIII. 43 or 68.

[10] L. c.; comp. *supra* p. 56 note 8. It is difficult to account for the ludicrous assertion of many heathen writers who attribute to the Jews a religious reverence for the ass (*Tac.* Hist. V. 3; *Plut.* Is. 30, 31, 51; Sympos. IV. v. 2; *Diod. Sic.* XXXIV. 1; *Joseph.* C. Ap. II. 7; *Flor.* III. 5), unless it was believed that the Jews must honour the animal detested by their enemies, the Egyptians: to trace it to a confused reminiscence of Gen. XXXVI. 24 is highly improbable. It is not a little curious that the same reproach was made to the Christians at least down to the third century; comp. *Minuc. Felix*, Octav. c. 28 (§ 7), ed. Halm, inde est (viz. from the false rumours of demons) quod audire te dicis, caput asini rem nobis esse divinam; quis tam stultus ut hoc colat? quis stultior ut hoc coli credat? etc.

[11] Isai. XLV. 6, 7; comp. LIV. 16; see also *infra* "Angels and Spirits" ch. 2 *sub fin.*

[12] Comp., however, *infra sub fin.*

Our conclusion, therefore, is that the principles of division with respect to clean and unclean animals were markedly different among the Israelites and among the Parsees or other nations. Yet they offer points of resemblance which are of the highest interest, and throw a welcome light upon the Hebrew ordinances. The Zend-Avesta distinguishes quadrupeds with cloven feet, with undivided feet or hoofs, and with five claws, all of which belong to the clean species[13]. The highest Hindoo castes or "the twice-born" were by the law of Manu forbidden to taste the flesh or milk of "quadrupeds with uncloven hoof"[14], the flesh of all "solitary animals, of unknown beasts or birds", and of "creatures with five claws", from which prohibitions, however, the hedgehog and porcupine, the tortoise, the rabbit, and the hare were excepted[15]. They were strictly to abstain from all fishes that have no scales[16]. According to later accounts, the Egyptian priests shunned all quadrupeds having "uncloven hoofs" or "many claws" or having "no horns"[17], cows, and all male animals if twins or spotted, many-coloured, deformed, or one-eyed, or tamed by labour[18], and all carnivorous birds: which criteria include the greater part of those set forth in the Hebrew law[19]. The Koran attempts no distinct principles on the subject; but it seems to be a general rule among Mahommedans to abstain from any animal that feeds upon human flesh, or that attacks men[20]. According to Cassius Hemina quoted by Pliny[21], Numa, desirous of checking prodigal expense[22], ordained that "fishes without scales" which were bought up by speculators and sold by them at exorbitant prices, should not be offered up as sacrifices to the gods[23]. As ruminants, with the exception of the camel, appear to have, though they have not

---

[13] La première espèce a le pied fendu, ... la seconde espèce est au pied d'âne, non fendu, ... la troisième espèce est à cinq griffes" (*Anq. du Perron* l. c.).

[14] *Manu* V. 8, 11.

[15] *Manu* V. 17, 18; *Yâjnav.* I. 177.

[16] Śas alca, *Manu* V. 16; comp. *Munk*, Réflexions, p. 61; Jones leaves sas alca untranslated.

[17] Μώνυχα ἢ πολυσχιδῆ ἢ μὴ κερασφόρα.

[18] Τῶν δ' ἀῤῥένων ὅσα δίδυμα ἢ κατάστικτα ἢ ἑτερόχροα ἢ παραλλάσσοντα τῇ μορφῇ ἢ δεδαμασμένα ... ἢ ἑτερόφθαλμα κτλ.

[19] *Porph.* Abst. II. 11; IV. 7; comp. *Spencer* Legg. Ritt. I. vii. 2, p. 124; *Sommer*, Bibl. Abhandl. I. 284 *sqq.*

[20] Comp. *Niebuhr*, Beschr. von Arab. p. 178.

[21] Hist. Nat. XXXII. 2 or 10.

[22] Parsimoniam commentus.

[23] Numa constituit ut piscis qui squamosi non essent ni pollucerent... ni quid ad polluctum emerent pretio minus parcerent eaque praemercarentur; comp. also *Festus* sub pollucere — "pisces quibus est squama, praeter scarum", which is a sea fish, probably a species of wrasse once in great favour among the Romans (Comp. *Plin.* IX. 17 or 29; *Hor.* Sat. II. ii. 22; *Mart.* XIII. 84; etc.

in reality, only one row of teeth, all of which seem to be in the lower jaw; this illusory characteristic was frequently employed as a criterion. It was so used by the Talmud, which proposed the rule, that "whatever animal chews the cud, is sure to have no upper teeth, and is therefore clean"[1]; by the Hindoo law, which permitted "all quadrupeds that have but one row of teeth, except the camel"[2]; by Greek naturalists, who taught, that "whatever animal has horns[3], has certainly not two rows of teeth"[4]; and by the Zabii, who were forbidden to eat the flesh of the camel and of "all quadrupeds that have teeth in both jaws, as the pig, the dog, and the ass"[5]: but the fact is that the ruminants, with the exception of the camel, have no *incisor* teeth in the upper jaws, the hardened gums sustaining the pressure of the lower incisors.

It is, therefore, clear that most ancient nations chose as chief criteria of quadrupeds, the structure of the foot and the stomach; as those of fishes, the presence or absence of scales; and of birds, the nature of their food; but that the Hebrews, though remaining within the general circle of current conceptions, worked out with independence a sytematic division not unskilfully adapted to their established practice; whether, as is not impossible, the rigorous application of rules so decided and so formal did not inevitably exclude animals previously employed as food, we are unable to determine.

Hence the distinction between clean and unclean animals originated among the Israelites by no means in the desire of separating themselves from idolatrous nations[6], and thus preventing religious and moral corruption, nor in the wish to establish another external difference between themselves and the heathens.

---

[1] Chullin 59[a], כל שמעלת גרה בידוע שאין לה שנים למעלה וטהורה; comp. *Maim.* De Cib. Vet. I. 3.

[2] *Manu* V. 18. The legislator hardly meant animals that have *incisors* in the lower jaw only (so *Munk*, Réflexions, p. 62); he evidently shared the common error of his time.

[3] That is, the ruminants, see p. 57.

[4] *Aristot.* Hist. An. II. III. 8, ὅσα μὲν γάρ ἐστι κερατοφόρα, οὐκ ἀμφώδοντά ἐστιν, οὐ γὰρ ἔχει τοὺς προσθίους ὀδόντας ἐπὶ τῆς ἄνω σιαγόνος; De Part. An. III. II. 7, διὸ τῶν κερατοφόρων οὐδέν ἐστιν ἀμφόδουν, ἄνω γὰρ οὐκ ἔχει τοὺς προσθίους ὀδόντας; comp. Hist. An. II. II. 6; III. XVI. 6.

[5] כל מאלה אסנאן פי אללחתין גמיעא; comp. *Hottinger*, Hist. Orient. p. 186.

[6] See *Aristeas*, in Frank. Monatsschrift 1858, p. 249; comp. p. 281; *Warnekros*, Alterthümer, ch. XXX, § 21; *Hess* in Rosenmüller's Morgenland, II. 161, 162; *Rosenm.* Schol. ad Lev. XI. pp. 58, 59; *Brentano* on Levit. XI. 2, 45; but on the other hand, *Ewald*, Alterthümer, p. 205 note, "man verwechselt die Folge, welche allerdings die Speisgesetze immer mehr hervorbrachten, mit ihrem Ursprunge und ihrem ersten unbefangenen Sinne."

Entirely groundless, for instance, are views like these: "Moses forbade the Israelites to eat the camel, which up to his time had been considered clean, in order to isolate them from the Arabs, perhaps also to deter them from remaining in Arabia or settling there, at any later period, through love of nomadic cattle-breeding" [7]; or "God intended to enjoin upon the Hebrews the dietary laws as something peculiar, so that the holy people might be distinguished from the profane nations no less by their food than by their worship" [8]. This latter remark is a fair specimen of the method, now happily obsolete among Biblical critics, of mechanically explaining precepts which ought to be understood by organic laws of nationality, or of intellectual and religious progress. It is vain to adduce in support of that view the words of a late Levitical legislator: "I am the Lord your God who have distinguished (הבדלתי) you from other nations; you shall therefore distinguish (והבדלתם) between clean beasts and unclean, and between unclean fowls and clean, and you shall not make your souls abominable by beast or by fowl, or by any manner of living thing that creeps upon the ground, which I have distinguished (הבדלתי) for you as unclean" [9]. These words have a very different import; they do not refer to external separation or distinction from heathens; but connected as they are with laws of idolatry, incest, and unnatural depravity, they allude to a life of holiness and piety by which the Hebrews were to deserve and to justify the election by which they had been glorified through Divine grace. This is abund-

[7] *Michael.* Mos. R. IV. § 204 (the following words, l. c. p. 141, seem almost like a *reductio in absurdum*: "If another neighbouring nation had held the same food unclean, Moses would probably have given quite different laws of diet": as if a people's food can be regulated mechanically by arbitrary prescription, and did not result from its habits, experience, and abodes); comp. also § 203 *passim* ("the most intimate friendships are concluded at tables" etc.), and his notes on Lev. XI; *Kitto* on Lev. XI. 2; Gen. XLIII. 32 ("the Egyptians cannot eat a meal with the Hebrews", etc.), and Comm. *in loc.*; *Herod.* II. 41, ἀνὴρ Αἰγύπτιος ... οὐδὲ μαχαίρῃ ἀνδρὸς Ἕλληνος χρήσεται κτλ.; nay the Egyptian priests touched no food or drink imported from a foreign country (*Porph.* Abst. IV. 7, comp. c. 6), though this rule was rather prompted by motives of frugality and by aversion to luxury (πολύς τις οὕτως τρυφῆς ἀπεκέκλειστο τόπος); comp. however, *De Pauw*, Recherches, I. 107.

[8] *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. I. vii. 1, comp. 2, "erat nempe rationi consonum, ut Judaei in ipsa quasi fronte Dei sui nomen gererent, et signo aliquo teste scirent omnes, se Deo sancto et peculiari nomina sua tradidisse"; and the artificial and frigid argument "singularis gentis Israeliticae dignitas et excellentia postulavit ut cibo tantum peculiari et dignitatis alicujus speciem ferente pasceretur."

[9] Lev. XX. 24, 25; comp. *Spencer* l. c. p. 121.

antly evident from the concluding sentence, "And you shall be holy unto Me, for I the Lord am holy, and I have distinguished you (ואבדל) from other nations that you should be Mine"[1]. Even the dietary rules of the Egyptian and Hindoo priesthood[2] were but partially designed to secure a rigid seclusion from other castes or nations[3], and were particularly intended as a means and symbol of superior sanctity; but the corresponding ordinances of the Pentateuch were in no way calculated to serve the purpose of isolating the Hebrews; for they have numerous and important points of contact with those of heathen nations; the deep aversion against the pig which the Hebrews shared with many others, especially the Egyptians, Hindoos, and Arabians[4], is alone sufficient to overthrow an opinion opposed to well-established facts.

Equally untenable is the assertion that the Hebrews were warned against certain creatures as unclean, in order to draw them away or to shield them from the dangers of animal worship. "Every beast is in some manner akin to a demon", observes Origen[5]; hence Moses declared all animals as impure from which the Egyptians and others took auguries, while he permitted nearly all the rest[6]; and this curious opinion is upheld by subsequent and even by recent writers[7]. It is not impossible that the unlimited dominion over all beasts which, after the creation, was emphatically bestowed upon men[8], and to which, after the Deluge, was added a free permission to use all animals for food[9], was designed to counteract the disgrace and absurdity of animal worship[10]: but the lists of the Pentateuch, on the one

---

1 Lev. XX. 26; comp. ver. 7 (והתקדשתם והייתם קדשים), 8 (אני יהוה מקדשכם). Decidedly unjust, therefore, is the censure of Gramberg (Rel. Id. I. 366), that the author "puts forth an utterly formal and narrow notion of holiness", consisting "merely in a separation from other tribes, independently of all morality which is in no way concerned in the matter"; see *infra*.

2 Comp. *Herod.* II. 37; *Plut.* Is. cc. 7, 8; *Porph.* Abst. IV. 6, 7; etc.; *Manu* II. 52—57; IV. 62, 205—225; V. 5—56.

3 Comp. *Herod.* II. 79 (πατρίοισι δὲ χρεώμενοι νόμοισι, ἄλλον οὐδένα ἐπικτέωνται), 91 (Ἑλληνικοῖσι δὲ νομαίοισι φεύγουσι χρᾶσθαι . . . μηδ' ἄλλων μηδαμᾶ μηδαμῶν ἀνθρώπων νομαίοισι); see *supra* p. 71 note 7.

4 Comp. *infra*.

5 Contra Cels. IV. 93, pp. 225, 226 ed. Spencer.

6 Πάντα μὲν ἀκάθαρτα ἔφησεν εἶναι τὰ νομιζόμενα . . . μαντικά κτλ.; ἔοικεν οὖν τις εἶναι ἑκάστῳ δαιμόνων εἴδει κοινωνία πρὸς ἕκαστον εἶδος ζώων.

7 Comp. *Theodoret.* Quaest. I in Levit.; *Lengerke*, Kenaan, I. 379, "Die Gesetze über reine und unreine Thiere führen auf vorangegangenen Naturdienst, welchem sie entgegenwirken wollen . . . und daraus erklären sich zum Theil die Speisegesetze."

8 Gen. I. 28.

9 Gen. IX. 2, 3.

10 See Comm. on Gen. pp. 216, 217.

hand, include animals that received divine honours among heathens, and were yet declared clean, as the bull[11], the sheep[12], and the goat[13], since in Egypt there was hardly an animal that was not worshipped either by the whole or by a part of the country[14]; and on the other hand, they embrace some which, as the ass and the pig, were detested among pagans, and were yet pronounced unclean by the Hebrew legislators, as is proved by the slightest reference to the sacred animals of the Egyptians and other nations[15].

The matter, then, may be thus rationally explained. Many classes and species of animals were entirely out of the question, and may at once be dismissed with a few passing remarks. Who would think of eating poisonous creatures, such as snakes, adders, and vipers? Yet some species are harmless, and are indeed commonly consumed by several tribes of northern Africa[16], while some, as the boas, are dangerous not by their venom but by their enormous size and muscular and crushing strength. Nor would people look for sustenance to the infinite variety of insects, some beautiful, others repulsive, some troublesome or destructive, others innocuous or useful, though a number of these even have not been disdained as food by the Hebrews and other nations[17]; nor to the Worms (Annulata, Annelida), whether red or white, though in Phrygia, in the Pontus, and elsewhere, the white fat worms with dark heads, bred in putrid wood, were an expensive delicacy[18]; to the imperfect "radiata", inhabitants of the sea, with tuft-like appendages "radiating" round their mouth in horizontal rows, though some species (as the holothuria edulis) is esteemed as a dainty among the Chinese; or the still more undeveloped and rudimentary classes, the Entozoa, the Sea-nettles (Acalephae), and the plant-like Polyps, though even some kinds of the latter (as the actinia) are eatable.

---

[11] Apis: — *Herod.* II. 153; *Diod. Sic.* I. 84, 85; *Plut.* Is. c. 29; Mnevis: — *Diod. Sic.* l. c.; *Strabo* XVII. I. 27, p. 805; the ox: — *Herod.* II. 41; *Strab.* XVII. I. 47, p. 817; comp. *Ael.* Nat. An. XI. 40; also the cow: — *Strab.* XVII. I. 35, p. 809; *Ael.* Nat. An. X. 27.

[12] *Herod.* II. 42; *Strab.* XVII. I. 40, p. 812; comp. *Plut.* Is. c. 72; etc.

[13] *Herod.* II. 42, 46; *Strab.* l. c.; *Diod. Sic.* I. 88.

[14] Comp. *Herod.* II. 65; *Diod. Sic.* I. 83—90; see *Strab.* l. c.

[15] Comp. *Parthey*, Plut. über Isis, I. 260 *sqq.*; *Uhlemann*, Aegypt. Alterthumskunde, II. 203—206; *Wilkinson* Ancient Egypt, *passim*; *Braun*, Naturgesch. der Sage, II. pp. 474, 475.

[16] Comp. *Galen.* De Alim. Facult. III. 3, ἐχίδνας τε καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ὄφεις, ὅσα τε κατ' Αἴγυπτον καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐσθίουσιν.

[17] See *infra*.

[18] See *Brentano* on Lev. XI. 42.

Again, we may for our present purpose disregard the animals not found in Palestine and the neighbouring countries — the Quadrumana or ape-tribe, living in warmer regions, and like the peacocks imported by Solomon's fleet from Ophir as a foreign curiosity [1]; the carnivorous "pouch" or kangaroo tribe (marsupalia), as the marsupial marten, and the opossums, most formidable enemies to poultry, yet occurring chiefly in America; the teethless species (Edentata), only found in tropical and subtropical regions, sluggish and stupid creatures with protruded maxillaries and long claws, as the singular "duck-billed quadruped" (ornithorhynchus paradoxus), the anteaters, the scaly armadillo, and the despised sloth (bradypus); most of the "thick-skinned animals" (Pachydermata seu Multungula) including the largest, if not the strongest, of all terrestrial animals, the sagacious elephant and the unwieldy hippopotamus, the unequal-toed tapir and the impervious rhinoceros, all of which are indigenous to Africa and the warmer districts of Asia, although the swine, valued by some, abhorred by others, belongs to the same order [2]; again, the wild species of the "one-hoofed" quadrupeds (Solidungula), the quagga, the dauv [3], and the zebra, shunning the abodes, and defying the subjection, of man [4], although the wild ass (onager) [5] is by many tribes of eastern Asia preferred to any other game [6]; the wild Ruminants, as the American llama, the new-world vicugna, and the graceful giraffe, the fleet inhabitant of African deserts, the bison, the buffalo, and aurochs (Bos urus); the Seal-tribe (Pinnipeda), as the Arctic phocidae, the sea dog, the seal, and the formidable walrus (trichechus rosmarus) with its terrible tusks; and the huge Whale-tribe (Cetacea), mostly inhabiting the Northern and the Southern Ocean, comprising the most colossal animals in existence, the Greenland whale, up to 80 feet long and 60 tons in weight, with its dangerous fringes of horny fibres instead of teeth, and the spermaceti whale (physiter) attaining even a length of 100 feet, the rapacious narwhal and the dolphin, living, like the preceding, upon polyps, mollusks, and fishes, the herbivorous Arctic and Atlantic sea-cow, and the Indian mermaid; many of the "Swimming birds" (Natatores), as the polar-divers (colymbidae), the penguins of the Southern Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; and the similarly formed fishes of the tropical seas of the

[1] 1 Ki. X. 22; 2 Chr. IX. 21.

[2] See *infra.*

[3] Hippotigris Buchellii; see *Brehm*, Illustrirtes Thierl. II. 375.

[4] See Comm. on Gen. pp. 378, 379.

[5] Also called Kulan by the Tartars, or Gurkur; see *Brehm* l. c. p. 363.

[6] Comp. *Martial.* XIII. Ep. 97, 100; *Plin.* VIII. 43, 44 or 68, 69.

order Pectognathi, as the hedgehog fish, the thornback, and the unicorn fish, distending their bodies and then appearing like floating globes[7].

The Hebrews, moreover, may be well supposed to have instinctively spared many birds which delighted them either by their beautiful plumage or their melodious voice (the Canores and Sylvidae), and which they deemed too harmless to be persecuted, especially those of the order of Incessores, including the thrushes (merulidae) and the linnet, the fieldfare and the blackbird, the lark and nightingale, the hammer and ortelan, the red-breast and the wren, swifts and swallows, the finches and the sparrow, the cuckoo, the parrot, and the peacock; though many of these birds fell and fall a prey to Sybarites in all climes[8]. And lastly, some animals were probably left untouched, because, being more useful by their labour than by their death, it was deemed inexpedient to diminish them by untimely slaughter[9]; to this category we may count the horse and the camel, the ass and the mule, invaluable, if not indispensable, in the East both for agriculture, travel, and commerce, though even these animals were, as they still are, killed for food by various nations[10], just as the ox, so serviceable to the husbandman, was eaten by the Hebrews and nearly every other people[11].

Now leaving all these creatures out of view, we may suppose that, at first, a natural aversion induced men to abstain from some animals which inspired them with disgust either by their appearance or their habits. It was probably for this reason of mere loathing that many avoided, nay abhorred, the dirty and mire-loving swine, which soon

---

[7] On the Fauna of Palestine, which include some Indian and many Ethiopic types, especially among the mammalia, pointing to an early immigration, see Naturforscher, I. 282 *sqq.* (notes of a Lecture delivered by Tristram, in the Royal Society).

[8] Comp. *Galen.* De Aliment. Facult. III. 19; *Celsus*, De Medic. II. 18.

[9] See Comm. on Lev. I. 96, 97.

[10] On the *camel* see *supra* p. 56, the ass p. 68; on the *mule* being eaten comp. *Joseph.* Antiq. XII. III. 4; on the *horse* as food see *Joseph.* l. c.; *Herod.* I. 133 (the Persians); *Plut.* De Sollert. Anim. c. 2; Comm. on Lev. I. p. 89 notes 11, 12; also 2 Ki. XXIII. 11; *Herod.* I. 189; VII. 40; *Xen.* Cyrop. VIII. III. 12; *Herodian.* V. 6; *Tacit.* Germ. c. 10; *Galen.* De Aliment. Facult. III. 2; *Justin.* I. 10; *Kleuker*, Zend Avesta, II. 264; *Boch.* Hieroz. I. II. 10; *Meiners*, Gesch. der Relig. I. 224—226; it is eaten by some Mahommedan sects (comp. *Niebuhr*, Beschreib. v. Arab. p. 178), the Bedouins of southern Arabia (*Burckhardt*, Beduinen, p. 196), and there are, as is well known, at present many hippophagi in various parts of the continent.

[11] Comp. 1 Ki. XIX. 21; see, however, *supra* p. 68 note 10.

became the very type of uncleanness[1], and all Reptiles[2], which, though highly developed in their muscular system, are partly repulsive by the clammy sliminess of their bodies, and partly detestable on account of their lurking rapaciousness, and which include the only venomous animals, the serpents, laden by legend with the curse of eternal and deadly enmity against man, and not unnaturally identified with the principle of physical and moral evil, with disaster and sin[3]. Dislike, in fact, caused many to shun "every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth, whatsoever goes upon the belly, and whatsoever goes upon all four"[4]. Most people have, it is true, reconciled themselves to the turtle-tribe (Cheloniae), especially on account of the Edible Tortoise (chel. esculenta) dear to many — even to Hindoo priests[5] — for the famous turtle-soup, if not on account of the giant tortoise (chel. mydas) yielding the beautiful tortoise-shell; some feast with zest on the hind legs of the green water-frog; while others justly delight in keeping the green tree-frog (hyla arborea) in their houses, and trust to it as a weather-prophet: yet who can be surprised that the Hebrews, supposing them even to have been acquainted with these animals and their qualities, were nevertheless disinclined to deviate from the general principle of viewing every reptile as "an abomination" (שֶׁקֶץ)[6]; that they prominently kept in view such species of the class as the predatory and gluttonous river-tortoise (aspidonectes); associated even with the most tempting frog the plump and sluggish, ugly and tuberculated toad equally offensive to sight and smell; and eagerly shunned every lizard-like animal that exhibits the slightest affinity to the terror-inspiring crocodile, though the people of Nubia and of Upper Egypt eat the crocodile[7], and the Hindoos did not refrain from the alligator[8]?

Again, physical aversion no doubt prompted the Hebrews to keep aloof from most of the Invertebrate animals, endowed with organs so rudimentary and imperfect, that for a long time their very right to a place in the animal kingdom was disputed; for those creatures lack

---

1 See *infra*.

2 Reptilia, Amphibia.

3 See Comm. on Gen. pp. 117, 118; comp. *Bechai* on Lev. XI. fol. 29[a], "the serpent is the root of all uncleanness and dirt" (זוהמא); *Yalk. Chad.* 1[a], § 1, ed. Lemb. כיו שבא נחש על חוה הטיל בה זוהמא (i.e. menstruation, see on XV. 19—24).

4 Lev. XI. 41, 42, which words aptly describe the four principal divisions of reptiles, the four-footed turtle (chelonii), the lizards (sauri) and frogs (batrachiae), and the feetless serpents, though a few of the sauri and of the batrachiae have two or no feet.

5 *Manu* V. 18; *Yâjnav.* I. 177.

6 Lev. XI. 41, 42.

7 *Burckhardt*, Reisen in Nubien, p. 57 (Germ. Transl.).

8 *Manu*, *Yâjnav.* ll. cc.

even the faculty of sensation which secures communion with the external world, some consisting merely of a series of soft alimentary canals or a stomach, others possessing sanguineous vessels and centres of nerves, while none are provided with the entire osseous, muscular, and nervous systems that distinguish the higher classes, and impart to them a variety of shape, beauty, motion, and intelligence; they were, moreover, for the most part, considered repulsive in several respects, for they include those myriad swarms of vermin which, however indispensable in the great chain of organic life, constantly prey on man's rest, his comfort, and his property, compel him to an unceasing warfare of offence and defence, and are hence in many Eastern cosmogonies described as productions of the sinister or destructive power in nature, of Ahriman or Typhon: among them are the predaceous and insidious spider, though at all times men have been found who ate spiders even with a relish[9]; the louse, the flea, and the disgusting bug bred by uncleanness; the voracious caterpillar; the mischievous moth — the cloth- and fur-moth, and worse than all the corn-moth, often a pest in granaries; the fly in its endless varieties, harassing and tormenting, spoiling and destroying — the carrion-, chamber-, cherry-, stubble-, leaf-, fungus-, and horse-fly; the beetle tribe with their larvae or grubs doing incalculable injury to our corn vegetables, and trees, though we must acknowledge the medicinal utility of the poisonous Spanish fly (lytta vesicatoria); the hemiptera with their swarms of scale-insects; the plant-lice damaging to rose-trees and other shrubs, though one single species, the coccus cacti which feeds on the fig-cactus, serves the use of man by the charming carmine colour which it yields, the basis of scarlet; the angry wasp and the revengeful hornet with their numerous sub-tribes, among which, however, the cynips (cynips quercus), by stinging certain plants, produces the valued gall-nut, the chief substance of ink and black dyes; the gad- or bot-fly (oestrus), a plague to our cattle by the eggs which it deposits on their shoulders and backs, and thus indirectly introduces into their stomachs and intestines; the scorpion with its hollow sting inflicting wounds often mortal, always painful, and its poison-bladder; and the unnumbered hosts of Worms, some of which, as the common earth-worm (lumbricus terrestris), are injurious to the tender radicles of plants, though the leech has long stood in high repute as useful in numerous ailments. Hence the Hebrews rejected also the crustaceous or shelled animals, untempted by the

---

[9] See *Brehm*, Illustrirtes Naturleben, VI. pp. 567 *sqq*.

dainties of lobster and crab, of prawn and shrimp, counting them rather among the "creeping things with many feet" which they held in abomination (שֶׁקֶץ)[1], and coupling them with the troublesome and tormenting fish-parasites, the wood-louse tribe — the water-flea and the barnacle, the armed glomeris and the milliped. They even left untouched all Mollusks: these indeed, on account of their perfectly developed vital organs, have been justly compared with the trunk of the higher classes of animals deprived of head and limbs; in many cases they live in beautiful and finely convoluted shells, applicable to various useful and ornamental purposes, as the pearly and the paper nautilus, the large cowrie, the fiery oven, and the trumpet snail, and in other instances they yield an admirable purple-coloured juice formerly employed in dying the most costly stuffs[2], or they furnish precious pearls and the glittering mother-of-pearl, as the fresh-water and the marine pearl-mussel (mya margaritifera); yet they are hardly inviting as food on account of the soft and slimy mantle that covers most of them like a sack, whether they have a shell[3], or not, as the slugs, and whether that shell is one entire piece, as in the snail, or consists of two parts, as in the mussels; they include such monsters as the great cuttle-fish (octopus vulgaris, the polypes of the ancients), which, possessing most formidable tentacula no less than twelve feet long, probably gave rise to the fiction of huge sea-monsters (Kraken) so frequently introduced in northern legends. Therefore it can well be understood, that many nations, and among them the Hebrews, remained insensible to the reputed delicacy and nutritiousness of the oyster, the edible snail (helix pomatia), the cockle, and the large class of conchifera[4].

Next to physical dislike, a regard for health naturally guided the early generations in the selection of food; but just as it is impossible for us to measure the former by our present notions, so it would be uncertain to estimate the latter by our present knowledge and experience. In primitive and unscientific times, the one no doubt exercised no mean influence upon viewing the other; for that wich is externally repulsive, unclean, or clammy, was commonly suspected as unwholesome and injurious[5]. Let us, instead of all other instances,

---

[1] Lev. XI. 42.

[2] See Comm. on Exod. pp. 486, 487.

[3] Testacea or Conchylia.

[4] Comp. *Galen*. De Aliment. Facult. III. 3, κοχλίας ὁσημέραι πάντες Ελληνες ἐσθίουσιν; but he observes with respect to mollusks in general (l. c. c. 35), σκληρόσαρκα δ' ἐστὶ καὶ δύσπεπτα καὶ βραχὺν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς περιέχοντα τὸν ἀλυκὸν χυμόν.

[5] Comp. *Rashbam* on Lev. XI. 3, the forbidden animals "are disgust-

consider the case of the *Swine*, highly instructive in more than one respect: we shall here at once treat of the subject fully, in order to obviate the necessity of returning to it again, though by so doing we may seem to interrupt our present enquiry.

The unclean habits of the swine struck the Hebrews so strongly, that they gave rise to the saying, "The snout of the pig resembles ambulant dirt"[6]; swine were considered as the fit habitations of "unclean spirits" or "devils", driven out of possessed persons[7]; a man wallowing in the last and most disgusting stage of drunkenness was compared with the swine[8]; Maimonides believed that "the principal reason why the Law held the pig in abomination, was because this animal is the filthiest of all and feeds on the filthiest refuse", and he added with pardonable exaggeration, that it would have been a strange anomaly if the Hebrews, upon whom the most scrupulous cleanliness was enjoined even with respect to their camp[9], had been permitted to rear pigs, whereby "the streets of their towns, nay their very houses must become more foully offensive than privies, as is at present seen in the countries of the Franks"[10]. The Egyptians, it is well known, regarded the pig as hateful to sun and moon; they deemed it so singularly contaminating by its "uncleanness", "unholiness", and "all-devouring voracity, unsparing even of its own young and of men"[11], that any person who had accidentally touched a pig, was

---

ing, and injure and heat the body"; see also *Rosenm.* Schol. ad Lev. XI. pp. 59, 60, the legislator "iis maxime victus animalis generibus Israelitis interdixit, quae citeriore corruptione vitiantur", etc.

[6] *Talm.* Berach. 25[a], פי חזיר כצואה עוברת דמי; *ibid.* 43[b]; comp. also 2 Pet. II. 22; *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 48.

[7] Comp. Matth. VIII. 28—32; Mark V. 2—13; Luke VIII. 27—36.

[8] *Yalkut Shimeoni* c. 61, fol. 16[a], כחזיר שמתלכלך בטיט ורפש (in the well known legend taken from מדרש אבכיר, of the planting of the vine jointly by Noah and Satan).

[9] Comp. Deut. XXIII. 13—15.

[10] *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III.48. According to Jewish writings, the image of the pig is derived from "the unclean spirit", i. e. Satan (צורתו הבאה מרוח הטומאה נקראת חזיר); comp. *Lactant.* Instit. IV. 17; *Arist.* Hist. An. VIII. 8; *Plin.* VIII. 51 or 77; *Ael.* Nat. An. V. 45; *Varro*, R. R. II. 4; *Colum.* VII. 9, 10; *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. I. p. 135, "Porcus non tam immundus quam immundities ipsa videtur." The assertion of Porphyry (Abst. I.14) that swine were unknown in Canaan and Phoenicia, is hazardous and unsupported, though they were not bred by the Hebrews, but by their heathen neighbours; comp. 1 Chr. XXVII. 29—31; Matth. VIII. 30; Mark V. 13; Luke VIII. 32, 33; XV. 15; and *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. 696—698.

[11] *Herod.* II. 47; ὗν δὲ Αἰγ. μιαρὸν ἥγηνται θηρίον εἶναι; *Plut.* Is. 8, τὴν ὗν ἀνίερον ζῶον ἡγοῦνται; *Ael.* Nat. An. X. 16, ἐμίσησαν Αἰγ. τὸ ζῶον ὡς μυσαρὸν καὶ πάμβορον; comp. *Ja-*

obliged instantly to plunge into the water, dressed as he was; swineherds, detested and disgraced, "though of pure Egyptian blood", were forbidden to enter any of the national temples, or to intermarry with any other class or caste; and the Egyptian priests and all those initiated in the mysteries rigidly abstained from pork, except on one solitary occasion which will presently be noticed[1]. The same food was scrupulously shunned by the Ethiopians, who hardly ever kept swine[2]; by Libyan tribes, as the Barcaeans, who followed the Egyptians[3]; by the Comani in Pontus, who deemed it a pollution of their temples to admit a pig within the precincts of their towns[4]; by the Scythians, who "never sacrificed swine nor suffered them to be reared in their country at all"[5]; and the Galatians in Pessinus, who shrank from touching any part of the swine[6]. It was prohibited to the Zabii[7]; to the holier orders of the Hindoos, who abhorred it as much as human flesh[8], and the more so as the latter and pork were considered almost perfectly alike in taste and smell[9]; and to the Parsees, because swine were believed to devóur the impure creatures of the evil demon, or the *kharfesters*[10]. The same antipathy was shared by the Phoenicians[11], and the Syrians in Hierapolis, who regarded it as an abomination to eat or to sacrifice swine[12]. From the temple of Hercules or Melkarth in Gades (Cadiz),

---

*seph.* c. Ap. II. 14; *Plut.* Symp. IV. v. 2, 3, εἰ δὲ δύσμορφον ἡ ὗς καὶ θολερόν κτλ.; οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο βορβόρῳ χαῖρον οὕτω καὶ τόποις ῥυπαροῖς καὶ ἀκαθάρτοις ὁρῶμεν; *Athen.* Deipnos. VII. 55.

[1] Comp. *Herod.*, *Plut.*, and *Ael.* ll. cc. The mythical or cosmic reasons assigned for this aversion do not concern us here; comp. f. i. *Nork*, Vergleichende Mythologie, p. 19 ("Typhon frisst in Gestalt eines wilden Schweines dem Osiris die Zeugungstheile ab, d. h. der Winter hemmt die Vegetation").

[2] *Porph.* Abst. I. 14, οὐδὲ νῦν ἐν Αἰθιοπίᾳ φασὶν ὁρᾶσθαι τὸ ζῶον τοῦτο.

[3] *Herod.* IV. 186.

[4] *Strabo* XII. VIII. 9, p. 575.

[5] *Herod.* IV. 63.

[6] *Paus.* VII. XVII. 5, though the connection of this custom with the life of Attes is mythical; comp. *Braun*, Naturgesch. der Sage, II. 111.

[7] *Hotting.* Hist. Or. p. 186.

[8] *Manu* V. 14; *Ael.* Nat. An. XVI. 37, ὗν δὲ ἐν Ἰνδοῖς οὔ φασι γίνεσθαι,... μυσάττονται δὲ καὶ ἐσθίειν τοῦδε τοῦ ζῴου κτλ.; though the statements of Aelian (l. c. III. 3), borrowed from Ctesias, that no swine were bred in India, is exaggerated (comp. *Arist.* Hist. An. VIII. 27, Κτησίας, οὐκ ὢν ἀξιόπιστος; *Philostr.* Apoll. II. 28).

[9] *Galen.* De Alim. Fac. III. 2.

[10] *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. p. XLIII; see, however, *infra*.

[11] *Herodian.* V. 6 (τούτων γὰρ — χοίρων — ἀπείχετο Φοινίκων νόμῳ); comp., however, *Lampridius*, Vit. Heliog. 21, 32 (exhibuit et sumina apruna; . . . alia die de porcis).

[12] *Lucian*, Syr. Dea c. 54, σύας δὲ μούνας ἐναγέας νομίζοντες οὔτε θύουσιν οὔτε σιτέονται; comp. *Dion Cass.* LXXIX. 11; see, however, *infra*.

women and swine were excluded[13]. Pork was denounced as detestable by Mohammed[14]; it was and is still abhorred by the Druses[15]; by the Christian Copts, following probably the example of their Egyptian ancestors, though they eat the wild boar[16]; by the Arabs and Turks[17]; and most of the South American tribes[18].

Now it is well known, that pork was consumed by many ancient nations, who acknowledged it as wholesome nourishment. The Greeks heard without surprise of Homer's divine swineherd[19], although the transformation of Ulysses' friends into grovelling swine was to them equally intelligible. The Romans paid the utmost attention to the rearing of pigs[20]; among them pork was employed medicinally for very numerous purposes[21], it formed an important item in their ordinary diet[22], and was in a variety of ways dressed, as a delicious dainty not only with care, but so expensively that sumptuary laws were enacted to check the extravagance[23]. Galen[24] declared, as the result of long observation, that "of all victuals pork is the most nu-

---

[13] *Sil. Ital.* Pun. III. 22, 23, Femineos prohibent gressus, ac limine curant Saetigeros arcere sues.

[14] *Koran* II. 168; V. 4; VI. 146 ("for this is an abomination" رجس); XVI. 116.

[15] *Seetzen,* Reisen, I. 102.

[16] Comp. *Lane,* Mod. Egypt. III. 188; *Sonnini,* Voyage, III. 293, les Coptes ne s'en nourissent jamais, non plus que les Mahométans, en sorte que rien n'est plus rare que cet animal dans le Saïd.

[17] Comp. *Plin.* VIII. 52 or 78, in Arabia suillum genus non vivit; *Sol.* c. 33 (suillis carnibus prorsus abstinent; sane hoc animalis genus, si invectum illo fuerit, moritur illico); *Sozomen.* Hist. Eccl. VI. 38; *Hieron.* Adv. Jovinian. II. 7 *init.* p. 334 ed. Valarsi; *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. I. vii. 4, p. 132. The pig is, besides corpses and blood, the only object the touch of which the Bedouins consider unlawful (harám); *Burckh.* Beduinen, p. 80; *Sale,* Koran, Prelim. Disc. p. 91; *Lane,* Mod. Egypt. I. 131.

[18] *Rosenm.* Morgenland, II. 170, 171.

[19] Comp. *Hom.* Od. XIV. 80, 81, ἔσθιε . . . χοίρε' ἀτὰρ σιάλους γε σύας μνηστῆρες ἔδουσιν; see *Athen.* Deipn. IX. 17; *Porph.* Abst. I. 14; III. 20, ἡ δὲ ὗς φύσει γέγονε πρὸς τὸ σφαγῆναι καὶ καταβρωθῆναι; comp., however, *Bochart,* Hieroz. I. p. 707.

[20] *Varro* R. R. II. 4, suillum pecus donatum ab natura dicunt ad epulandum; *Lactant.* Instit. IV. 17.

[21] Comp. *Plin.* XX. 13 or 51; XXI. 21 or 89; XXII. 25 or 69; XXVIII. 9 or 37; etc. etc.

[22] Comp. *Galen.* l. c. II. 1, φαίνεται γοῦν τά τε χοίρεια κρέα . . . πολλὴν χρείαν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις παρεχόμενα; *Celsus,* De Medic. II. 18, inter domesticas quadrupedes levissima suilla est, gravissima bubula; see *Trusen,* Sitten, Gebräuche und Krankheiten der alten Hebräer, p. 31.

[23] *Plin.* VIII. 51 or 77, neque alio ex animali numerosior materia ganeae; quinquaginta prope sapores, cum ceteris singuli; hinc censoriarum legum pagina etc.; *Athen.* III. 48, 49; IX. 19.

[24] L. c. III. 2, 19; see also *Porphyr.* Abst. I. 15.

tritious"[1] and he found, for instance, that gladiators and others engaged in athletic exercises visibly lost strength if, instead of pork, they took the same quantity of any other meat. Similar opinions were entertained among many tribes even in western Asia and northern Africa, by whom pork was not only deemed healthier than beef, mutton, and goose, but eminently suitable for invalids[2]. Pork forms a staple food in China, where the pig is one of the chief victims sacrificed to the gods and to the manes of Confucius[3]. It is commonly eaten by the people of India[4]; it is permitted even to the Parsees, provided that due precautions are taken that the pig does not consume unclean creatures within a year of its slaughter[5]; and it is held lawful by the oriental Christians, who yet abstain from camel's flesh. The Jews had constantly to bear the taunting irony of other nations "because they do not eat the most eligible meat"[6]. Jewish writers themselves, as Philo and the physician Isaac ben Soleiman living in the tenth century, admit the excellence and nourishing qualities of pork[7]; and the most rigorous Talmudism, believing bacon to be a remedy against consumption and atrophy, allows it to Jews suffering from these and similar complaints.

Yet, on the other hand, it is a notorious fact that pork was, from early periods, shunned by many on account of its own or the pig's injurious properties. It was regarded with repugnance by the Egyptian priests, who contended, that "it engenders many superfluous humours"[8]. Maimonides declared that "pork is too juicy and too rich to be recommended as food", and he enlarged this observation into the general rule, that "all animals forbidden by the Law are un-

---

[1] Πάντων ἐδεσμάτων ἡ σὰρξ τῶν ὑῶν ἐστι τροφιμωτάτη, or τῶν ὑῶν τῆς σαρκὸς οὐδὲν ἂν ἄλλο τροφιμώτερον ἔχοις εὑρεῖν.

[2] Comp. *Meiners*, Gesch. der Relig. I. pp. 230, 231; see *Maimon*. Mor. Nev. III. 48.

[3] *De Pauw*, Recherches, pp. 169 *sqq*. etc.

[4] *Bohlen*, Alt. Ind. II. 163.

[5] Comp. *Spiegel* l. c.

[6] *Plut*. Symp. IV. iv. 4, comp. v. 1, ὅτι τὸ δικαιότατον κρέας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν; comp. *Joseph*. De Maccab. c. 5, διὰ τί γὰρ τῆς φύσεως κεχαρισμένης καλλίστην τὴν τοῦδε τοῦ ζώου σαρκοφαγίαν βδελλύττῃ κτλ.; *Clem. Alex*. Strom. VII. p. 718 ed. Sylb.; *Artemidorus*, Oneirocrit. I. 72, ἄριστα πᾶσι τὰ χοιρεῖα.

[7] Comp. *Talm*. Chull. 17[a] (כל מיב ... כרלי חזירי, i. e. bacon); *Philo*, De Concup. c. 4, Op. II. 352 (Χερσαίων μὲν οὖν τὸ ὑῶν γένος ἥδιστον ἀνωμολόγηται παρὰ τοῖς χρωμένοις); *Sprengel*, Histoire de la Médecine, trad. franç. de Jourdan, II. 323 ("il — Is. b. Sol — vante la chair de porc comme un aliment très-sain", in his work Liber de diaetis universalibus et particularibus ed. Posthii, Basil. 1570).

[8] *Plut*. Is. c. 5, πολλὴν ποιοῦντα περίττωσιν.

wholesome nutriment"[9]; whereas ruminants, because thoroughly masticating their food, and perfectly separating the good from the deleterious humours, yield healthful meat[10]. This view occurs in many anterior and subsequent writers, variously and often strangely modified[11]. Pork was pronounced injurious not only to the health of the body, but to the vigour and clearness of mind[12]. The swine, "by far the most brutish of all animals", was by some of the stoics considered as consisting merely of flesh, without any vestige of soul or of a higher power beyond the preserving principle of animal life[13].

But the pig was brought into disrepute, not more by its habits, than by the cutaneous disorders to which it is unquestionably subject, especially in the East, and by which, as many believed, consumers of pork are certain to be affected. The Talmud remarks, "Ten measures of pestilential sickness were spread over the earth, and nine of them fell to the share of pigs"[14]. "Pork is detested", observes Plutarch, "because foreign nations generally abhor scab and leprosy, and even believe that these diseases destroy men by contagion; for under the belly the pig is full of leprosy and scabby eruptions[15], which are supposed to appear on the surface in consequence of some internal taint or disorder"[16]. It suffices to refer with a passing allusion to the well-known assertion of Tacitus, that "the Jews abstain from pork on account of the loathsome affliction of leprosy, by which they were once disgraced, and to which the pig is liable"[17]. Even drinking the milk of the "unholy" swine was supposed to engender leprosy and scabby ulcers, "diseases utterly hateful to all Asiatics"[18]. An

---

[9] *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 48; comp. *Rashb.* on Lev. XI. 3.

[10] Comp. *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. I. vii. 1, pp. 116, 117.

[11] Comp. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. II. p. 405 ed. Sylb., the richness of such meat as pork leads to luxury and intemperance (ὅσα φύσει πίονα ... τρυφητιῶσι γὰρ ἡ τοιαύτη χρῆσις χορηγεῖται).

[12] As beans were proscribed by the Pythagoraeans because checking the buoyancy of thought; see *supra* p. 66.

[13] *Plut.* Symp. V. x. 3, τὴν ὗν σάρκα κρέα γεγονέναι λέγουσι, τῆς ψυχῆς, ὥσπερ ἁλῶν, παρεσπαρμένης ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαμένειν; *Porph.* Abst. III. 20, τῇ σαρκὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὁ θεὸς οἷον ἅλας ἐνέμιξεν; *Plin.* VIII. 51 or 77, animalium hoc maxime brutum, animamque ei pro sale datam non inlepide existumabatur; *Cic.* Nat. Deor. II. 64, cui quidem ne putresceret, animam ipsam pro sale datam dicit esse Chrysippus.

[14] *Talm.* Kiddush. 49[b] עשרה קבים נגעים ירדו לעולם תשעה נטלו חזירים; comp. Shabb. 129 אי פגע בדבר אחר קשה לדבר אחר, i. e. אי פגע בחזיר קשה לצרעת, see Rashi in loc.

[15] Πᾶσαν δὲ ὗν ὑπὸ τὴν γαστέρα λέπρας ἀνάπλεων καὶ ψωρικῶν ἐξανθημάτων ὁρῶμεν.

[16] *Plut.* Symp. IV. v. 3.

[17] *Tac.* Hist. V. 4, sue se abstinent merito cladis, qua ipsos scabies quondam turpaverat, cui id animal obnoxium; comp. *infra*, the conclusion of this treatise, esp. p. 111.

[18] *Plut.* Is. c. 8, τῶν τὸ γάλα πινόντων ἐξανθεῖ τὰ σώματα λέπραν καὶ

observing traveller judiciously remarks, that the custom of abstaining from pork arose, no doubt, from hygienic rules indispensable under a burning sky: this will not be disputed, if it be remembered that the species of pigs found in hot climates, belongs to the swine of China, Siam, and India, rather than to those of Europe; these Chinese pigs, even if reared in our colder zones, furnish a flesh more delicate indeed than that of our common pigs, but much more charged with fat, thereby enfeebling the most robust constitutions, and producing indigestion and injurious acids which are doubly fatal in the East where the stomach is generally weakened by excessive heat. Moreover, the abundance of greese, which checks perspiration so freely engendered in hot countries, causes scabby diseases which are peculiar to the pig, and which under a broiling sun easily degenerate into leprosy[1].

Nor have modern science and experience been able to contradict the observations of former ages. For not only has the hurtful distemper of swine, freely bringing forth the tape-worm and long known under the name of "chalazae"[2], been found confirmed, but the existence of another and much more dangerous disease has been proved — the *trichinosis* or infection by trichinae[3]. Some years since it caused just uneasiness, if not consternation; in a few instances it grew into an epidemic, and appeared even endemic in certain districts[4]. The trichinae, which were probably brought to Europe by the importation of foreign, especially Chinese pigs, received that name about 35 years ago[5], because their bodies, fine as hairs (τρίχες), are often spirally rolled up. Though sometimes crowded by millions in one individual[6], they

---

ψωρικὰς τραχύτητας; *Ael.* Nat. An. X. 16 (on the authority of Manetho), γάλακτος ὑείου ὁ γευσάμενος ἀλφῶν ὑποπίμπλαται καὶ λέπρας; *Nachman.* on Lev. XI. fol. 91[a] ed. Pressb., and *Bechai* on Lev. XI. fol. 27[b], ed. 1864, חלב החזיר אם ינק היונק ממנו . . . היה איתו נער מצורע; comp. *Michael.* M. R. § 203, "whoever is afflicted by a cutaneous disease, were it but the common scab, must not eat pork." On several diseases of the pig known to the ancients see *Aristot.* Hist. An. VIII. 21; *Plin.* VIII. 51 or 77 (obnoxium genus mortis, anginae maxume et strumae, i. e. quinsy and scrofula); XI. 37 or 68; *Colum.* R. R. VII. 10.

[1] *Sonnini*, Voyage, III. 291, 292; comp. also *De Pauw*, Recherches, p. 104, les prêtres de l'Egypte . . . tâchaient principalement d'éviter la lèpre du corps, la lèpre des yeux ou la sporophthalmie et la gonorrhée etc.; see also on Chapt. XIV.

[2] Cysticercus cellulosae, Gr. χάλαζαι (comp. *Aristot.* Hist. An. VIII. 21), Germ. Finnen (comp. *Ersch und Gruber*, Encycl. I. XLIV. pp. 279—282).

[3] Trichina spiralis.

[4] Comp. *R. Virchow*, Die Lehre von den Trichinen, III. ed. Berl. 1866, pp. 62, 63, 66.

[5] By Hilton in 1832, and by Owen in 1835.

[6] Bodwitch calculated the number of trichinae found in one man to

can be recognised by the microscope only, owing not so much to their diminutive size, — for they attain a length of one-third to one half of a line — but to their complete transparency, which prevents the reflection of the received light. The generation of trichinae takes place, in the intestinal canal only, from animals there introduced with infected food. Arrived at their sexual maturity, or between the twentieth and the sixtieth day, the females which are viviparous are furnished with 1000 to 2000 ova[7]; the very next day the new brood begins to appear, the production of which is continued for three weeks. Then the old trichinae die, and the young animals immediately commence their peregrinations: fed by the fibres of the flesh which they irritate or destroy, they work their way, within twelve days, through the sides of the canal and the ligaments (not through the blood) chiefly into the muscles, and penetrate even to the more remote parts of the body. The worm grows till the 25th day, when it rolls itself up spirally; then the encysting process commences and is concluded in the third month, while the calcination of the capsule or cyst requires between 18 and 24 months, and preserves to the animal a truly marvellous vitality, which has been found unimpaired even after upwards of 13 years[8]. The worm grows in the muscles, but does not multiply there. Hence men have to fear no danger from the time when the worm becomes enclosed in the capsule, which forms its prison, and renders its further migration and activity in the same body impossible. The symptoms of the disease vary according to the quantity of trichinae which invade the muscles, and the ravages they cause in the fibres of the flesh; but they are often sufficiently alarming. The patient is suddenly seized with vomiting and purging, with griping, spasms, and gastric disorders, whence the illness, in its first stages, has sometimes been mistaken for cholera; or he suffers from various affections of the muscles, from debility, collapse, and stiffness similar to gout and rheumatism; often a feverish condition ensues not unlike the agonies of typhus; and generally the face becomes peculiarly swollen, especially near the eyes. Sometimes the symptoms assume an acute form, and the persons die in the second or third week after they have eaten infected meat; or serious results occur only after 10 or 14 days, and death takes place in the fourth or seventh week; and in other instances, though not ending fatally, a chronic malady remains, consisting in emaciation and wasting away. The first mortal case

---

amount to upwards of seven millions and a half; see *Gross*, Elements of path. Anat. 1845, p. 215.

[7] Comp. *Pagenstecher*, Die Trichinen, 1865, p. 92.

[8] Comp. *Virchow*, l. c. pp. 39, 40.

of illness from trichinae was ascertained in the year 1861 in the vicinity of Dresden [1]; then, to pass by many isolated instances, followed an epidemic in Plauen in the Voigtland, where about 30 persons were taken ill [2], and a more serious one (in 1863) at Hettstädt in the province of Saxony, where 153 persons were seized and 28 died [3]; and lastly, in Hedersleben near Quedlinburg, a town of about 2000 inhabitants, the most important and most formidable outbreak of all took place; for in a comparatively short time upwards of 300 cases and 90 deaths were recorded, all of them the effect of a single diseased pig. However, both the facts and the apprehensions have been unwarrantably exaggerated. For as a rule, trichinae in swine are extremely rare; statistics prove, that they are found hardly in one pig among 5,000 or 10,000, nay in one among 50,000 [4]; they are fatal only if they penetrate into the muscles in very large quantities; and they are destroyed, or at least rendered innocuous, by a temperature above 50° Réaum. It is, therefore, only necessary to avoid raw bacon so extensively eaten on the Continent, and in some counties of England by agricultural labourers; and to refrain from imperfectly smoked sausages prepared of raw pork, and from raw pork minced or scraped, as commonly taken with bread just in those parts of Germany in which the most fearful epidemics of trichinosis have raged: but pork becomes unfailingly harmless by stewing, roasting, and baking, generally also by thorough salting, pickling, and smoking. These precautions suffice to avert disease through trichinae: careful feeding of the swine, microscopic examination of pork by experienced observers, as now introduced in many of the larger towns of Germany, and public slaughter-houses subjected to official control, may be recommendable as additional protections [5].

---

1 Comp. *Zeucker* in Virchow's Archiv XVIII. p. 561.

2 Comp. *Boehler*, Die Trichinenkrankheit und die Behandlung derselben in Plauen, 1863.

3 Comp. *Rupprecht*, Die Trichinenkrankheit im Spiegel der Hettstädter Endemie betrachtet, 1864.

4 "Immerhin halte ich es für richtig", observes Virchow, "dass im Grossen und Ganzen trichinische Schweine selten sind" (l. c. p. 37).

5 Comp. *Virchow* l. c. pp. 77 *sqq.*; *Fr. Küchenmeister* Ueber die Nothwendigkeit einer allgemeinen Durchführung einer mikroskop. Fleischschau, Dresd. 1864; *A. C. Feit*, Bericht . . . über öffentliche Schlachthäuser, 1864; see in general *Leuckart*, Untersuchungen über Trichina spiralis, 1860; Die menschlichen Parasiten und die von ihnen herrührenden Krankheiten, 1863, vol. I; *K. Haubner*, Ueber die Trichinen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Schutzmittel gegen die Trichinenkrankheit bei Menschen, Berlin 1864; *Pagenstecher*, Die Trichinen 1865; *R. Virchow*, Die Lehre von den Trichinen, III. Edit., Berlin 1866; *A. C. Feit* l. c. pp. 13—15;

Hence we may conclude, that the Biblical prohibition of pork was prompted, among other reasons, by the diseases which its consumption was even in early ages noticed to produce or to foster, though we are unable distinctly to point out those diseases, whether the tapeworm, trichinosis, or any other disorder was engendered.. If we add that the pig was known to be omnivorous, to devour rats and mice, and sometimes its own young, that it occasionally attacks men and consumes human bodies[6], and was even supposed to feed upon serpents[7], we can well understand why the eating of pork was, at a comparatively remote time, denounced by Hebrew teachers with uncompromising vehemence, and why it was enumerated among the worst abominations of idolatry[8], and the most wicked practices[9].

But do even all these combined circumstances account for the supreme importance attached to abstinence from pork? They hardly suffice to explain all the remarkable facts which are associated with this subject, and some of which we may be allowed to recall to the reader's memory. In the times of the Syrian dominion and of the Maccabees, the Jews preferred the most horrible tortures and death itself to the defilement of pork; and the aged Eleazar and the mother with her seven sons were no exceptional examples of heroic fortitude. They considered it a triumph and a glorification of God, to show their constancy by offering up their lives as a sacrifice[10], and they were certain of the most splendid rewards which awaited their firmness in the future world[11]. The swine was not only singled out as the type of all unclean beasts[12], but the eating of pork was equivalent to forswearing the Law and to absolute apostasy[13]. Later, the

---

esp. *A. C. Gerlach*, Die Trichinen, Hannover 1866; etc. etc.

[6] *Aelian*, Nat. An: X. 16 init., ἡ ὗς καὶ τῶν ἰδίων . . . ἀφειδῶς ἔχει, καὶ μέντοι καὶ ἀνθρώπου σώματι ἐντυχοῦσα οὐκ ἀπέχεται, ἀλλ' ἐσθίει; *Plin.* VIII. 77 or 51, comesse fetus his non est prodigium; X. 63 or 83, feminas (subantes) autem in tantum efferari ut hominem lacinent, candida maxime veste indutum; XI. 53 or 115, quia et subus serpentes in pabulo sunt; XXIX. 4 or 23; *Colum.* R. R. VII. 11, sunt quaedam scrofae quae mandunt foetus suos; comp. *Strabo* IV. IV. 3, p. 197; Sept. 1 Ki. XXI. 19; XXII. 38 (ἔλιξαν αἱ ὕες καὶ οἱ κύνες τὸ αἷμα Ναβουθαί κτλ.); *Talm.* Nidd. 58[b]; Moed Katon 24[a] (שמטו הזיריים את גויריתו); Bab. Kam. Tos. 19[b].

[7] *Aristot.* Hist. An. IX. II. 9.

[8] Isai. LXV. 4; LXVI. 17.

[9] Isai. LXVI. 3; comp. Prov. XI. 22; Matth. VII. 6.

[10] 1 Macc. I. 63, 64; 2 Macc. VI. 18—31; VII. 1 *sqq.*, 37; *Joseph.* Macc. 5—14.

[11] 2 Macc. VII. 9, 14, 24.

[12] 1 Macc. I. 47.

[13] 2 Macc. VII. 1 *sqq.*; see *Joseph.* Macc. c. 5; Ant. XII. v. 1; Bell. Jud. I. I. 2; *Philo*, In Flacc. c. 11; some editions of the Sept. read in Ps. XVII

very word חזיר was avoided as detestable and replaced by the euphemism דבר אחר[1]; or if used, it was applied as a byword of idolatrous nations[2], especially of archenemies of the Jews, such as the Edomites and Romans[3]. The doorposts of houses in a swine-breeding town were not to be provided with the religious inscriptions (מזוזות) ordained by the Law[4]; and the rearing of pigs by Jews was unconditionally forbidden in any country[5], and even stamped as an accursed pursuit, as was the study of Greek philosophy, since both alike were considered to lead to desertion of the Jewish faith[6]. Finally, the abhorrence of the Israelites to pork struck the heathens as the most conspicuous characteristic of their religion[7], and it was believed that they would eat human flesh with no greater repugnance than pork[8]. This peculiar aversion to the pig must have had a peculiar reason; it must in some manner have been connected with the very essence of the Hebrew faith itself. In searching for the reason, we obtain welcome aid from statements of classical writers.

It cannot be doubted that the swine, on account of its prolificness, was extensively regarded as an emblem of the fertility of nature and of her productive powers; it received, therefore, a cosmic significance; it represented the main principle of all heathen religions — the eter-

(XVI). 14 ἐχορτάσθησαν ὑείων (for ישבעו בנים).

[1] Comp. *Talm.* Shabb. 110[b], 129[b]; Berach. 43[b]; *El. Levita* Tishbi s. v. דבר; the same paraphrase was used with reference to leprosy (*Talm.* Shabb. 129[b]) and to sexual intercourse (*Talm.* Berach. 8[b]); comp. in Greek πρᾶγμα ἀλλόκοτον.

[2] *Yalk. Rub.* 12[a], גוף של עכום הוא גוף ונפש של חזיר.

[3] Comp. *Abarb.* Rosh Emun. c. XIII. fol. 17[b], ed. Altona, with reference to Ps. LXXX. 14; see *Eisenmenger*, Entd. Judenth. I. 741, 755, 779—785.

[4] Deut. VI. 9; XI. 20; comp. *Creizenach*, Schulchan Aruch, I. 121.

[5] *Mishn.* Bab. Kam. VII. 7, אין מגדלין חזירים בכל מקום; Avoth de-Rabbi Nathan c. 35; comp. *Porph.* Abst. I. 14, Φοίνικες δὲ καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπέσχοντο, ὅτι οὐδ' ὅλως ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐφύετο.

[6] ארור אדם שמגדל חזירים, *Talm.* Bab. Kam. 82[b]; Menach. 64[b]; Sot. 49[b]; *Talm. Jer.* Shekal. fol. 47[b] (where rearing swine is coupled with the two disgraceful vices of drunkenness and usury): the rule was fixed כל שאסורה מדברי תורה אסור לעשות בו סחורה; comp. *Maimon.* מאכלות אסורות c. 5; *Yor. Deah* § 117; מצות השם, fol. 106[a], rule 13.

[7] Comp. *Tacit.* Hist. V. 4; *Plut.* Symp. IV. v. 1 *sqq.*; *Strabo* XVI. II. 37; *Diod. Sic.* Fragm. XXXIV. 1; *Joseph.* C. Ap. II. 14; Ant. XIII. VIII. 2; *Philo*, Legat. ad Caium c. 45; *Porph.* Abst. IV. 11 (διετέλουν πολλῶν μὲν ἀπεχόμενοι ζώων, ἰδίως δὲ ἔτι καὶ νῦν τῶν χοιρίων); *Petron.* Satir. Fragm. XLVII. 1.

[8] Comp. *Juven.* XIV. 98, Nec distare putant humana carne suillam; comp. VI. 160; *Macrob.* Sat. II. 4, melius est Herodis porcum esse quam filium, as Augustus is reported to have observed; comp. also *Aelian*, Nat. An. XVI. 37 (with regard to the Hindoos), οὐκ ἂν γεύσαιντό ποτε ὑείων, ὥσπερ οὖν οὐδὲ ἀνθρωπείων οἱ αὐτοί.

nal working of the elements and of the innate forces of matter, a principle directly opposed to that of Hebraism, which rigorously insists upon one personal Deity, creating, ruling, and preserving the universe and all mankind. Hence many pagan nations sacrificed the swine to those gods to whom they attributed the fertility of the soil and the fruitfulness of cattle. Though the Egyptians commonly avoided the pig as particularly unclean, they offered and consumed one once every year, at the feast of the full moon, in honour of Isis and Osiris, the fructifying powers of nature, and this was done so scrupulously, that the poor who could not afford a pig, were ordered to shape one of dough, and to hallow and to eat this image[9]. The pig was indeed believed to have suggested the first idea of ploughing and the plough-share by breaking up the earth with its protruding snout[10]. In Egypt it was no unimportant agent in securing agricultural success; for in some parts of the country, especially in the Delta, as soon as the subsiding Nile had irrigated the fields, and when the sowing had been completed, the husbandmen turned swine into their land to press the seed into the ground, thus protecting the grains from the birds; and at harvest time pigs were employed to tread out the corn[11]. The famous zodiac of Denderah represents between the sign of fishes and that of the ram a man carrying a small pig, which points to the Egyptian swine offering in reference to the progress of the seasons[12]. A pig formed the usual sacrifice for Demeter[13]. Thus the Athenians generally offered one in their mysteries, which mainly related to the secret activity of nature[14]. On Athenian and Eleusinian coins, Ceres

---

[9] *Herod.* II. 47, 48 init., τοῖσι μὲν νῦν ἄλλοισι θεοῖσιν θύειν ὗς οὐ δικαιεῦσι Αἰγύπτιοι. Σελένῃ δὲ καὶ Διονύσῳ μούνοισι, τοῦ αὐτοῦ χρόνου, τῇ αὐτῇ πανσελήνῳ, τοὺς ὗς θύσαντες, πατέονται τῶν κρεῶν; comp. Wilkinson in loc.; *Ael.* Nat. An. X. 16, ὅταν οὖν πανηγυρίζωσι τῇ σελήνῃ θύουσιν αὐτῇ ἅπαξ τοῦ ἔτους ὗς κτλ.; *Plut.* Is. c. 8, θύοντες ἅπαξ ὗν ἐν πανσελήνῳ καὶ ἐσθίοντες κτλ.; comp. c. 43. The Zabii also eat pork on a certain day (comp. *Hottinger*, Hist. Or. p. 198).

[10] *Plut.* Symp. IV. iv. 2; ὕνις the ploughshare is supposed to have been named from ὗς.

[11] *Herod.* II. 14 (where Wilkinson remarks, "In the district of Gower, in South-Wales, corn is trodden in by sheep to this day"); *Ael.* Nat. An. X. 16; *Plut.* Symp. l. c.; *Plin.* XVIII. 18 or 47 (credo antiquitus factitatum). In times of mice-plagues, the pigs were turned among the mice to tear up their runs (*Aristot.* Hist. An. VI. xxx. 2).

[12] Comp. *Creuzer*, Symb. IV. 289.

[13] *Aristoph.* Ran. 337, 338; *Macrob.* Sat. I. 12.

[14] *Varro* R. R. II. 4, Initiis Cereris porci immolantur; *Aelian* l. c.; *Hygin.* Fab. CCLXXVII; the reason adduced by Aelian, "because the pigs injure the young crops" is an improbable conjecture, although it is repeated by other writers, as Macrob.,

is figured together with a swine[1]. The Boeotians, at an annual festival celebrated in their sacred grove near Potniae in honour of Demeter and Kora (Proserpine), let down into subterranean chambers pigs which were supposed to reappear in the following summer at Dodona, near the old and sacred oracle[2]. The early Romans honoured Ceres or Tellus after the conclusion of the harvest by the sacrifice of a pig[3], generally a fat and pregnant sow[4], which indeed was considered to have been the first offering slaughtered to Ceres[5], if not the first of all sacrifices[6], "because the swine is useful to men mainly by its flesh", that is, by its death[7].

Therefore, pigs, so far from being detested, were often declared holy. Thus the Syrians in Hierapolis, who neither ate nor offered swine, did so, according to some ancient authorities, "not because they believed pigs to be a pollution, but sacred animals"[8]. The Cretans held the pig holy, not on account of the mythical reason put forth by some foreign writers, that a sow allowed the infant Jupiter to suck her teats and by her grunting prevented the child's cries from being heard, but because it was the emblem of fruitfulness, whence the Praisians, a tribe of Crete, regularly sacrificed a sow before marriage[9]. Callimachus

---

Hygin., and Clem. Alex. (Strom. VII. p. 718 ed. Sylb. ἐπεὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων τοὺς κάρπους ἀνορύσσει καὶ φθείρει); comp. also *Ovid*, Fast. I. 349—352 (ulta suas merita caede nocentis opes etc.); Metam. XV. 112, 113 (quia semina pando eruerit rostro etc.).

[1] See *Creuzer*, Symb. IV. 380; comp. pp. 291, 378.

[2] *Paus.* IX. viii. 1; *Clem. Alex.* Admon. ad Gent. p. 11 ed. Sylb., δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἐν τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις μεγαρίζοντες χοίρους ἐκβάλλουσιν.

[3] *Hor.* Epist. II. i. 143, Tellurem porco . . . piabant; comp. *Plin.* VIII. 51 or 77.

[4] *Cornutus*, De Natur. Deor. p. 168 ed. Osannus (θύουσι δ' ὗς ἐγκύμονας τῇ Δήμητρι πάνυ οἰκείως, τὸ πολύγονον . . . παριστάντες); *Macrob.* Saturn. I. 12; sus praegnans ei — Majae — mactatur, quae hostia propria est terrae; *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 22, Telluri matri scrofa inciens immolatur et feta; very fat and quite perfect pigs were hence called *porci mystici*; comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. p. 256.

[5] *Ovid*, Fast. I. 349, prima Ceres avidae gavisa est sanguine porcae; comp. also *Juven.* X. 354, 355; VI, 447.

[6] *Varro*, R. R. II. 4, sus graece dicitur ὗς olim θῦς dictus, ab illo verbo quod dicunt θύειν, quod est immolare; ab suillo enim genere pecoris immolandi initium primum sumptum videtur (comp. *Athen.* IX. 64); *Arist.* Ethic. Nicom. VIII. 11; *Ovid*, Metam. XV. 111, 112, et prima putatur hostia sus meruisse mori.

[7] *Porph.* Abst. I. 14, οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστι χρήσιμον πρὸς ἄλλο τι ὗς ἢ πρὸς βρῶσιν; III. 20, ἡ δὲ ὗς οὐ δι' ἄλλο τι πλὴν θύεσθαι ἐγεγόνει; *Lactant.* Instit. IV. 17. Among the northern nations the boar was regarded in a similar light; comp. *Bähr*, Symb. II. 260.

[8] *Lucian*, Dea Syr. c. 54, ἄλλοι δ' οὐ σφέας ἐναγέας ἀλλὰ ἱροὺς νομίζουσιν.

[9] *Athen.* IX. 18, Πραίσιοι δὲ καὶ ἱρὰ ῥέζουσιν ὑΐ, καὶ αὕτη προτελὴς αὐτοῖσι θυσίη νενόμισται.

called Venus Castnietis the wisest of her sisters, because she was the first among them who accepted the sacrifice of swine[10]. Nay the Hebrews themselves were believed, however erroneously, to have avoided pork, not from feelings of disgust, but "because they held the sow in honour as their instructor in sowing and ploughing"[11].

Hence again, as Ceres, or agriculture, was looked upon as the originator of all personal and civil ties, of matrimony and law, of social and political order[12], the swine was employed for various solemn and imposing rituals connected with domestic and public life. The Athenians, on entering the national assembly, used certain parts of the pig for purification[13]; when they desired to expiate a house, a temple, or a town, the priests carried young pigs round the edifice or the city; and they sprinkled with pig's blood the benches used at popular assemblies[14]. By the same offering the Romans purified the public roads or cross-ways[15]; conciliated the manes of dead men the bones of whom had been left uncovered upon the ground[16]; and honoured the Lares[17]; they included the pig among the animals employed for their periodical lustrations[18]; sealed peace, treaties, and friendly compacts by the slaughter of a pig[19], and maintained this custom even to the

---

[10] *Strabo* IX. v. 17, p. 438.

[11] *Plut.* l. c. οὕτως καὶ τὴν ὗν σέβεσθαι σπόρου καὶ ἀρότου διδάσκαλον; *Petron.* Satir. Fragm. XLVII. 1, p. 103 ed. Berl. 1862, Judaeus licet et porcinum numen adoret etc.

[12] Comp. *Diod. Sic.* I. 14, διὸ καὶ τοὺς παλαιοὺς Ἕλληνας τὴν Δήμητραν θεσμοφόρον ὀνομάζειν, ὡς τῶν νόμων πρῶτον ὑπὸ ταύτης τεθειμένων; *Ovid*, Metam. V. 341—343; *Plut.* Conjug. Praecepta init., μετὰ τὸν πάτριον θεσμὸν, ὃν ὑμῖν ἡ τῆς Δήμητρος ἱέρεια . . . ἐφήρμησεν κτλ.; *Serv.* ad Aen. IV. 58; etc. etc.

[13] *Demosth.* Adv. Conon. c. 39, τοὺς ὄρχεις τοὺς ἐκ τῶν χοίρων.

[14] Which ceremony was called περίστια; and the term χοιρίδιον became synonymous with καθάρσιον; comp. *Suid.* sub περιστίαρχος and sub καθάρσιον (ἔθος ἦν Ἀθήνησι καθαίρειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὰ θέατρα καὶ ὅλως τὰς τοῦ δήμου συνόδους μικροῖς πάνυ χοιριδίοις, ἅπερ ὠνόμαζον καθάρσια); and equally explicit are *Pollux* lib. VIII. col. 447, ed. Basil.; *Hesych.* s. κάθαρμα; and *Schol. Aristoph.* Ach. 44. It is indeed not impossible that the passage in Isaiah above quoted (LXVI. 17), "they that sanctify and purify themselves in the gardens . . . eating swines' flesh", involves a similar notion and practice.

[15] *Propert.* V. I. 23, parva saginati lustrabant compita porci.

[16] *Cic.* De Legg. II. 22 (57).

[17] *Hor.* Od. III. XXIII. 4.

[18] In the sacrifice of *suovetaurilia;* comp. also *Juven.* Satir. XI. 82—84.

[19] *Varro* R. R. II. 4, Initiis pacis foedus cum feritur, porcus occiditur; *Virg.* Aen. VIII. 641, caesa jungebant foedera porca; Liv. I. 24 (tu illo die, Jupiter, populum Romanum sic ferito ut ego hunc porcum hic hodie feriam): in which practice the Latin usage *foedus icere* originated; comp. כרת ברית; see Comm. on Genes. p. 367.

times of the emperors[1]; they, therefore, represented the image of a pig among the figures on the Roman standards, since the object of war is peace[2], and it was an old and long preserved usage of the Roman bride, when first entering her husband's house, to touch the doorposts with pig's fat[3]. The same animal was sacrificed by the Cyprians for purposes of divination[4]; by the Argives to Venus at the festival of Hysteria[5]; and by the ancient Latini, the princes and chiefs of Etruria, and the Italic Greeks, at matrimonial feasts, which are associated both with a sacred alliance and the idea of progeny[6]. Moreover, as pork was, in its nature and taste, considered to resemble human flesh[7], the offering of a swine was, on peculiar emergencies, substituted for a human sacrifice[8].

Can it, then, be surprising that the Jewish doctors and sages, anxious to wean the people from the worship of nature and her powers, and to imbue them with reverence for the one eternal Creator, the Bestower of all earthly blessings, looked with implacable detestation upon the animal which typified a main feature of paganism, and declared the eating of pork as nothing less than a revolt against the foundations of Judaism, nay that the early teachers among the Christians shared the same repugnance, and relaxed in it only after long struggles[9]? The very persecution and ridicule which the Jews constantly suffered on that account, helped to intensify their abhorrence, especially as the eating of pork was, in later times also, enforced and regarded as the first and most conspicuous act of the Jewish

[1] *Sueton.* Claud. 25, cum regibus foedus in foro icit porca caesa etc.

[2] *Festus* s. v. porci effigies inter militaria signa quintum locum obtinebat, quia confecto bello, inter quos pax fieret, caesa porca foedus firmari solebat.

[3] *Plin.* XXVIII. 9 or 37, certe novae nuptae intrantes etiamnum solemne habent postes eo (adipe suillo) attingere; comp. also *Braun*, Naturg. der Sage, II. 319, 320.

[4] *Pausan.* VI. II. 2, Κύπριοι δὲ καὶ ὑσὶν ἐπεξευρόντες εἰσὶ μαντεύεσθαι.

[5] *Athen.* III. c. 49.

[6] *Varro* l. c. nuptiarum initio antiqui reges ac sublimes viri in Hetruria in conjunctione nuptiali nova nupta et novus maritus primum porcum immolant; and he adds the explanation of a peculiar Latin usage: nam et nostrae mulieres, maxime nutrices, naturam qua foeminae sunt, in virginibus appellant porcum, et graece χοῖρον significantes esse dignum insigni nuptiarum. Comp. in general *Cassel*, De Judaeorum odio et abstinentia a porcina ejusque causis, Magdeb. 1740; De sue in Sacrif. Gentilium, 1743; De Sacrificiis porcinis in cultu deor. veter. 1775; De sue in divinationibus et mysteriis magicis (nov. Bibl. Brem. II. 113 *sqq.*).

[7] *Galen*, De Alim. Fac. III. 2, see *supra* p. 80.

[8] Comp. *Ovid*, Fast. VI. 158.

[9] Comp. *Ernesti*, Comm. Theol. III. 363.

renegade, as among Mohammedans it is still held to be equivalent to abjuring the Islam[10]. Thus all the varied reasons which individually unfitted different animals for food, were combined in the pig to render it hateful in the eyes of the Jews — loathsome uncleanness, unwholesomeness, carnivorous ferocity, and dangerous seduction to paganism.

We now resume the main thread of our enquiry[11].

It is not impossible that the Hebrews were also induced by motives of health to look with distrust upon the hare and rock-badger[12], and upon fishes unprovided with fins and scales. For the fins replace the limbs which, in fishes, are rudimentary and imperfectly developed; and the presence of scales was deemed a sign of a more advanced organisation, while their real or supposed absence, giving to the fishes a slimy and disagreeable appearance, seemed to qualify them to live in the mud rather than in the water, and was in the eel, for instance, easily connected with the poisonous and hated serpent. It has, moreover, been ingeniously conjectured, that the scales are formed by the secretion of all superfluous and unhealthy humours which exist in the body, and which therefore in fishes without scales remain in the flesh, and make it heavy and even dangerous food[13]. Indeed in Egypt, fishes without scales are generally found to be injurious, and were forbidden by the laws of El-Hakim[14].

But when the people, after long struggles, made progress in moral refinement, they deemed it no longer sufficient to study mere expediency, and simply to avoid repulsive and unwholesome animals; but they felt an aversion to all beasts and birds of prey, which feed upon carcass, or attack live animals or men, and regarded them as "an abomination"[15]: from physical dislike and instinctive caution an

---

[10] Comp. *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. pp. 695—707; *Cunaeus*, De Rep. Hebr. II. c. 24, pp. 342—348; *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. I. vii. 4, pp. 131—138; *Bähr*, Symb. II. 233, 234, 256—258; etc. etc.

[11] See *supra* p. 79.

[12] See *supra* p. 55.

[13] Comp. *Abarb.* on Lev. XI. fol. 26[b], 27[a], ed. Amsterd. הסנפיר וקשקשת הם נולדים בדגים מטהרות הטבע כו'; *Nachman.* on Lev. XI. 9, the fishes with scales remain generally near the surface of the water, and inhaling the air, and warmed by the sun, they lose the superabundance of moisture, are less cold, and therefore more digestible, etc. (also in *Bechai* on Lev. XI fol. 28[a]); *Clem. Alex.* Strom. II, p. 389 ed. Sylb. "qui enim pisces squamos non habent . . . pascuntur in profundo maris" (see *supra* p. 61); *De Pauw*, Recherches, p. 154.

[14] Comp. *Lane*, Mod. Egypt. I. 132. The Talmud warns persons with weak eyes altogether against fish, which it believes to be injurious to the eyes (דגים קשין לעינים, Nedar. 54[b]; Meil. 20[b]).

[15] Comp. Lev. XI. 13 *sqq.*

advance was made to ethical restraint and self-respect[1]. Mildness of temper was not unnaturally expected from vegetable food, or the meat of harmless animals. "The thoughtful", observes a heathen writer, "usually value even among the irrational animals the tamer, more moderate, and milder kinds"[2]. Philo remarks more explicitly, that wild beasts, which feed on human flesh, were excluded, "because a gentle meal is becoming the gentle soul"[3]; and developing this idea, it may be too elaborately, he contends, that the lawgiver selected those herbivorous animals "which are domesticated and tame by nature, and feed on the simple food supplied by the earth", while he prohibited the carnivorous kinds, "lest by a desire to retaliate the sanguinary deeds of the wild beasts anger and ferocity are engendered in the human mind"[4]. The aversion of the Hebrews to beasts of prey increased together with their abhorrence of blood; and they detested all rapacious animals that devour the flesh with the blood, that is, the soul[5]. Therefore, they not only kept aloof from the bat-tribe (cheiroptera), which suck the blood of living animals, and some of which, as the phyllostoma, attack men when asleep, and have given rise to the numerous fables about vampyres[6]; but they also rejected all carnivorous animals pro-

[1] "Unclean are all animals", observes Keil (Arch. II. 19; on Lev. p. 83) "that bear in them the stamp of sin, death, and decomposition"; which remark, correct to a certain extent, becomes artificial if carried out in detail, and especially if sin is attributed to the animal world also, whether really or typically; see *supra* p. 62.

[2] *Ael.* Nat. An. X. 16, τὰ πραότερα καὶ φειδοῦς ἅμα καὶ εὐσεβείας μετειληχότα.

[3] Προσηνεστάτην καὶ ἡδίστην εὐωχίαν παρασκευάζειν λογιζόμενος τὸ πρέπον ἡμέρῳ ψυχῇ.

[4] *Philo*, De Concup. cc. 4, 9; similarly *Ebn Ezra* on Lev. XI. 42, "the consumed body turns to flesh in the body of the consumer"; *Nachman.* on Exod. XXII. 30, "the forbidden food has solely reference to purity of soul" (טהרה בנפש) etc.; and on Lev. XVII. 11, "the food becomes one with him who eats it" etc., אם כן תהיה עבי ונסות בנפש האדם; *Bechai* on Lev. XI. fol. 27[b], on Lev. XVII. fol. 46; *Lipmann* Sepher Nizzachon on Lev. XI. 4, "the food shuts up the organs of the mind so that they cannot reach the truth"; etc.; see also *Clem. Alex.* Strom. VII. 717, 718 (ἀσύμφορόν ἐστι ἡ διὰ τῶν σαρκῶν τροφὴ εἰργασμένη ἤδη καὶ ἐξομοιουμένη ταῖς τῶν ἀλόγων ψυχαῖς); *Hotting.* Jus Hebr. pp. 209, 220 (noxius ciborum usus et esus ipsi quoque animae periculosus est); *Eisenmenger*, Entd. Judenth. II. 618.

[5] See p. 2. In this sense we may agree with the remark of Philippson (Pentat. p. 595; Israelit. Religionslehre III. 36), Trusen (Sitten p. 28), Wunderbar (Bibl. Talm. Medic. II. p. 50), and others, that "animal life should be incorporated in human life with the discreetest caution, lest, by the assimilation of both, the human be debased into animal life, and the soul be depraved and profaned", etc.

[6] Yet the largest species, the black rousette (pteropus edulus) is eatable; it is of the size of a small dog, and

vided with powerful claws to seize, and with formidable teeth, sharp, pointed, or conical, to hold and to tear their prey: whether the Insect-eaters (insectivora), as the hedge-hog (erinaceus), permitted to the Hindoo priests[7]; the common and the pigmy shrew (sorex araneus and pygmaeus), of musky scent, the smallest of all mammiferous quadrupeds; the mole (talpa Europaeus), beneficently preying upon earth-worms and insect larvae; or the Carnivora proper — all unguiculate, furnished with six incisor teeth in each jaw, massive grinders, tuberculated, pointed, and serrated, large fangs or tearers, peculiarly adapted for their sanguinary work — as the bear in its various kinds, which was a dainty to some ancient nations[8], as it is still to North-American and Siberian savages, who worship bears, and entreat their pardon after the slaughter[9]; the long and slender tribes of badger and glutton, the weasel and otter, the pole-cat, the ferret, the marten, and the ermine, all higly prized for their valuable furs; the civets (viverridae), as the ichneumon justly honoured and protected in Egypt; the whole feline tribe, the most blood-thirsty and formidable of all predaceous animals, both on account of the velocity of their movements and their enormous strength, as the lion, the panther, and the leopard, though all were occasionally eaten in the ancient world[10], the ocelot and the jaguar, the terrible hyena preying on carrion only or on corpses grubbed out of their graves, and the wild cat, though now valued, domesticated, and rendered useful, and formerly eaten by some heathen nations[11]; and lastly, the whole canine family, as the cunning fox, though no uncommon food in Palestine and Italy[12], the gluttonous wolf, and the nocturnal jackal, the natural scavenger of all manner of carrion and offal. As regards the dog itself, it was indeed long eaten by some nations as the Carthagenians[13], as it is still consumed by the people of China and Cochin-China, "its flesh being with the exception of that

---

resembles the rabbit. See Lev. XI. 19, and notes in loc.

[7] *Manu* V. 18; *Yâjnav.* I. 177.

[8] *Galen*, De Alim. Facult. III. 2.

[9] *Meiners* l. c. pp. 219, 220; see *supra* p. 47.

[10] Comp. *Joseph.* Ant. XII. III. 4; *Galen* l. c. The notice of Philostratus (Apoll. II. 29) with respect to lions and the hams of tigers said to have been eaten in India, is questionable.

[11] Comp. *Herod.* II. 66.

[12] Comp. *Joseph.* l. c.; *Galen* l. c.

[13] Comp. *Plut.* De Sollert. Anim. c. 2; *Justin.* XIX. 1, legati a Dario Persarum rege Carthaginem venerunt afferentes edictum quo Poeni humanas hostias immolare et canina vesci prohibebantur; *Galen* l. c. κατ᾽ ἔνια τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐσθίουσι πάμπολλοι. Occasionally the dog seems, in Greece, to have been sacrificed for the purposes of divination, though Pausanias himself, who records an instance (VI. II. 2), observes κυσὶ δὲ οὐδένες ἐπί γε μαντικῆς νομίζουσιν οὐδὲν χρᾶσθαι.

of the hog the most common in their markets"[1], and by the inhabitants of Zoab and other African tribes[2]; and it was even worshipped by some, as the Egyptians[3], or employed for purificatory and other sacrifices, as by the ancient Greeks[4] and some Thracian tribes[5]; yet it was by others, as the Persians, looked upon with mingled feelings of veneration and aversion, according as they either considered its moral and useful qualities or its ferociousness and voracity[6] in the East often rendered wolflike by neglect and want[7]; and it was by others again invariably regarded with unmitigated disgust, as by the Hindoos, who count the dog's soul among the most impious of spirits, and therefore hold the touch of a dog to be hideous contamination[8], by the Zabii[9] and by the Mohammedans, who dare not drink from a vessel from which a dog has drunk unless it be cleansed seven times with water, and who shun the slightest contact with the animal, be it only its wet nose, as a defilement to be removed by a purification "with seven waters and once with clean earth"[10]: the Biblical writers also allude to the dog exclusively in terms of contempt and disparagement, without evincing the slightest appreciation of its singular instincts[11], although they were not unacquainted with the most re-

---

[1] *Mc Culloch*, Dict. of Commerce p. 533 ed. 1859.

[2] *De Pauw*, Recherches, p. 169; *Shaw*, Trav. p. 67.

[3] See *supra* p. 73.

[4] *Plut.* Quaest. Rom. 52, 68, τῷ δὲ κυνὶ πάντες . . . Ἕλληνες ἐχρῶντο καὶ χρῶνταί γε μέχρι νῦν ἔνιοι σφαγίῳ πρὸς τοὺς καθαρμούς κτλ.: this kind of purification was called περισκυλακισμός; Romul. c. 21; comp. *Pausan.* III. xiv. 9.

[5] *Ovid*, Fast. I. 389, 390 (Exta canum vidi Triviae libare Sapaeos, Et quicunque tuas accolit, Haeme, nives).

[6] Comp. *Justin.* l. c.; *Boundehesch* XIV. l. c. "le chien a été donné pour prendre soin des hommes et protéger les animaux". See the elaborate precepts and discussions on the subject in *Vendidad* XIII. 21—159; XIV. 1—75; XV. 9—21, 60—137, which all aim at securing the services and breaking the savage habits of the dog by careful treatment; the dog's look was supposed to have the power of driving back evil spirits; roads on which corpses had been carried were purified by leading dogs along them (*Vendid.* VIII. 38 *sqq.*); comp. also III. 25—27, 39, 40; see *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. pp. XXXIII, XXXVIII.

[7] See 1 Ki. XIV. 11; XVI. 4; XXI. 19, 23; XXII. 38; 2 Ki. IX. 35, 36; Isai. LVI. 10, 11; Jer. XV. 3; Ps. XXII. 17, 21; LIX. 7, 15; LXVIII. 24; comp. Exod. XXII. 30; Luke XVI. 21.

[8] Comp. *Manu* III. 92, and *Jones* in loc.

[9] Comp. *Hotting.* Hist. Or. p. 186.

[10] *Niebuhr*, Beschr. v. Arab. p. 40; *Lane*, Mod. Egypt. I. 132.

[11] Comp. Exod. XI. 7; Deut. XXIII. 19; 1 Sam. IX. 8; XVI. 9; XVII. 43; XXIV. 15; 2 Sam. III. 8; IX. 8; XVI. 9; 2 Ki. VIII. 13; Isai. LVI. 10, 11; LXVI. 3; Ps. XXII. 17, 21; LIX. 15; Prov. XXVI. 11; Eccl. IX. 4; Matth. VII. 6; 2 Pet. II. 22; Philem. III. 2; Revel. XXII. 15; comp. on the other

markable, if not the original species, the shepherd-dog[12], and in later times learnt to like it as a companion both at home and on journeys[13]; and the Egyptians, looking chiefly on the diseases to which the dog is subject in warmer climates, as eruptions in consequence of bad blood and humours, and especially leprosy, considered the embalmers of dogs particularly prone to splenetic and similar disorders[14]. For analogous reasons the Hebrews may have shunned many of the rodent tribes (rodentia or glires), as the mouse and the rat, though the graceful neatness of the former has tempted many[15], and "the rat of the desert" (jerboa) is by Bedouin tribes prized as so exquisite a delicacy[16], that it is expressly forbidden to stricter sects[17]; again, the beaver and the porcupine, the subungulate guinea-pig and its kindred (the savoury-fleshed agoutis, the paca, and the cavia); though they avoided other species of the same class from different motives, as the hare and the rabbit, and the pretty and lively squirrel tribe (sciurina) harmlessly living on fruits and grain. They naturally shunned the formidable or repulsive birds of prey (raptatores), distinguished by powerful feet and talons, strength of vision, and swiftness of wing, preying upon other animals or feeding upon carrion, whether the "nocturnal" or "crepuscular" owl, or the "diurnal" birds, the ravenous vulture and the colossal condor, the largest of all flying birds measuring with its extended wings from 11 to 13 feet, the family of the intelligent and courageous falcons (accipitrini),

---

hand, *Cic.* Nat. Deor. II. 63 (or 158). It is well known that the later Jews called their heathen enemies dogs, as the Mohammedans usually call the Christians.

12 Job. XXX. 1. Jewish writers (as Bechai on Exodus XXII. 30) observe that טרפה, which comes from Satan, is appropriately thrown before the dogs which, like טרפה, belong to Satan; yet according to a Midrashic explanation, the flesh of animals torn by wild beasts (טרפה) was assigned by the Law to the dogs (Exod. l. c.) as a reward for not having barked at the Hebrews in the night of their flight from Egypt (Exod. XI. 7); comp. *Mechilta* on Ex. XXII. 30 (c. 20, משפטים, fol. 104 ed. Weiss, ללמדך שאין הקב"ה מקפח שכר כל בר—); *Rashi* in loc., and others.

13 Tobit V. 16; XI. 4; Matth. XV. 27; comp. *Hom.* Il. XXIII. 173 (τραπεζῆες κύνες); Od. XVII. 309.

14 Comp. *Horapoll.* I. 39, οἱ θεραπεύοντες δὲ τὸ ζῶον τοῦτο ἐν ταῖς κηδείαις . . . ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον σπληνικοὶ γίνονται κτλ. It is well known that the dogs in Egypt, Turkey, and Arabia are generally more or less infected with a kind of leprous eruption, since they are badly kept or rather unappropriated and masterless "from the Hellespont to the confines of Cochin-China"; see Ps. LIX. 7, 15; comp. *Harmer*, Observat. I. p. 344 ed. Clarke; *Rosenmüller*, Naturgesch. II. 95—99.

15 Comp. Isai. LXVI. 17.

16 *Burckhardt*, Beduinen, p. 50; see notes on XI. 5, ad שָׁפָן.

17 *Niebuhr*, Beschr. v. Arab. p. 179.

living upon smaller birds, on reptiles and insects, as the eagle, the once-prized falcon, and the hawk, though young eagles and young hawks were recommended and eaten as delicacies [1], the fan-tailed kite, the buzzard, and the harpy; again, a portion of the order of incessores, as the raven tribe — the jay and the mag-pie, the jack-daw and the crow, and especially the ominous raven often seizing quadrupeds and feeding upon corpses [2]; many "running birds" (cursores), especially the edacious and desert-loving ostrich, unsparing of smaller animals [3]; and many "wading birds" (grallatores), mostly feeding on worms, insects, and grubs, snails, slugs, reptiles, and fish, as the bustard, heron, and the bittern, though other species of this order, if disdained at all, must have been objected to for different reasons, as the snipes (scolopacidae), plovers (charadriadae) and waterhens (rallidae), the crane eaten by the ancient Romans [4], the stork valued as food by the Moslems [5], and the ibis venerated in Egypt; some of the "swimming birds" (natatores), as the insatiable pelican [6], which was extensively consumed in Egypt, though not by the priests [7], and the cormorant [8] inhabiting marshes and dreary solitudes [9]; and lastly, the whole of the sharktribe (plagiostomi), including the most voracious of all sea monsters, armed with rows of sharp, strong, and fearful teeth, the terror of the boatman, as the white, the hammer-headed, and the giant shark [10], the latter reaching a length of forty feet, and the sawfish [11], with long serrated snout, a weapon formidable even to the largest fishes.

Corresponding customs or laws prevailed among nearly all ancient nations. The Hindoo "twice-born" were bidden to avoid all carnivorous and webfooted birds, all birds of prey that strike with their beaks, or wound with their talons, and those which dive and devour fish [12].

---

[1] *Arisot.* Hist. An. VI. 7, γίγνονται δὲ καὶ τῶν ἱεράκων οἱ νεοττοὶ ἡδύχρεῳ σφόδρα καὶ πίονες; *Albert. Magn.* De Animal. l. XXIII. p. 614, caro accipitris dulcis est et levis propter bonum nutrimentum quo alitur; *Salt*, Trav. in Abyss. p. 152; *Bechstein*, Naturgesch. Deutschlands, II. 211, 221, 225.

[2] See Comm. on Gen. p. 195. Crows with some white feathers are eaten by Mohammedans (*Niebuhr*, Beschr. v. Arab. p. 178).

[3] See notes on XI. 16.

[4] *Celsus*, De Medic. II. 18.

[5] *Niebuhr* l. c.

[6] Probably קָאַת; Lev. XI. 18; Deut. XIV. 17; comp. Ps. CII. 7; see on Lev. XI. 18.

[7] *Horap.* I. 54.

[8] Perhaps תִּנְשֶׁמֶת (Lev. XI. 18; Deut. XIV. 16).

[9] Comp. Isai. XXXIV. 11; Zeph. II. 14; Ps. CII. 7. See notes on XI. 13 *sqq.*

[10] Squalus carcharias, zygaena malleus, and sq. maximus.

[11] Sq. pristis.

[12] *Manu* V. 11–14; *Yâjnav.* I. 172—175.

The rule prevails among the Mohammedans not to eat any animal which attacks men or tears human bodies, and they shun as food chiefly the lion and all other felinae, the fox and jackal, the serpent and scorpion, the frog and the turtle, and all birds of prey[13]. The Chinese alone have no religious law whatever with regard to food, and they eat any animal they fancy[14].

Now when all the creatures hitherto pointed out were banished from the table, namely, those excluded as a matter of course, those spared for their utility as beasts of burden and draught, and those shunned from motives of physical antipathy and of health, or on account of their bloodthirstiness; there remained but comparatively few species of herbivorous quadrupeds, whether domesticated from time immemorial, as the ox, the sheep, and the goat, in their different varieties, or living peacefully and harmlessly in woods, valleys, or mountainous tracts, as the deer-tribe (cervidae) — the roe and the hart, the stag and the fallow-deer —, the antelope and gazelle still eaten by the Bedouins whenever they can insnare them[15], the buffalo, the wild goat, the wild ox, and the chamois[16]; though cows, as is well known, were never touched by the Egyptians[17], ostensibly because they were sacred to Isis, but really to prevent the breed of cattle from being diminished[18]; nor by the Hindoos, both for the reason just adduced, and because they furnish the sacrificial butter[19]; nor by most of the Phoenicians[20], the inhabitants of Tibet[21], and others. Of birds th.re remained the domestic fowls (gallinacei or rasores), especially the pigeon-tribe (columbae) very numerous in Palestine[22], though held inviolable in Syria and Egypt[23], nay even too holy to be touched[24]; the cock declared sacred by the Pythagoreans, especially the white

---

[13] *Niebuhr* l. c. pp. 178, 179. Plutarch (Quaest. Roman. 93) has preserved this line from one of the lost tragedies of Aeschylus, Ὄρνιθες ὄρνις πῶς ἂν ἁγνεύοι φαγών.

[14] Comp. Lün-yü, Book I, c. X, § 8 (ed. Cramer, p. 113); *De Pauw*, Recherches, p. 169 (ils mangent des rats, des chauves-souris, des hiboux, des cigognes, des chats, des blaireaux, des chiens, etc.).

[15] *Burckhardt*, Beduinen, p. 49.

[16] Comp. Deut. XIV. 4, 5; see *supra* p. 58, note 8.

[17] *Herod.* II. 41; *Porph.* Abst. II. 11, 61.

[18] *De Pauw*, Recherches, p. 149; comp. *supra* p. 73, note 11.

[19] *Meiners*, Gesch. der Relig. I. 217—219; *Lassen*, Ind. Alterth. I. 792; Mahabhar. Book I, in *Goldstücker's* Essay on Mahabh. p. 13.

[20] *Porph.* l. c.

[21] *Meiners* l. c. p. 194.

[22] See Comm. on Lev. I p. 80.

[23] Comp. *Porph.* Abst. IV. 7.

[24] Comp. *Lucian*, Syr. Dea 14, 54; *Plut.* Is. 74; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. VIII. 14 (50); comp., however, *Herod.* I. 138; see *Bochart*, Hieroz. vol. II. lib. I. c. 5; *Selden*, De Diis Syr. pp. 271 *sqq.*; *De Pauw*, Recherches, I. 164.

species[1]; whatsoever game-birds that were caught[2] or bred in the country, as the quail[3], the partridge, and other birds of the same kind, of course if lawfully killed; and such swimming-birds as geese and ducks[4]. And of fishes were left the kinds not eel-like and not reputed for fierceness and voracity, and nearly all the species of the large order of the "soft-finned" (malacopterigii), and some of the "spiny-finned" (acanthopterigii)[5]. It was from these animals that the legislators deduced the criteria of permitted animals — rumination and cloven feet, scales and fins —, while they were satisfied with a simple enumeration of the forbidden birds, in which they probably discovered no common characteristics of a striking nature[6]. How difficult it was for the levitical writers strictly to insist upon abstract principles, and how imperiously they were swayed by existing usages, is proved by the fact that, while they rigorously and almost vehemently interdicted all insects as "an abomination" (שקץ), they expressly, and even in opposition to the Deuteronomist[7], made an exception in favour of four kinds of native locusts mainly feeding upon grass and succulent fruits, evidently because they found the custom of eating locusts deeply rooted in the nation, as it prevailed and still prevails in the countries adjoining the southern and eastern shores of the Mediterranean, in Libya and Egypt, Nubia and Abyssinia, Arabia and Syria, and elsewhere[8]: and generalising the criteria, they

---

[1] Comp. *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 34; comp. also *Lucian*, Syr. Dea 48.

[2] Comp. Jer. V. 27; Hos V. 1; VII. 12; Ps. CXXIV. 7.

[3] Comp. Num. XI. 31, 32; Ps. CV. 40.

[4] See Comm. on Lev. l. c.

[5] See notes on XI. 9—12. Curious is the notion of Pliny with respect to allex or garum (XXXI. 8 or 44), aliud vero castimoniarum superstitioni etiam sacrisque Judaeis dicatum quod fit a piscibus squama carentibus, where probably non carentibus must be read, whether the mistake be the copyist's or Pliny's.

[6] See *supra* p. 53.

[7] See *supra* p. 59.

[8] See notes on XI. 21, 22; comp. Matth. III. 4; Mark I. 6; *Herod.* IV. 172 (with respect to the Nasomenes, a Libyan tribe); *Plin.* VI. 30 or 35 (pars quaedam Aethiopum locustis tantum vivit fumo et sale duratis in annua alimenta; hence called ἀκριδόφαγοι, *Strabo* XVI. iv. 12, p. 772); VII. 2 (an Indian tribe); XI. 29 or 35 (Parthis et hae — locustae — in cibo gratae), 26 or 32 (gentes vescuntur iis — cicadis — ad orientem, etiam Parthi opibus abundantibus); *Diod. Sic.* III. 29 (with respect to the Ethiopians, ἐκ τούτου — sc. swarm of locusts — δαψιλεῖς τροφὰς ἔχουσιν ἅπαντα τὸν βίον); *Ludolf*, Hist. Aeth. I. xiii. §§ 20—22 (suavis enim valde nec non salubris est cibus); *Michael.* on Lev. XI. 22; *Niebuhr* l. c. pp. 171, 172; *Burckhardt*, Beduinen, pp. 375, 376; Arabia, p. 162; Syria, p. 382; *Kitto* on XI. 21; *Harmer*, Observat. II. 58; *Paxton*, Illustrat. Nat. Hist. pp. 117, 118; *Knob.* Levit. p. 456; esp. *Ritter*, Erdkunde, VIII. 789—815. The grasshopper was also eaten, especially to

declared lawful all winged insects provided with springing feet; yet in reality they desired to legalise no more than those four species; therefore, strictly taken, the rule is specious, and applies only to a few individual instances[9].

But when the Hebrews, in rejecting bloodthirsty and carnivorous animals, had passed from physical to ethical considerations in their selection of food, they soon proceeded, by a simple and natural transition, to the strictly religious sphere, and connected the dietary rules with the notions of "purity" and ceremonial cleanness. It is from this point of view that we find those rules regarded in the Pentateuch, since the Pentateuch has preserved to us not the earlier but the most advanced stages of Hebrew theology. In that code the dietary precepts constitute an integral part of the levitical system; and they form an essential link in that lengthening chain of laws of purity which was intended to encircle and to control the whole life of the Hebrews. Then for the first time the terms "clean" and "unclean" animals were used not in a physical, but in a dogmatic or ethical sense[10]; for they were also applied to such beasts as the camel[11] which, clean, useful, and tractable, could from no external aspect be called unclean; gradually even much stronger expressions were chosen to describe an unclean animal, such as "abomination" and "horror"[12], expressions elsewhere used to brand the most heinous religious and moral offences, as idolatry and incest. For how could the later legislators, who so carefully regulated, and guarded against, even the slightest external contact with unclean things, be indifferent as to the objects which the worshippers of the Lord assimilated with their organisms[13]? And now the more conscientious among the Hebrews began to attach the utmost importance to "cleanness" of food. With a certain proud satisfaction Ezekiel exclaimed, "O Lord God! behold, my soul has not been polluted; for from my youth up even till now have I not eaten of that which dies of itself, or is torn by wild beasts, neither did abominable flesh come into my mouth"[14]. But while the

whet the appetite (*Aristot.* An. Hist. V. xxx. 3; *Plin.* XXX. 8 or 21; *Athen.* IV. 10).

[9] Comp. Lev. XI. 20—23, and notes *in loc.*

[10] Gen. VII. 2; VIII. 20; Deut. XIV. 7, 11, 12, 19, 20; Lev. XI. 4—8, 24, 31, 35, 43; comp. notes on Lev. XI. 2—8.

[11] Lev. XI. 4.

[12] תּוֹעֵבָה, Deut. XIV. 3 (לא תאכל כל תועבה); שֶׁקֶץ, Lev. VII. 21; XI. 10—13, 20, 22, 23, 41—43; פִּגּוּל, Ezek. IV. 14.

[13] See *supra* p. 94 note 5.

[14] Ezek. IV. 14; comp. XXII. 26; Acts X. 14; XI. 8. See also *Riehm*, Charakteristik der messian. Weissag. in Stud. und Krit. 1865, p. 428, who, however, attributes, with questionable justice, Ezekiel's remarks to

Deuteronomist simply declares certain creatures as "unclean", and only incidentally utters a warning against touching their carcass[1], the author of the corresponding section in Leviticus so carefully amalgamates the precepts respecting unclean animals with all the complicated principles of the ceremonial law, that his tendency and his later age are not only felt but can be convincingly proved. He more than once cautions against the slightest contact with the dead bodies of unclean animals[2]: "whoever touches the carcass of them shall be unclean until the evening"; "whoever bears ought of the carcass of them, shall wash his clothes and be unclean until the evening"[3]. He extends the same rigorous ordinances to clean animals that die of themselves or are torn by wild beasts; the touching of their dead bodies renders a man unclean till the evening; carrying them or eating of their flesh necessitates, moreover, the washing of the garments: "but if he wash them not, nor bathe his body, then he shall bear his iniquity". He enforces this law upon the native Hebrew and the stranger alike[4], and thereby proves that he looked upon it and upon the whole circle of these commands in a thoroughly levitical light[5]. Nay he sets forth special regulations which, by their form and spirit, fairly rouse astonishment; for treating of eight species of animals considered particularly unclean, as the mouse, the mole, and the lizzards, he literally enacts: "Whosoever touches them when they are dead, shall be unclean until the evening; and upon whatsoever anything of them falls when they are dead, that shall be unclean, whether it be any vessel of wood, or garment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be wherein any work is done, it must be put into water, and it shall be unclean until the evening and then it shall be clean; and any earthen vessel into which anything of them falls, whatsoever is in it shall be unclean, and you shall break the vessel itself. Of all food which is eaten, that on which water comes [in such earthen vessel] shall be unclean; but all drink which is drunk shall be unclean in such vessel of whatever kind; and every thing whereupon any part of their carcass falls shall be unclean, oven and stove shall be broken; they are unclean, and they shall be unclean to you. Yet a well and a cistern, any receptacle

his individual bias rather than the spirit of his time.

[1] Deut. XIV. 8.

[2] Lev. XI. 8, 11, ואת־נבלתם תשקצו, etc.

[3] Lev. XI. 24—28, 31.

[4] Lev. XI. 39, 40; XVII. 15, 16.

[5] Yet the Talmud, in opposition to the spirit of the Biblical ordinances, views the dietary precepts as entirely unconnected with the laws of purity; see against this view *Holdheim* in Geiger's Wissenschaftl. Zeitschr. VI pp. 51 *sqq.*; comp. *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. I. vii. 2, p. 123; *Sommer*, Bibl. Abhandl. I. 246.

of water shall be clean; but he who touches their carcass shall be unclean. And if any part of their carcass fall upon any sowing seed which is to be sown, it shall be clean; but if any water be put upon the seed, and any part of their carcass fall thereon, it shall be unclean to you"[6]. Who can recognise in these trifling and playful enactments the broad simplicity of the earlier portions of the Bible? Who does not almost feel as if he were transported into the frigid atmosphere of Rabbinical casuistry? The plain and tangible principles of religious unity were worked out, at once trivially and laboriously, into a network of ritualistic minutiae which seem to bear the character of subsequent commentaries on old-established statutes, and which can only have originated when the free and noble teaching of the prophets had been silenced, and when the deadening influence of priestly rule had replaced a spiritual and life-like heart-worship by the monotony of a cumbrous ceremonialism[7]. Yet not even the most exacting levitism could presume to punish contravention with any penalty beyond temporary uncleanness[8], whereas the eating of blood or fat was visited with the dire threat of excision[9]: later Rabbinism, however, ordained stripes for eating unclean food amounting to the size of an olive, and even for eating a much smaller quantity[10]. According to Manu, offences in diet are one of the principal causes that give death power even over the Brahman[11]; they are no less heinous than the gravest moral transgressions, deserve the severest chastisement, and require repeated purifications[12]; nay, the "twice-born", to cleanse himself from the unconscious taint of illicit food, must

[6] See Comm. on XI. 29—38.

[7] The Rabbins prescribe washing before and after meals, benedictions and grace, etc. etc. (comp. *Orach Chajim* §§ 159 *sqq.*; Matth. XVI. 1, 2; Mark VII. 1—5; Luke XI. 38). Similar rules obtained among the Hindoos (*Manu* II. 52—57; IV. 62, 218—225; V. 36; *Yâjnavalkya* I. 32, 106, 112, 114, 167—169), the Parsees (comp. *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. p. L), and others.

[8] "Zum deutlichen Zeichen, dass man dies Verbot zu halten mehr dem blossen Gewissen überliess", observes Ewald (Alterth. p. 208).

[9] *Keil* (Archaeol. II. 23) attempts an explanation of the difference by observing that eating fat or blood implies "a contempt of the holiness of Jehovah", while eating unclean food is "only contempt of the vocation and mission of Israel"; but subtle and specious as usual, he lays exclusive stress upon the late levitical conception of the blood as the means of atonement, and disregards altogether its older and often urged character as the seat or principle of life; moreover, atonement through blood, no less than abstinence from unclean food, aims at the holiness of the Israelites, and not of Jehovah.

[10] See the minute rules in *Maimon.* De Cib. Vet. cc. II; XIV. 1—5.

[11] *Manu* V. 4.

[12] *Yâjnav.* III. 229; comp. *Manu* XI. 56.

annually perform one of the hardest penances devised by the Hindoo codes [1].

However, the significance of the dietary laws soon made the final advance, of which they were capable within the circle of Hebrew notions: from the levitical they were raised into the theocratic sphere; they were associated not merely with the idea of purity but of holiness, brought into direct relation with the sacrifices and their work of atonement [2], and converted into an instrument for elevating the life of the Hebrew by applying to it the Divine standard. This last and most important step was accomplished, in the Book of Leviticus, with a precision, clearness, and force bespeaking the most matured stage of religious thought attainable by the Hebrew mind within the Biblical times. The great principle was proposed, "I am the Lord your God; you shall, therefore, hallow yourselves, that you may become holy; for I am holy: nor shall you make yourselves unclean with any manner of creeping things that creeps upon the earth; for I am the Lord that brought you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God; you shall, therefore, be holy; for I am holy" [3]. The regulations on food, regarded in so peculiar a light, were made a chief means of distinction between the chosen people and the pagans: "You shall put a difference between clean beasts and unclean, and between unclean fowls and clean, and you shall not make your souls abominable by beast, or by fowl, or by any manner of living thing that creeps on the ground, which I have separated from you as unclean; and you shall be holy to me, for I the Lord am holy, and have severed you from other nations, that you should be Mine" [4]. The same principle was applied to other kinds of unlawful food: "You shall be holy men to Me, therefore you shall not eat any flesh that is torn by beasts in the field, you shall cast it to the dogs" [5]; "you shall not eat of anything that dies of itself... for thou art a holy people to the Lord thy God" [6].

---

[1] The penance of *prájápatya*; *Manu* V. 21; comp. IV. 222.

[2] Comp. pp. 5, 12, etc.

[3] Lev. XI. 44, 45, and notes in loc.; comp. XIX. 2; XX. 7; Num. XV. 40; 1 Pet. I. 15, 16; *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 33; also Lev. XV. 31; XVI. 16; XX. 8; XXII. 16, 32; Num. XIX. 13, 20; Deut. XXIII. 13—15; *Spencer* l. c. (sub munditiae illius exterioris figura legem Judaeos ad puritatem vere sic dictam et divinae conformem sectandam incitasse); *Jellineck*, Einleitung in die Thora, pp. 26, 27; *Hamburger*, Real-Encycl. I. pp. 508, 509.

[4] Lev. XX. 25, 26; comp. Exod. XIX. 5, 6; see, however, Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 589, 590.

[5] Exod. XXII. 30.

[6] Deut. XIV. 21. See notes on Lev. XI. 44—47.

These conceptions, it is true, emanated obviously from great religious refinement, and seemed calculated to promote it in others; yet they were as obviously incongruous and exaggerated; for they unreasonably made the highest aims of the soul and the very essence of a holy life dependent upon such indifferent things as eating and drinking[7]. Hebraism, viewing man in the undivided unity of his bodily and spiritual existence, and anxious to stamp all his physical relations with Divine holiness, desired to make religious forms and piety identical. The object was praiseworthy and perhaps deserving the experiment. But it was a fatal, though often repeated mistake, to suppose that the Divine aspirations of man are strengthened by connecting them, through symbol or ceremony, with the routine of everyday life; on the contrary, they are sooner or later invariably lowered to the level of the latter, either by the blunting and benumbing uniformity of habit, or by a confusion of means and end in feeble or dishonest minds. Formalism inevitably engenders spiritual conceit, separation, and a sanctimonious contempt of others, who are supposed to stand on a lower level before God[8]. Thus later Jewish writings often express the idea that, as other nations are not singled out by God for "holiness" or eternal life, it does not matter if they eat the food to be shunned as abominable by the Hebrews[9]. Instead of vainly attempting to hallow life by a distinction of things externally clean and unclean, it is wise to take to heart maxims like these, "There is nothing unclean of itself, but to him that esteems anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean"[10]; or "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy"[11]; and "Meat commends us not to God, for neither if we

---

[7] Comp. *Justin. Mart.* Dial. c. Tryph. p. 237, καὶ γὰρ βρωμάτων τινῶν ἀπέχεσθαι προσέταξεν ὑμῖν ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχητε τὸν θεόν.

[8] Comp. Acts X. 28 *sqq*.

[9] Comp. *Midr. Rabb.* Lev. c. 13, אומות העולם שאינן לחיי העולם הבא וכו'; *Yalkut Shim.* c. 563, Habak. fol. 83$^b$, התרתי את האיסורין שאין בהם לחיים וכו'; *Rashi* on Lev. XI. 2, לפי שישראל דבוקים במקום וכו'; *Bechai* on Lev. XI fol. 27 ed. 1864, התיר הקב"ה לז' אומות שקצים ורמשים... לפי שהם מוכנים לגיהנם וכו'; on Exod. XI. fol. 31$^b$, הכה so. לפי שהאומות מאותו צד הם המשחית (Satan), like טרפה and נבלה; *Aramah*, Aked. Yitsch. c. 60 on Lev. XI. fol. 62$^b$ ed. Frankfurt; etc.

[10] Hebr. XIV. 14.

[11] Rom. XIV. 17, also vers. 2, 3, 14; comp. Luke XI. 41, "but rather give alms of such things as you have, and behold, all things are clean to you"; Matth. XV. 11, 17, 18, 20; Mark II. 16; Luke XI. 38; XV. 2; Hebr. XIII. 9, "It is a good thing that the heart be established with grace, not with meats, which have not profited those that have been occupied therein"; Col. II. 16, 17.

eat are we the better, nor if we eat not are we the worse"[1]. We may be allowed to remind the reader of the saying of an old Gnostic, preserved by an opponent who fails to disparage its beauty by irony: "We are as little defiled by meats as the sea is defiled by tainted influxes; for as the sea becomes master over every fluid, so we become masters over all meats... The sea receives everything and refuses nothing, because it is conscious of its greatness... Thus meats have power only over small men; but those who have the fulness of liberty take in everything, and remain unpolluted"[2]. Noble feeling, elevated thought, and self-denying deeds, the only Divine attributes in man, are both independent and unmindful of capricious and changeful forms. The command, "You shall be holy, for I the Lord am holy", is indeed a fine utterance, the worthy crowning stone of a laboriously developed system of religion, and a lofty ideal fit to aid man in his struggles against meanness and sin, and to nourish his longing for harmony of mind; but it can only be realised, though distantly at best, by vigilance, devotion, and energetic yet humble activity. Sanctity must result from sanctification through a pure, unselfish, and useful life, guided by truth, cheered by benevolence, and shielded by moderation.

Now it may be admitted that the dietary precepts of the Hebrews gain by a comparison with those of other eastern nations. They are simpler and less restrictive, and yet more systematic and more comprehensive[3]. They forbid no part of the vegetable creation[4],

---

[1] 1 Cor. VIII. 8; comp. Mark VII. 15, "There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him"; 1 Tim. IV. 4, "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving"; Acts X. 15, "What God has cleansed that call not thou common".

[2] *Porphyr.* Abst. I. 42, οὐ γὰρ ἡμᾶς μολύνει τὰ βρώματα ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὴν θάλατταν τὰ ῥυπαρὰ τῶν ῥευμάτων κτλ.; comp. *Bernays*, Theophrast's Schrift über Frömmigkeit, pp. 15, 16; see also *Manu* IV. 225, "the food of a liberal man is purified by his faith, but the food of a learned miser is polluted, because he does not believe what he has read." A glimpse of this truth is even discoverable in the writings of the Rabbins, who declare that God will, in the time of the Messiah, render clean all animals that are considered unclean at present; comp. *Midr. Yelamd.* on Ps. CXLVI. 7, למה נקרא שמו חזיר מפני שעתיד הקב"ה להחזירו לישראל; *Yalk. Chad.* 99[b], § 36, מה שאמרו שעתיד חזיר לחזור להתירו וכ'; *Abarb.* Rosh Emun. c. XIII, fol. 17[b] ed. Altona, etc.

[3] With respect to the regulations of the Hindoos, comp. f. i. *Manu* II. 52—57; IV. 62, 218—225; V. 5—10, 25, etc.; *Colebrooke*, Relig. Cerem. of the Hindoos, Asiat. Res. VII. 277; though they are not more minute and trifling than the later Rabbinical ordinances; see *infra*.

[4] Comp. *supra* p. 66.

nor wine[5], as the Mohammedan law does[6]. They are so well calculated to promote frugality, temperance, and health, that excesses in eating and drinking could be made amenable to the law[7]. They are the same for people and priests, with the unessential exception, that the latter had, during their ministrations, to avoid wine and strong drink, like the Nazarite during his time of sacred seclusion[8]; whereas the Hindoo "twice-born" and the Egyptian priest had exclusive laws intended to surround them with the halo of superior sanctity[9]. Yet the very distinction between "clean" and "unclean" animals involves a deplorable desertion of older and better notions; it dooms to aversion and loathing a great part, nay most, of those creatures which, after the work of the six days, God had declared "very good", in common with every other production[10]; it thus destroys the grand conception of the first cosmogony, which

---

[5] Comp. Deut. XIV. 26; etc. Yet after the destruction of Jerusalem many Jews would not drink wine, because it could no longer be poured out on the altar as a libation (*Talm.* Bab. Bathr. 60[b]); and in later Judaism, abstinence from wine was considered to become men of peculiar piety (*Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 33, 48); while on the other hand, in seasons of danger and urgent distress, especially in times of war and for medical purposes, all animals and all kinds of food were permitted (comp. 2 Ki. VI. 25; *Maim.* De Cib. Vet. XIV. 13—17; De Regib. VIII. 1, ... חלוצי צבא מותר להם לאכול נבלות וטרפות או בשר חזיר אם היא רעב י'; *Bechai* on Deut. VI. fol. 16); so also among the Hindoos (*Manu* V. 27, 33; *Yâjnav.* I. 32, 33, 179), the Mohammedans (*Koran* II. 168; VI. 119, 145; XVI. 116), and others (*Lane,* Mod. Egypt. I. 131).

[6] *Koran* II. 217; V. 92 (where wine is enumerated among the works of Satan); XVI. 69; comp. *D'Herbelot,* Bibl. Orient. p. 696; *Sale,* Koran, Prelim. Disc. pp. 87, 88; *Lane,* Mod. Egyptians, I. 130, 131; however, the Turks and Persians, and in war all Mohammedans, allow themselves greater laxity with respect to wine.

[7] Comp. Deut. XXI. 20, זולל וסובא (see, however, *Talm.* Sanh. 71[a]); also Isai. V. 11, 12, 22; *Clem. Alex.* Paedag. II. pp. 139, 149 ed. Sylburg. The Hindoo law also enjoins "frugal fare" and eating "not to surfeit" (*Yâjnav.* I. 112, 114). "Pythagoras forbade his disciples to pick up what fell from the table, for the sake of accustoming them to eat moderately" (*Diog. Laert.* VIII. 34); comp. also *Porph.* Abst. I. 49 *sqq.*

[8] Lev. X. 9; Num. VI. 3, 4; see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 700—702; comp. also Prov. XXXI. 6, 7; 1 Tim. V. 23.

[9] The latter avoided, in the time of their lustrations, even salt and bread; comp. *Porph.* Abst. IV. 6, 7; *Plut.* Is. cc. 5, 7, 8, 32; *Manu* V. 5 *sqq.*; *De Pauw*, Recherches, pp. 102 *sqq.*; *Priaulx*, Quaestiones Mosaicae, pp. 185—191; Comm. on Lev. I. l. c.

[10] Gen. I. 31. Apologists as Krummacher (Paragraphen zur heil. Gesch. pp. 63 *sqq.*) and Hengstenberg (Christol. I. 39) try to evade the difficulty by declaring that "the whole of the animal creation, in its present condition, cannot possibly have been issued from the hand of God": but all

is upheld even in the Elohist's permission given to Noah to eat *all* animals whatever[1]; and if it is not Persian in intent and origin[2], it is certainly almost Persian in result and effect; for though not coupled with the injunction of persecuting and extirpating the "unclean animals", it renders them in so far Ahrimanic as they are branded as an "abomination", and withdrawn from the unrestricted use of man who has yet been pronounced their unrestricted master[3].

Why, then, were the levitical rules endowed with unchangeable permanency? Why was not every individual allowed to decide which creature is repulsive in his eyes and which not? Ought not advancing experience to be left free to teach, which animals are wholesome in each clime, and which injurious? And above all, do the symbols, once full of life and significance to remote generations, call forth the same truths and emotions in times distinguished by a different civilisation, progressing under very varied influences, and so decidedly working by discerning thought, and not by dark and vague emblems, that in the same measure as our wealth of ideas increases, the number of forms and symbols diminishes? Can these, after their connection with the spiritual principles which they once represented has ceased, still promote religion, that is, inward purity and noble zeal? And if not, what else are they but a slavish yoke, an unmeaning lumber, a clog to body and mind and soul, irrational in themselves, and strangely in contradiction to the intellectual achievements of our time? Can they, unfelt and dead as they are, work upon the heart by some unexplained miracle, merely by the force of faith — a supernatural notion always discarded by the philosopher, and at present rejected by the enlightened adherents of all creeds? Moral improvement cannot be attained without moral exertion, and lasting benefits can only result from truth, and not from delusions, however fondly cherished. If man derives the impulse for his actions, not from the living fountain of his reason and

---

the well-known attempts at explaining the deterioration, partially implying a dualism in the nature of the Deity, are without exception unscriptural.

[1] Gen. IX. 3; see p. 48.

[2] See *supra* pp. 67, 68.

[3] Comp. Gen. I. 26, 28; IX. 2. It is futile to assert that "unclean" as applied to animals involves no degradation; see notes on Lev. XI. 44—47. Orthodox interpreters who felt this, took refuge in the subtle distinction that the unclean animals are no abomination in themselves, but only in reference to man, and hence explain the addition of לכם in XI. 10, 12, 20, etc. (see *Wesseli* in loc.): as if the Law were concerned about things in the abstract, and not in their relation to man, and about the influence they exercise upon the Hebrews.

his own ideal nature, but from the blind dictates of authority, however imposingly exalted, his morality is as unsafe as his belief; the one may be cold, narrow, and selfish; and the other, mechanical and unthinking, though perhaps earnest and devoted, is often hardly distinguishable from the darkest superstition. Abstinence from blood, fat, and the sciatic nerve, as the supposed seats or emblems of life, or from "unclean" animals as causing defilement of the soul, may once have had a religious force and reality, because a mysterious cosmic relation was supposed to exist between man and the whole animate creation: but from the time that the station and mission of man were more clearly defined and better understood, those rules could by no effort of ingenuity be any longer connected with religion or Divine worship; and they must be relegated into the sphere of expediency and personal option[4]. Thus meat cut out of a living beast has long been abhorred by all civilised nations; meat of animals that die of themselves, or are torn by wild beasts, is instinctively shunned as a matter of precaution or aversion; and seething the kid in its mother's milk is naturally avoided from motives of humanity, although these did not at first suggest the prohibition[5].

The laws of food had indeed an important mission to fulfil, and they fulfilled it completely. In later periods of Jewish history, after the time of Alexander the Great, when the contact with idolatrous nations, and the familiarity with heathen, especially Greek, philosophy threatened to endanger the purity of monotheism[6], the teachers and leaders of the people avowedly employed the dietary restrictions, infinitely increased and minutely worked out, as the most effectual means of checking the dreaded intercourse with

---

[4] It is therefore difficult to attach any distinct meaning to the enigmatical remark of Hengstenberg (Bücher Mose's, p. 193): "In the circle of the Hebrew religion, such dietary laws only were possible, which, in spite of their formal repeal, last virtually to all eternity"; the idea may be eternal, but the symbol has ceased to exist after the "formal repeal" of the dietary laws. Comp. also the strange observations of Baumgarten (Theol. Comment. I. 160).

[5] See pp. 9, 14, 20, 33. We leave here out of the question ordinances not properly dietary, such as the prohibition of leaven on Passover; leaven and honey in connection with sacrifices; the produce of young trees during the first three or four years; the restrictions with respect to firstlings and firstfruits, and the like; comp. *Maim.* De Cib. Vet. init.

[6] Comp. *Diod. Sic.* Fr. XL. 3 *s. fin.* πολλὰ τῶν πατρίων τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις νομίμων ἐκινήθη; hence the strong Talmudical interdict ארור אדם שילמד לבניו חכמת יונית, *Talm.* Sotah 49[b]; Menach. 64[b], which was, however, not acted upon in all periods.

foreigners[1]. "Keep aloof", they enjoined, "from their bread and their oil on account of their wine, from their wine on account of their daughters, from their daughters on account of their idols"[2]. They were induced to insist upon such commands the more rigorously, because they desired thoroughly to preclude the Jews from sharing the sacrificial meals of pagans, which were held in the deepest abhorrence[3]. They forbade them, in fact, to taste any food or drink whatever that had been prepared by heathens or in their vessels, or to use for religious rites any materials that had passed through heathen hands. We need only allude to the well-known instances of Daniel and Tobit, of Esther and Judith[4], and point to the remarkable edict promulgated in the time of Antiochus the Great, "Let not any flesh of horses or mules or asses be brought into the city, whether wild or tame, nor that of leopards, or foxes, or hares, nor, in general, that of any animal which the Jews are forbidden to eat, nor let the skins of such animals be brought into the town, where, moreover, no such beast is to be bred up": contravention of this edict was punished by a fine of 3,000 drachmae of silver to be paid to the priests[5]. In addition to this, it will suffice to refer to the treatise of the Mishnah on Idolatry (Avodah Zarah), in order to perceive how infinitely precepts and precautions were multiplied[6];

---

[1] It seems that already in the fifth century B. C., the eating of forbidden food (κοινοφαγία) was in Judea visited with severe punishment, which many evaded by fleeing into Samaria (*Jos.* Ant. XI. VIII. 7). Kitto observes justly (notes on Lev. XI. 2): "A dietary law is far more efficient in its results, as a rule of distinction, than any difference in doctrine, worship, or morals which man could entertain".

[2] *Talm.* Avod. Zar. 36[b]; comp. 35[b], 36[a].

[3] See Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 213, 214; comp. Exod. XXXIV. 15, 16; Num. XXV. 1, 2; *Joseph.* Maccab. c. 5. Equally severe are the injunctions of Mohammed, *Koran* II. 168 (forbidding "that on which any other name but God's has been invoked"); V. 4; VI. 116, 118, 121, 146; XVI. 116; comp. *Sale*, Koran, p. 81; *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. II. IX. 2, p. 338.

[4] See Dan. I. 8—16; Tob. I. 10—12; Addit. to Esth. III. 11 (Sept. after IV. 17, Vulg. XIV. 18, though according to the Canonical Book of Esther, she did not scruple to eat with the King and Haman); Judith XII. 1—3; comp. 1 Macc. I. 62, 63; 2 Macc. V. 27; *Joseph.* Maccab. c. 5; Mark II. 16; Luke XV. 2; John IV. 9; Acts X. 28; and *supra* p. 87.

[5] *Jos.* Ant. XII. III. 4. Yet camels and horses, asses and dogs, were at all times kept, bred, and used by the Jews; see *supra* p. 75 note 10.

[6] See espec. sect. II, IV and V, and the vast number of regulations in *Maim.* De Cib. Vet. III. 13 *sqq.*; XI—XIII; *Yor. Deah* §§ 112—115, 118—138; comp. *Joseph.* Vit. 13; Acts X. 28, "You know that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation"; *Talm.* Sanh. 104[a],

till the Jews loaded upon themselves the invidious reproach, that "they alone among all men shun every intercourse with other nations, and look upon all as enemies"[7]; or that "they observe the strangest customs, and show no friendliness to anyone"[8]. The consequences were inevitable. Owing to their social seclusion, they were soon misunderstood and cruelly misjudged. Their civil laws and institutions, their habits and pursuits, their history and doctrines, were even by truth-seeking historians ludicrously and almost incredibly distorted[9]. At last a synodical decree expressly forbade all

---

"whoever invites a non-Jew into his house as his guest, and waits upon him, brings his children into misery and exile" (כל המזמין גוי לתוך ביתו וכ׳); Avod. Zar. 8[a] (Jews eating together with a non-Jew as his guests, even if they have their own lawfully prepared food, act "as if they were eating of the sacrifices of the dead"); *Pirke Rabbi Eliezer* c. XXIX, מי שאוכל עם הערל כאלו אוכל עם הכלב (though recent editions, as that of Lemberg 1867, read instead מי שאוכל עם מכחישי יהוה כאלו אוכל לחם בנא). In a similar spirit, the New Testament commands, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine (concerning Christ), receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is a partaker of his evil deeds" (2 John vers. 10, 11).

[7] *Diod. Sic.* Fragm. XXXIV. 1, μόνους γὰρ ἁπάντων ἐθνῶν ἀκοινωνήτους εἶναι τῆς πρὸς ἄλλο ἔθνος ἐπιμιξίας κτλ. *Philostr.* Apollon. V. 33 (reproaching the Jews with a βίος ἄμικτος, and hatred of κοινὴ τράπεζα). What a chasm separates the teaching of an Isaiah from the Talmudical doctrine that all non-Jews are from their birth, and certainly from their earliest stage of puberty, to be considered as not less unclean than a man afflicted with a running issue! (*Talm.* Av. Zar. 36[b], 37[a]; comp. Lev. XV. 1 *sqq.*).

[8] *Diod. Sic.* ibid. μηδενὶ ἄλλῳ ἔθνει τραπέζης κοινωνεῖν μηδ' εὐνοεῖν τὸ παράπαν; comp. *Dion Cass.* XLIX. 22, τὸ γάρ τοι γένος αὐτῶν θυμωθὲν πικρότατόν ἐστι; LXVIII. 32; *Joseph.* Ant. XIII. viii. 3, διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἄλλους αὐτῶν (sc. of the Jews) τῆς διαίτης ἀμιξίαν, to which Josephus naturally adds, πειθόμενος δὲ κατ' εὐσέβειαν πάντα ποιεῖν κτλ.; *Lysimach.* ap. *Joseph.* c. Ap. I. 34, "give no counsel to any stranger, but always advise them for the worst" (μήτε ἀνθρώπων τινὶ εὐνοήσειν, μήτε ἄριστα συμβουλεύσειν, ἀλλὰ τὰ χείρονα); see also *Philo*, In Flacc. c. 5 (with respect to the Egyptians, διὰ τὴν παλαιὰν καὶ τρόπον τινὰ γεγενημένην πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ἀπέχθειαν).

[9] Comp. *Diod. Sic.* Fr. XL. 3 (ἀπάνθρωπόν τινα καὶ μισόξενον βίον εἰσηγήσατο, sc. Moses); *Tacit.* Hist. V. 2—5, 13 (apud ipsos . . . misericordia in promptu, sed adversus omnes alios hostile odium; separati epulis, discreti cubilibus, etc.; Judaeorum mos absurdus sordidusque, etc.; comp. *Whiston's* Josephus, Dissert. III); *Justin.* XXXVI. 2 (caverunt ne cum peregrinis communicarent); *Flor.* III. 5 (illud grande impiae gentis arcanum); *Theophr.* ap. *Porph.* Abst. II. 26 (comp. *Bernays*, Theophr. Schrift üb. d. Frömmigk. pp. 109 *sqq.*); *Strabo* XVI. ii. 34—46 (ἐκ μὲν τῆς δεισιδαιμονίας αἱ τῶν βρωμάτων ἀποσχέσεις κτλ., § 37, although Strabo's account is almost singular in its impartiality);

Christians to take any meal with the Jews, for the avowed reason that the Jews despised to eat with the Christians[1]. These hostile prejudices, at which the student might smile, if the smile did not die away in his shudder at the hideous crop of hatred, oppression, and carnage, outlasted the ancient time and the middle ages, and will continue their mischievous work of retarding humanity and brotherly feeling, nay they may startle the civilized world again and again by sanguinary outbreaks of the populace, as long as the Jews cling to statutes which appear to them Divine, but which are nothing but the expression of the changeful customs of a distant age and a peculiar clime, and which, moreover, have been burdened and almost hidden by the rank over-growth of Rabbinical additions and misconceptions. The Jews cannot persevere in an isolation which, in the earlier centuries after their dispersion, was perhaps beneficial, because it enabled them to work out undisturbed the system of a pure faith, but which in our age of science and common enlightenment is sui-

*Dion Cass.* XXXVII. 17 (κεχωρίδαται δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔς τε τ' ἄλλα τὰ περὶ τὴν δίαιταν πάνθ' ὡς εἰπεῖν κτλ.); *Manetho*, *Apion*, a. o. ap. *Joseph.* C. Ap., *Plut.* Symp. IV. v. 6; Is. c. 31; *Juven.* XIV. 96—106 (non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti etc.); *Cic.* Pro Flacc. c. 28 (huic autem barbarae superstitioni resistere etc.; in tam suspiciosa ac maledica civitate etc.; istorum religio sacrorum a . . . gravitate nominis nostri, majorum institutis abhorrebat); *Quinct.* III. vii. 21 (est conditoribus urbium infame, contraxisse aliquam perniciosam caeteris gentem, qualis est primus Judaicae superstitionis auctor); *Plin.* XIII. 4 or 9 (gens contumelia numinum insignis); *Rutil. Numat.* I. 383—398 (humanis animal dissociale cibis. Reddimus obscenae convicia debita genti. Radix stultitiae, cui frigida sabbata cordi, Sed cor frigidius religione sua est. Caetera mendacis deliramenta catastae etc.; adding almost prophetically, Latius excisae pestis contagia serpunt, Victoresque suos natio victa premit); *L. Ann. Seneca* Fragm. 42, III. p. 427 ed. Haase (similar to Rutilius: quum interim usque eo sceleratissimae gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnes jam terras recepta sit; victi victoribus leges dederunt); *Sueton.* Aug. 76; Tib. 36 (qui superstitione ea tenebantur etc.); *Apul.* Florid. I. 6 (Judaeos superstitiosos); *Amm. Marcell.* XXII. 5 (foetentium Judaeorum et tumultuantium saepe taedio percitus, dolenter dicitur — M. Aurel. — exclamasse: O Marcomanni! o Quadi! o Sarmatae! tandem alios vobis inertiores inveni); see Comm. on Exod. pp. XXV—XXXII; *Frankel*, Monatsschr. 1856, pp. 83—94; 1860, pp. 125—142; *L. Geiger* in Hilberg's Illustr. Monatshefte II. 13—25, 103—111.

[1] Omnes deinceps clerici sive laici Judaeorum convivia evitent, nec eos ad convivium quisquam accipiat, quia quum apud Christianos communibus cibis non utantur, indignum atque sacrilegum est eorum cibos a Christianis sumi, etc.; see *Eisenmenger*, Entdeckt. Judenth. II. 646, referring to Jus Canonic., Decret. Pars II, causa 28, Quaest. 1, cap. 14.

cidal perversion, and treason against the genius of history. And wherever a free social intercourse with their fellow-citizens has been rendered possible by the abandonment of an obsolete dietary code, they have been better understood, and, as an invariable consequence, respected and valued[2].

## IX. SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER ON THE NEW TESTAMENT IN REFERENCE TO THE CEREMONIAL LAW.

As this subject is of considerable importance in the history of religion, and involves some disputed questions which have not always been approached in a spirit of impartiality, it may here, at the conclusion of so many ceremonial ordinances, be fitly discussed.

Neither Christ nor his immediate apostles abrogated the ceremonial institutions of "Mosaism"[3]. Christ declared, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than one title of the Law to fail"[4]; "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfil"[5];

---

[2] Comp. *Philo*, In Flacc. c. 11, Op. II. 531, πότε δὲ οὐκ εἰρηνικοὶ πᾶσιν ἐνομίσθημεν; etc.

[3] Comp. Matth. V. 23, 24; VIII. 4; XXIII. 18—20, 23; XXVI. 17—20; Mark I. 44; XIV. 22; Luke II. 22, 24; IV. 16 ("as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day"); V. 14; XI. 42; XXII. 7—15; XXIV. 53 ("they were continually in the Temple"); John V. 1; VII. 8, 10; Acts II. 1 *sqq.*; III. 1; XXI. 20, 26; XXIV. 17, 18; also Matth. III. 15; IX. 16 *sqq.*; XVII. 24 *sqq.*; Luke XVIII. 18 *sqq.*; see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 59, 60; *H. Grotius*, De Verit. Rel. Christ. lib. V, cap. 7 ("Ab Jesu in terris observatam legem Mosis"); Wolfenbüttler Fragmente, ed. 1835, pp. 43, 44; *E. J. Meyer*, Verhältniss Jesu und seiner Jünger zum alttestamentlichen Gesetz, pp. 18—20, 82 *sqq.*

[4] Luke XVI. 17; comp. Matth. V. 18.

[5] Matth. V. 17, Πληρῶσαι, *i. e.* to observe and enforce it completely, or according to its spirit; comp. Matth. III. 15; Rom. VIII. 4; XIII. 8 (ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκεν), 10 (πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη); Gal. V. 14: such πλήρωμα is exemplified in the passages immediately following, Matth. V. 21—48 ("You have heard that it was said by them of old time ... But I say unto you etc."); and it is already alluded to in Jerem. XXXI. 31—34 ("I will put My Law into their inmost minds, and write it upon their hearts"), and this is the "New Covenant" (ברית חדשה, ver. 31); comp. Matth. XXVI. 28, τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης; Hebr. VIII. 13; comp. John IV. 23, "The hour comes and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth", 24, "God is a spirit etc."; 2 Cor. III. 6, "who also has made us able ministers of the new testament, not of the letter but of the spirit; for the letter kills, but the spirit gives life"; and esp. Rom. III. 31, "Do we then make void the Law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the Law" (νόμον ἱστάνομεν). Other acceptations of the term πληρῶσαι and of the whole verse see in *Vitringa*, Observ. Sacr. I. III. 5, vol. I.

and, "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven"[1]. And the early apostles never ceased to blame Paul for teaching, that the converted gentiles were free from the burden of the Law[2]. John, as his "Revelation" proves, knew no difference between Christianity and Judaism; he branded the least deviation from the old creed as an act of "the synagogue of Satan"[3]; he was implacable against those more liberal converts who disregarded the Mosaic marriage-laws, and partook of the flesh of heathen sacrifices; he called them Nicolaitanes whose deeds he hated, Balaamites who cast stumbling blocks before the believers, or followers of Jezebel who would be mercilessly destroyed[4]. "When from first to last the doctrine of the Church at Jerusalem was sternly levitical, it is quite incredible that Jesus ever taught his disciples the religious nullity of levitical ceremonies, and the equality of gentiles with Jews before God"[5]. Long after the reported resurrection and ascension of Christ, Peter protested solemnly, "Nothing common or unclean has at any time entered into my mouth"[6]. Indeed, if Christ be considered as the Messiah predicted in the Old Testament and expected at his time, he can on no account be supposed to have repealed the Law, which itself declares to be unalterable for ever[7].

---

pp. 204—211; *De Wette* in loc.; *Meyer*, l. c. pp. 3—8, 30, 31, 38—42, 69, 70, 76 *sqq.*, 109 *sqq.*, 117 *sqq.*, 123 *sqq.* The view thus expressed and laboriously defended by the latter writer, "Jesus is come in order to do perfectly, that is to *realise*, all that the Old Testament intended by its *prophecies* and by its *types*" (p. 1; comp. p. 137), is very commonly adopted; but it is against the context, against the language, and against the tenour of Christ's teaching. The passage in its literal and correct meaning was deemed so offensive that some, as Marcion, simply declared it a spurious addition (comp. *Tertull.* c. Marc. IV. 7, Hoc — Matth. V. 17 — Marcion ut additum erasit; see *Meyer*, l. c. pp. 77); nay Strauss also has recourse to the same desperate expedient (Leben Jesu, pp. 212, 213, "die anstössigen Verse — Matth. V. 18, 19 — geben sich gradezu als ein Einschiebsel zu erkennen", adding another conjecture or assertion "nicht in den Text unseres jetzigen Matthaeus, wohl aber in die Rede Jesu und vielleicht eine frühere Aufzeichnung derselben").

1 Matth. V. 19.

2 Comp. *Zeller*, Vorträge und Abhandlungen geschichtlichen Inhalts, pp. 203 *sqq.*, 228 *sqq.*

3 Revel. II. 9; III. 9.

4 Revel. II. 6, 14, 15, 20—24; comp. *Zeller*, l. c. pp. 203, 214, 216.

5 *Francis W. Newman*, Against Hero-making in Religion, p. 11. On Luke XVI. 17 above quoted he observes (ibid. p. 12), "I am, of course, aware, that Christian theologians would have us believe that Luke is here defective, and that the words in Matthew 'Until all be fulfilled' mean 'Until my *death* shall fulfil all the types'; but this would make Jesus purposely to deceive his disciples by a riddle; . . . he must have known how he was understood; they supposed him to mean that Levitism was eternal, and he did not correct their impression." Comp. also *Maximi* Homiliae hyemales et aestivales, quoted by *Friedreich*, Zur Bibel, I. 232.

6 Acts X. 14; XI. 8; comp. *infra*.

7 In Gal. IV. 4, Christ is in fact called γενόμενος ὑπὸ νόμον (comp.

It is true, he appears occasionally to have opposed himself to ritual observances. When the scribes and Pharisees complained, that his disciples were transgressing the tradition of their forefathers[8] by not washing their hands before meals[9], and by plucking ears of corn and rubbing out the grains with their hands on the Sabbath-day[10], he palliated this conduct by reproaching the Pharisees, in his turn, with a corruption of the Law, and he quoted what appeared to him apposite parallels taken from Hebrew history and the ordinary Temple practice, though the analogies are doubtful or imperfect[11]; and later, he himself openly neglected the same ceremonies[12]. He spoke lightly of the dietary rules, which in his time had grown so luxuriantly in Judaism. "Not that", he urged, "which goes into the mouth defiles a man, but that which comes out of the mouth, this defiles a man"[13]. This sentiment was incomprehensible to his disciples[14]; they considered it "a parable", which they desired to have explained; so far from their minds, nay so incredible appeared to them the idea of a total abolition of the levitical laws of food: but Christ reproached them with obtuseness[15], and furnished explicit illustrations to prove that evil thoughts and other moral offences "are the things which defile a man; but to eat with unwashed hands defiles not a man"[16]. And when he had acted on this view, and was censured by a Pharisee, he pointed out, how little it availed "to make clean the outside of the cup and platter", while "the inward part was full of ravening and wickedness"; and he gave expression to this fine maxim: "But rather give alms of such things as you have, and behold, all things are clean unto you"[17]. He predicted to his followers that they were sure to suffer hatred and perse-

---

1 Cor. IX. 20). *De Wette* (on Matth. V. 17) remarks, "The question whether Christ intended to repeal the ritual law, disappears under our hands if, as is necessary, we understand both καταλῦσαι and πληρῶσαι in reference to the spirit and not merely to the letter: according to the spirit, that is, for the ends of devotion, Christianity has in reality *not* abolished the ritual law of Mosaism, but has rendered it more perfect"; and again (on Acts X. 13—16), "Christ did not repeal the ceremonial law rashly and arbitrarily, but left it to the progress of time to effect its removal." But these remarks beg the question, and are wanting in decision. Even orthodox Christians admit that "the disciples originally expected from the Messiah the observance of the Mosaic Law according to its letter", *E. J. Meyer*, l. c. p. 17.

8 Τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; comp. Hebr. XI. 2; not "elders" of the scribes or of the Sanhedrin.

9 Matth. XV. 1, 2; comp. Mark VII. 1—5.

10 Matth. XII. 1, 2; Mark II. 23, 24; Luke VI. 1, 2.

11 Matth. XII. 3—6; Mark II. 25, 26; Luke VI. 3, 4; also Matth. XXIII. 16—22.

12 Luke XI. 38; comp. XV. 2; Mark II. 16.

13 Matth. XV. 11; comp. *Talm.* Shabb. 33b, אף על פי שכליות יועצות ולב מבין וכ'.

14 Comp. John XVI. 12 *sqq*.

15 Matth. XV. 16, Ἀκμὴν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοί ἐστε.

16 See Matth. XV. 11—20. A similar want of γνῶσις on the part of the disciples appears with respect to the very nature and mission of Christ; see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 306 note 8; comp. also Luke XXIV. 25, 45; John II. 18—22; Acts I. 6, 7.

17 Luke XI. 37, 41; see p. 105; comp.

cution from the chiefs and rulers of the Synagogue, evidently on account of his more liberal doctrines [1]. Nay, laying stress upon the words of Hosea, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice" [2], pointing to his own Messianic work, and insisting, that his authority was greater than that of the Temple, he plainly declared that he was "the lord even of the Sabbath-day", and was entrusted with the power of altering or spiritualising its celebration, since, as he significantly added, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" [3]: therefore, he did not scruple to heal the sick on that sacred day, to the great scandal of his opponents, and he justified his conduct by the axiom-like question, "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath day or to do evil? to save life or to kill?" [4].

Yet with all this he never meant to attack the validity of the "Mosaic" Law; he merely denounced its extravagant expansion by alleged traditions, to which his disciples, like the rest of the Jews, clung tenaciously, and which the Rabbins surrounded even with greater sanctity than the written Law itself [5]. "Take heed", he warned them, "and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees" [6]; for "they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders" [7]; while he declared, on the other hand, "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light" [8]. He did not oppose the Hebrew Law, which he considered, at least partially, efficacious for righteousness [9]; but he rose against the rigour of the zealots [10], who had almost hidden its true meaning by casuistry and oppressive formalism. "You have made", he said to them reproachfully, "the commandment of God to no effect by your tradition" [11]! Or if he opposed the Law, he did so merely because its narrow interpretation inevitably leads to sterile Pharisaism. He did not even impugn the ritual ordinances of the Pentateuch, because he seemed unwilling to endanger the force of the moral precepts with which they are coupled in the same code. In this respect, he differed little from the old Hebrew prophets, who insisted with fervour upon a religion of the heart, without thereby pronouncing rituals void or superfluous. "Woe unto you", he exclaimed, "scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you pay tithe and mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the Law, jugdment, mercy, and faith: *these ought you to have done, and not*

---

Matth. VII. 12; XXII. 36—40; also Gal. V. 14; James II. 8.

[1] Matth. IX. 15; X. 16—23.

[2] Hos. VI. 6; comp. Mark XII. 33, τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν περισσότερόν ἐστι πάντων τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν.

[3] Matth. XII. 6—8; Mark II. 27, 28; Luke VI. 5.

[4] Matth. XII. 10—13; Mark III. 1—5; Luke VI. 7—10; comp. also John V. 9, 16, 18; VII. 23; IX. 16; Luke V. 33; XIII. 14; XIV. 3, 4; Acts VI. 14; Matth. IX, 10—13; XI. 11.

[5] See p. 38.

[6] Matth. XVI. 6—12.

[7] Matth. XXIII. 2—4.

[8] Matth. XI. 30; comp. 28, 29.

[9] Matth. XIX. 17—21; Luke XVIII. 20—22; Mark XII. 28—34; comp. Luke XVIII. 9 - 14.

[10] Comp. Acts XXVI. 5, κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν . . . ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος.

[11] Matth. XV. 3—6; comp. XXIII. 16—19. The objections that have been raised against this view, however dogmatically or speciously urged (comp. *Meyer* l. c. pp. 86—109), are not conclusive.

*to leave the other undone*"[12]. These words precisely describe the position he occupied in reference to the Law[13]. Indeed, the earlier Karaites, as Anan, considered Jesus "as a true prophet for the heathens, and a wise teacher of the Law for the Jews", since to the former he preached the revealed Word, and the latter he tried to convince of the distortions which the Scriptures had suffered through arbitrary interpretations[14]. By stating, in reply to a captious question, that "all the Law and the prophets hang" on the two commandments of loving God with all our power and of loving our neighbour as ourselves[15], he merely imitated a favourite device of Jewish doctors, whose ingenuity delighted in deducing the varied precepts of the Law from a few verses of the Bible. "The 613 laws", teaches the Talmud[16], "were communicated to Moses, viz. 365 prohibitions or as many as the days of the solar year, and 248 commands or as many as the members of the human body; then came David and comprised them in eleven precepts[17], later Isaiah in six[18], Micah in three[19], and finally Amos[20] and Habakkuk in one[21]. And in propounding the maxim, "All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them, for this is the Law and the prophets"[22], he merely repeated, in a positive form, what Hillel, in negative terms, is said to have answered the heathen who desired to learn the whole Law in one sentence: "Whatsoever is hateful to thee, that do not thou to thy neighbour; this is the whole Law, the rest is only its interpretation; now go and learn"[23]. Yet who would assert that Hillel and the Talmudists repealed the ceremonial law, or considered it unimportant?

At first Christ desired his disciples not to preach to the Gentiles and Samaritans, but "rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"[24], though later, after his resurrection, he is related to have commanded them to go forth to instruct and to baptize "all nations" and "the uttermost part of the earth"[25]. In the Sermon on the Mount, he had no other object but to contrast the teaching of the Pentateuch in its spiritual conception with the unprofitable and graceless adherence to the letter, which must lead to the danger of exchanging Divine doctrines for "the commandments" or "tradition of men"[26]. But he was far from questioning the "Mosaic" teaching itself. In

---

[12] Matth. XXIII. 23; comp. vers. 25—28; Luke XI. 42.

[13] See Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 52—55.

[14] Comp. *Fürst*, Karäerthum, I. 42.

[15] Matth. XXII. 34—40; Mark XII. 28—34; comp. Rom. XIII. 8—10; Gal. V. 14; VI. 2; Jam. II. 8; 1 Tim. I. 5.

[16] Maccoth 23[b], 24[a].

[17] Ps. XV, "He that walks uprightly, and works righteousness and speaks the truth in his heart", etc.

[18] Isai. XXXIII. 15.

[19] Mic. VI. 8, "What does the Lord require of thee, but to act justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

[20] Am. V. 4, "Seek Me and you shall live."

[21] Hab. II. 4, "The just shall live by his faith."

[22] Matth. VII. 12; comp. Luke VI. 31.

[23] *Talm.* Shabb. 31[a], דעלך סני לחברך לא תעביד וכ'; comp. also *Aboth R. Nath.* cc. 15, 16, כשם שרואה את כבודו וכ'. See notes on XIX. 18.

[24] Matth. X. 6, 7, see John IV. 22; comp., however, vers. 4 *sqq.*; Matth. X. 23.

[25] Matth. XXVIII. 19; XXIV. 14; Acts I. 8.

[26] Matth. XV. 9; Luke VII. 7 (ἐν-

substituting for the old law, "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth", the doctrine, "If anyone will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also", he must have been aware that he was transferring a statute of a criminal code to the sphere of personal ethics, and that he was thus enabled to alter its spirit[1]. In denouncing divorce except in cases of faithlessness[2], he did not annul the law of the Pentateuch which was framed in deference to "the hardness of heart" of the Hebrews, but he virtually repeated it, since the Pentateuch also permitted divorce only if the husband had found in his wife "some uncleanness" (ערות דבר), that is, unchastity[3]; but he combated the prevailing doctrines which allowed divorce on many other and even trivial grounds[4]; and in support of his appeal he aptly quoted the words, "Therefore shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they both shall be one flesh"[5]. And his recommendation not to swear at all does not contradict the previous injunction, that, if oaths are resorted to, they should be scrupulously just[6]. He mainly desired to warn

---

τάλματα ἀνθρώπων), 8 (παράδοσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων).

[1] As regards the injunction, "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also" (Matth. V. 39; Luke VI. 29), it could not easily be acted upon even by Christ or St. Paul; comp. John XVIII. 22, 23; Acts XXIII. 3; see also Matth. XXI. 19.

[2] Matth. XIX. 3—9; Deut. XXIV. 1.

[3] Deuter. loc. cit.

[4] For instance, "if the wife but spoils her husband's meal by cooking or salting it too much" (אפילו הקדיחה תבשילו), *Mishn.* Gittin IX. 10: so taught Hillel and his school, and so Talmudism finally decided; while the school of Shammai, in this point more lenient, admitted faithlessness as the only valid reason for divorce; nor is it likely that the Hillelites ever acted on their objectional view, which resulted from an exegetical error (stress being laid on דבר rather than on ערות); comp. *Talm.* Gittin 90[a], "whoever dismisses his first wife, over him even the altar sheds tears."

[5] Questionable, therefore, is the remark of Strauss in connection with this subject: "Christus hatte das mosaische Gesetz auch über seinen rituellen Theil hinaus in seinen das sittliche Zusammenleben der Menschen betreffenden Bestimmungen für perfectibel, mithin für unvollkommen erklärt" (Leben Jesu, p. 211; comp. in general pp. 209—217).

[6] Matth. V. 33—42. There are some passages which might appear to have some weight, but are unavailable for our argument on account of their indistinctness; for instance, the abrupt and almost fragmentary words in Luke XVI. 16, ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου, ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται κτλ.; which seem to be reminiscences from Matth. XI. 12, 13 (see *De Wette* in loc.); or Christ's figurative remarks that it would be inappropriate for his followers to fast, in contrast to the Pharisees and the disciples of John (Matth. IX. 14—17); or his obscure declaration, differently interpreted in the New Testament itself, "that he was able to destroy the Temple of God, and to build it in three days" (Matth. XXVI. 61; Mark XIV. 58; John II. 19—22; Acts VI. 14): yet Strauss (l. c. p. 214) and others suppose these and similar expressions to prove that Christ considered it unfeasible to harmonize the old ceremonial system with those principles of an internal religion which he desired to enforce. Again, it is im-

his disciples, that, unless their righteousness surpassed that of the scribes and Pharisees, they would have no share in the kingdom of heaven[7]. In pursuing this end, he was so far carried away by his zeal as to state what, in itself, is not true, viz., "You have heard that it has been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour[8], and hate thy enemy"[9]; these last words do not occur in the Pentateuch, nor in any other part of the Hebrew Canon, and are absolutely against its spirit[10]; but he boldly added them, evidently because the Pharisees, taking the term "thy neighbour" (לְרֵעֲךָ) in the sense of "thy friend", were inclined to conclude, by the rule of the contrary, that it was right to hate the enemy, especially apostates and heathens, the detested foes and snares of the Jewish faith[11].

In a word, Christ preached no antagonism to the Law; nay so anxiously watchful was he for its stability that, in order to protect it, he partially conquered the antipathy he felt against the exaggerations of tradition, and exhorted his disciples, "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all, therefore, whatever they bid you observe, that observe and do"[12].

At first, Christianity meant belief in Jesus as the long promised and impatiently expected Messiah, and nothing else; it required from its followers

---

possible to draw any reliable inference from the facts, that the Evangelists mention no sacrifices on the part of Christ, nor allude to his having performed the regular pilgrimages to Jerusalem, and that he expelled the money-changers and cattle-dealers from the Court of the Temple (Matth. XXI. 12, 13; Mark XI. 15—17; Luke XIX. 45, 46; John II. 13—17); the *argumentum ex silentio*, precarious in any case, can least be employed with respect to narratives so incomplete as those of the Evangelists; and the expulsion of the money-changers and others may have been prompted by his knowledge or suspicion of fraudulent transactions; he may indeed have deemed these transactions unbecoming for the House of God, and therefore been anxious to remove them from its precincts altogether; yet we are not forced to admit that this involves a repugnance to the sacrificial service (as Strauss infers l. c. pp. 214, 215).

[7] Matth. V. 20; comp. *Meyer* l. c. pp. 62 *sqq*.

[8] Having probably in his mind the words of Leviticus (XIX. 18), "Thou shalt love thy neighbour (לְרֵעֲךָ) as thyself."

[9] Matth. V. 43.

[10] Comp. Lev. XIX. 17; Exod. XXIII. 4, 5; also Prov. XXIV. 17, 18; XXV. 21, 22; Ps. VII. 5, 6; XXXV. 12, 13; XXXVIII. 21; CXLI. 5, etc.; see Comm. on Exod. p. 444, and notes on Lev. XIX. 17, 18. "Die Feindesliebe", observes Hupfeld (Psalmen, IV. 432), "ist dem Alten Testamente keineswegs so fremd, wie es nach einem bekannten freien Citate des Heilandes scheinen könnte." The authorised English Version gives in the margin as alleged parallels to the words "thou shalt hate thy enemy", the passages Deut. XXIII. 6, and Ps. XLI. 10: it is very difficult to see how these passages teach hatred of the enemy.

[11] Comp. *Lightfoot*, Op. II. 295; *Schöttgen*, Horae Hebraicae, pp. 42—45 (where, however, many of the analogies adduced from Rabbinical writers are uncertain and insufficient).

[12] Matth. XXIII. 2, 3. Comp. also *Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. VI. 251 *sqq*., "bei der ursprünglichen Entstehung des Christenthums hat kein ausserjüdisches Element mitgewirkt."

baptism with that acknowledgment, and nothing more; and it established no distinctions from the old creed. Nay, even after Paul had uttered those great and world-reforming maxims, by which he hoped to reach and to unite the whole human family, "The Law was our schoolmaster (παιδαγωγός), but we are no longer under a schoolmaster"; "By the works of the Law shall no flesh be justified"; "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no Law"; "There is nothing unclean of itself, but to him that esteems anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean . . . The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost"[1]: even after Paul had pronounced these and similar truths drawn from the depths of the human soul, obstinate efforts, well reflected in the Acts of the Apostles, were made to conceal and to interpret away his aversion to ceremonialism—efforts invalidated by every sentence in his authentic writings[2]. And during centuries afterwards, the Church adhered almost fanatically to some of the dietary precepts, especially those concerning blood[3]; for it felt the necessity of guarding large sections of Christians against a relapse into common or Gnostic paganism[4]. For a long time, Paul stood nearly alone in his struggles for a purely spiritual faith. Peter indeed had a dawning conviction of the worthlessness of the Jewish laws of diet, and he expressed it by a vision, in which, as he described it, he saw a large vessel descending from the opened heaven, and filled with "all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts and creeping things, and fowls of the air"; then a voice called to him, "Rise, Peter, kill and eat"; but he answered, "Not so, Lord, for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean"; and the heavenly voice spoke again, "What God has cleansed, that call not thou common"; and when these speeches had been thrice repeated, the vessel was received again into heaven[5]: this vision was designed to overthrow the deep-rooted distinction between clean and unclean persons, or between Jews and Gentiles[6], and that between clean and unclean food, which involved one of the chief points of contrast which separated the Hebrew and the heathen[7]. But Peter was wavering; he was deficient in courage and consistency; in public, and before adherents of the Law, such as the followers of James in Jerusalem, he was afraid to be seen sharing the meals of heathen converts; like Barnabas, he dissembled, and stooped to questionable compromises, which more than counterbalanced the feeble effects of his teaching[8]. To St. Paul, who severely castigated such

---

[1] Comp. Rom. III. 20; VI. 14; VII. 4, 6; VIII. 2 *sqq.*; XIII. 8—10; XIV. 14—23; Galat. II. 4, 16, 19; III. 11—13, 19—25; IV. 1 *sqq.*, 9; V. 1, 18, 22, 23; 1 Cor. VII. 19; VIII. 8; 2 Cor. III. 6 *sqq.*; Ephes. II. 15; Col. II. 14, 16; 1 Tim. IV. 1—4; see also Hebr. XIII. 9; Luke XVI. 16; John I. 17; Acts XV. 10; XVIII. 13—15; XXIII. 29; *Porphyr.* Abstin. I. 42; see p. 105.

[2] Comp. Acts XVI. 3; XVIII. 18, 21; XIX. 21; XX. 16; XXI. 20 *sqq.*; XXIII. 6; XXIV. 11, 17; XXV. 8; see *Zeller*, l. c. pp. 208—210; Apostelgeschichte (Stuttg. 1854) pp. 297 *sqq.*, 320 *sqq.*

[3] See *supra* pp. 8, 9.

[4] Comp. *Leyrer* in Herzog's Real-Enc. XIV. 610.

[5] Acts X. 9—16; comp. XI. 5—10.

[6] Comp. Acts X. 28; XI. 18.

[7] See also Acts XV. 7—11, esp. ver. 10.

[8] Gal. II. 11—16, "I withstood

faintheartedness and evasion, who made Jews and Gentiles alike partake of the Messianic salvation[9], who declared the religion of Christ not to be the completion of the old faith, but an essentially new one, and for this purpose even spiritualised the doctrines of Christ, attributing to him, with unequalled self-denial, what was his own original creation[10]; to St. Paul, though wisely inclined to consider the external forms as things indifferent in themselves[11], the Christian world owes mainly its release from the chains of the dietary precepts and of ceremonialism in general[12]. Indeed his teaching, confirming and enlarging that of an Isaiah and Micah, might be hailed as the corner-stone of a universal creed, had he not, in the fervour of his enthusiasm, unwarrantably idealised Christ's person, nature, and mission also[13], and thereby given rise to a perversion of his own rational principles, and to a partial relapse into paganism.

---

Peter to the face because he was to be blamed, etc."

[9] Ephes. II. 11—13; Rom. III. 29, 30; etc.

[10] Comp. Gal. I. 12,16; Col. II. 14; etc.

[11] Rom. XIV; comp. 1 Cor. VIII. 8.

[12] The accommodation advised by him with respect to eating meat of sacrifices offered to idols (1 Cor. VIII. 1—13), was suggested by a judicious regard for the weak, and involved no abandonment of principle; see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 214; similarly IX. 19—23; Rom. XIV; comp. also Matth. XIX. 8.

[13] Comp. 1 Cor. VIII. 6; Rom. III. 22—26; V. 6 *sqq.*; XIV. 9, 10; Gal. IV. 4, 5.

# TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY.

## CHAPTER XI.

**Summary.** — *On clean and unclean animals.* God permits for food, as clean animals (טָהוֹר), among quadrupeds, the ruminants with cloven feet (*bisulca ruminantia*), excluding those which, according to notions prevalent among the ancient Hebrews, are either only ruminants or only bisulcous, as the camel, the rock-badger (שָׁפָן), the hare, and the swine (vers. 1—7); among fishes, those provided with fins and scales (ver. 9); among birds, all except twenty tribes individually enumerated (vers. 13—19); and among insects (שרץ העוף) those furnished with springing legs, of which four kinds of locusts are specified (vers. 21, 22). All the other animals of land, water, and air are "unclean" (טָמֵא, vers. 5—8, 26—29, 31) or "an abomination" (שֶׁקֶץ, vers. 10—14, 20, 23, 41, 42); their flesh is not to be eaten, nor their carcass (נְבֵלָה) to be touched (vers. 8, 11, 26, 31, 36, 39, 43); whoever does the latter becomes unclean, and remains so till the evening (vers. 24, 26, 31, 39, 40, 43), and whoever carries their carcass or any part of it, must, besides, wash his garments (vers. 25, 28). Among the lower land animals eight species are singled out as particularly defiling, viz. the weasel (חֹלֶד), the mouse (עַכְבָּר), and six kinds of lizards (צָב, אֲנָקָה, כֹּחַ, לְטָאָה, חֹמֶט, and תִּנְשָׁמֶת); their dead bodies render unclean not only the *persons* who touch them (ver. 31), but also the *objects* upon which they accidentally fall, such as utensils of wood or metal, garments or skins, which require cleansing by being left in water till the evening (ver. 32); if any part of their carcass falls into an earthen vessel, the contents of the latter become unclean, and the vessel itself must be broken (ver. 33), like ovens and stoves under similar circumstances (ver. 35); all food prepared with water and put into such earthen vessel is unclean; so also any beverage poured into such vessel, whatever its material (ver. 34); but wells and water pits into which such carcass has fallen, remain clean, though the carcass itself preserves its defiling impurity (ver. 36); clean also remains seed, if dry, but if moistened it becomes unclean (vers. 37, 38). — The touch of the carcass of a clean or permitted animal that has died of itself, renders unclean till the evening; carrying it, or eating of its flesh requires, moreover, washing of garments (vers. 39, 40). — Reptiles and worms, abominable and polluting, must be shunned as food unsuited for the chosen and holy people of a holy God (vers. 41—45). — A comprehensive formula, referring to the laws of clean and unclean animals, terminates the section (vers. 46, 47).

**1. And the Lord spoke to Moses and to Aaron saying to them,**

1. The first portion of Leviticus sets forth the principal statutes concerning sacrifices, and in natural connection with them describes the consecration of the Sanctuary and of the priesthood. We now enter upon the second great division of the Book, the laws of purity (ch. XI—XV). When the "kingdom of priests", as ideally conceived by the author, had been provided with the means of public worship and atonement, they were to be instructed how to attain and to preserve personal holiness, and how to strengthen holiness by purity. An atmosphere of religion was to surround every relation of practical life. Therefore, the laws of purity follow here in their appropriate place. To indicate the continuity of the narrative, the commands are addressed not to Moses only, but to Aaron also: the latter, as the appointed representative of the sacerdotal order, was principally concerned in the ordinances of purity; both he and the common priests were to be unstained when they entered the Sanctuary to perform their sacred duties, or when they were eating the sacrificial meals; it was their special duty to instruct the Israelites in the distinction between things clean and unclean (X. 10, 11); and they had to officiate at the offerings of expiation in cases of undesigned defilement (V. 2, 3). These are reasons enough, why the laws of sacrifice and priesthood should be supplemented by those of purity. Moreover, the arrangement of the details is, in this division, decidedly more regular than both in the preceding and following sections; indeed, with a few exceptions, it is systematic; it begins with purity in diet, advances to precepts on purity of persons, garments, and houses, and treats of these subjects in intelligible and judicious subdivisions (comp. Part I. pp. XV. XVI. XXII). We lay no stress on the circumstance, that in the laws of sacrifice already allusion is made to "a carcass of an unclean beast, a carcass of unclean cattle, and the carcass of unclean reptiles"; and in general to "unclean things" and "the uncleanness of men, whatever their uncleanness may be wherewith a man defiles himself" (V. 2, 3; VII. 19—21): for anticipations of this kind must be expected, and could perhaps not easily be avoided, in so complex a code. We are, therefore, justified in supposing, that the whole of this portion was brought into its present order by the same compiler. However, it would be hasty to conclude, that it was entirely written by the same author; on the contrary, a careful analysis of its component parts reveals striking differences of age and conception, and proves, in these as in all other religious precepts, a gradual progress from simplicity to intricate ritualism.

The laws of diet fitly stand first. If the Israelite was, through purity, to be holy because his God is holy, nothing was more important than to regulate the food he takes and blends with his body; for the body, the depository of the Divine image of the soul, and reacting upon it, was deemed sacred; it was not to be mutilated or wantonly disfigured; much less was it to be profaned by its amalgamation with detestable nourishment. In this respect, the dietary laws have even a greater force than the ancient Hebrews probably ever imagined. For it is at present known that, by a constant change of matter carried on

in the human organism, "man is not merely a creature that *consumes* food, but he himself — with his skin and hair, his bones and brain, his flesh and blood — *is* nothing else but his own consumed and metamorphosed food". Precepts relating to various kinds of food, as fat and blood, נבלה and טרפה, are, in a desultory manner, scattered throughout the Pentateuch, especially the middle Books; but the ordinances on clean and unclean animals are here at once given fully and systematically; they comprise nearly everything that the Hebrew law ever fixed on the subject; and they leave but little doubt respecting their object and character. They follow, in general, the classification of the animal kingdom usual among Biblical writers (see p. 50); for, beginning with quadrupeds, they proceed to fishes, then pass to birds, and conclude with the "creeping things" (שרץ). Yet they cannot conceal the traces of considerable additions inserted at different periods. Let us take the corresponding precepts of Deuteronomy as a basis of comparison (Deut. XIV. 3—21). Premising the general principle, "Thou shalt not eat any abominable things", the Deuteronomist enumerates ten species of clean quadrupeds and states their criteria; he next describes the characteristics of clean fishes; advancing to birds, he permits "all clean birds", and specifies twenty-one unclean or prohibited kinds; he then unreservedly proscribes "every creeping thing that flies" (שרץ העוף), that is, all winged insects; and he finally forbids the flesh of animals that died of themselves (נבלה), and seething the kid in its mother's milk, which, like the other commands, is introduced by him merely as a dietary regulation. If these comparatively simple injunctions are read by the side of our present section, it will be found, that the author of Leviticus indeed retained the outlines of the earlier work, but that he materially enlarged, and in some respects completely modified them. (1.) In addition to unclean fishes, "the moving things" of the water (שרץ המים), including especially the crustacea, are pointed out as an abomination (ver. 10).—(2.) Of the winged insects, those with springing legs, or certain species of locusts, are expressly declared clean, and permitted for food (vers. 21, 22). — (3.) Among "the creeping things that creep upon the earth", the Reptiles, Spiders, and Worms are specially dilated upon as detestable, and then all "the creeping things" in general are similarly denounced (vers. 41—43).—(4.) Among the inferior habitants of the land, eight species are signalized as pre-eminently unclean, and guarded against in a manner unprecedented for scrupulous minuteness (vers. 29—38, see Summary). — (5.) Above all, the "uncleanness" which results from eating, carrying, or touching any part of the carcass of a forbidden animal, and the lustrations required to re-establish a condition of purity, are stated and insisted upon with an emphatic earnestness which strongly contrasts with the wording and the spirit of former enactments (vers. 8, 11, 24, 26 — 28, 31 *sqq.*, 39, 40, 43 — 45). — (6.) Hence commands are inserted with regard to the flesh of *lawful* animals that died of themselves (נבלה), but they are meant less as laws of diet than as rules of purity, since they refer not merely to eating, but also to carrying and touching such meat (vers. 39, 40). — (7.) The context is, in one instance, illogically interrupted by additional injunctions of purity concerning the carcass of the great land animals, which had

indeed been treated of before, but as it seemed to the reviser, not with sufficient fulness and rigour (vers. 26—28; comp. ver. 8).—(8.) In another instance, with respect to unclean fishes, an almost intolerable tautology is resorted to, reiteration being supposed to add force (vers. 10—12).

We are, therefore, compelled to conclude, that some original ordinances on permitted and forbidden food, probably those preserved in Deuteronomy, were by the subsequent compilers of the more stringent code of *Leviticus* supplemented and altered with a view of their closer association with the laws of purity, and their more complete union with the levitical system. Indeed the component parts of our section are so transparent, that they may not only be pointed out with safety, but be arranged in chronological order so as to exhibit at a glance the gradual growth of the principles which gave rise to the laws of diet.

Philological Remarks. — Following out the preceding suggestions, we may thus analyse our chapter, and describe its individual parts. (1.) It begins with the older precepts concerning quadrupeds, fishes, birds, and insects (שרץ העוף), vers. 2-20: so far the dietary ordinances are carried in Deuteronomy also, and agree substantially with those of Leviticus; but the latter, now entirely abandoning, or rather passing beyond, the earlier source, first enlarges upon the class of animals treated of last, the insects, and adds (2.) a supplementary rule in favour of edible locusts, vers. 21, 22; yet (3.) prohibits with enhanced severity all other insects as defiling, and prescribes careful lustrations, in case they are touched or carried, vers. 23-25. (4.) As now the aspect of *purity* was to be more strongly urged, besides that of diet, additional commands are inserted with regard to the carcasses of unclean quadrupeds (בהמה), vers. 26-28. Then follows (5.) a series of regulations concerning a number of lower animals held particularly unclean, vers. 29-38, regulations so intricate and almost playful, that their spirit and very late origin cannot be mistaken. Moreover, (6.) distinct injunctions were deemed requisite on the polluting effect of the dead bodies of *clean* quadrupeds, vers. 39,40; and lastly (7.), as until then the insects alone (ערץ העוף) had been mentioned of all "creeping things" (שרץ), the other classes also, especially the hated reptiles and the crustacea, the spiders and worms (ערץ השרץ על הארץ) were expressly proscribed and denounced; and it was chiefly with respect to these most abhorred and most repulsive creatures, that the ideas of defilement and of holiness were forcibly dwelt upon, vers. 41-45; after which a comprehensive statement of the object of the section brings it to a proper conclusion, vers. 46, 47. — A *logical* arrangement of the contents would yield the following order of the verses: (1.) The laws on clean and unclean quadrupeds, vers. 2-8, 26-28, 39, 40. (2.) On fishes and birds, insects, and other "creeping things", vers. 9-25, 29-38, 41-47. It is, hence, probable that the first portion (vers. 2-20) was concluded, and perhaps diffused, when the remarks on the defilement of unclean quadrupeds were added (vers. 26-28), for else the latter would no doubt have been inserted after the 8th verse; and that then the injunctions were again carried on to ver. 38, for else the two following verses (39 and 40), treating of quadrupeds and interrupting the laws on creeping things, would probably have been placed after the

28th verse. The former circumstance especially affords a welcome corroboration of the view which internal reasons have induced us to form, that the corresponding section of Deuteronomy (XIV. 4-21), mainly coinciding with the first portion of our chapter (vers. 2-20), constituted the groundwork of the levitical legislation on diet.—All attempts at reconciling the discrepancies pointed out are necessarily unavailing, except upon the principle of historical development. Ewald, assuming original harmony and logic in the arrangement, simply believes that "the words vers. 26-28 must be considered as transposed, and ought to receive their former place after the 8th verse" (Alterth. p. 206 note 1): but transposition alone, as has been proved, does not suffice to explain the peculiar composition of our chapter. Knobel (Comm. pp. 439, 461) supposes that "the Deuteronomist omitted the enactments with respect to the most unclean creeping things (vers. 29-38), because a prohibition regarding them appeared no longer necessary in his advanced time": but the Deuteronomist had, according to the common view, which is shared by Knobel, no other object but to recapitulate and epitomise the legislation of the preceding Books; he could, therefore, make no arbitrary selection from his given materials; he would certainly not have suppressed ordinances so remarkable as those contained in the verses alluded to, had he found them in his sources, that is, had the Book of Leviticus in our present form been before him; for he would surely "in his advanced time" not have deemed superfluous those complicated rules about defilement which bespeak not a rude but a very cultivated stage of religious life, and which were subsequently made the basis of even more intricate regulations: nor can the prohibition of certain reptiles, which were evidently eaten by surrounding nations, have appeared too elementary to a writer who found it necessary to inveigh against every form of idolatry, from the worship of the heavenly orbs to the burning of children to Moloch, against sorcery, divination, and witchcraft, and against every kind of unnatural abuse (comp. Deut. XII. 29—31; XIII. 7—18; XVII. 2—7; XVIII. 9—14; XX. 18; XXIII. 18, 19; XXVII. 15, 16, 20, 21). The verses under discussion are a deliberate addition of a levitical compiler writing considerably later than the Deuteronomist: as such alone can their wording and their spirit be understood and accounted for. But even the levitical compiler felt that he was powerless to abrogate, by an abstract command, habits rooted in the life of the nation; he was, therefore, induced to legalise the custom of eating various kinds of locusts; and adding this permission to the laws of Deuteronomy, he endeavoured to invest it with the appearance of intrinsic justification by pointing out distinguishing characteristics of those insects (see p. 100). That the custom existed already in the time of the Deuteronomist, needs not be questioned; but if we read his positive and unqualified precept, "Every creeping thing that flies is unclean to you, they shall not be eaten" (*ib.*, ver. 19), supposing that he thereby alluded to insects, we may well ask whether he did not deem it feasible to uphold this rule in its uncompromising strictness, and to exclude from the food of the Hebrews those winged devastators, upon which he could only look with feelings of aversion and dismay (see, however, on vers. 20-25). The later

levitical legislator, finding the attempt a failure, and possibly apprehensive that the unchecked transgression of the Law in one particular might injure its authority in general, preferred adapting it to the stubborn exigency of facts, the more so, as he must have been reluctant to limit the dietary resources of the reestablished and not very prosperous commonwealth. A similar abandonment of an ideal principle in favour of practical considerations has been pointed out in another place (see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 42). From these remarks it will be evident, how unfounded is the view that the edible species of locusts are not alluded to in Deuteronomy on account of its "epitomising brevity" (*Riehm*, Gesetzgebung Mosis, p. 56; also Stud. und Krit. 1868 p. 359), and because "Moses did not intend to repeat every detail of the laws previously given" (*Keil*, Comm. on Lev. p. 80) — and yet Deuteronomy unnecessarily gives a specified list of the clean quadrupeds (see *infra* on vers. 2-8; comp. also *Graf*, Geschichtl. Büch. des A. T. p. 66); or because the matter did not appear "sufficiently important" (*Riehm*, Stud. und Krit. 1868, p. 360) — whereas the permission of locusts as food is a surprising deviation from a fundamental and very significant rule (see *infra* on vers. 20-25). It will suffice to point out the subterfuge prompted by apologetic perplexity, that Leviticus was written in the desert, where the locusts were indispensable to the Israelites as food, but Deuteronomy immediately before the conquest of Canaan, when those insects began to lose their importance for the immigrants (*Schultz*, Deuteron. pp. 83, 430; comp. *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 207) — as if the laws of the Pentateuch were intended for times of transition, and the contingency of eating locusts in Palestine was impossible. And we may passingly mention the strange conceit that, as the insects share the curse of the earth to which they are mainly tied, they were to be manifestly subjected to man's dominion (*Baumgarten*, Comm. II. 157) — as if dominion is manifested by consumption only, and that idea could not have occurred to the Deuteronomist as well as to the writer of Leviticus (comp. also l. c. pp. 157, 158, offering a most specious and untenable analysis of the second part of our chapter, from ver. 24).

While a preceding command is addressed to Aaron only (X. 8—11), because it concerns the priests exclusively, the injunctions relating to clean and unclean animals are fitly communicated both to Aaron and Moses. It is both unnecessary and inadmissible to explain the first words of the chapter, "And the Lord spoke to Moses that he should say to Aaron" (*Rashi* on I. 1, a. o.); and it is futile to interpret the last words of the first verse (לאמר אלהם), "that Aaron should say to his sons Eleazar and Ithamar", mentioned immediately before (X. 12 *sqq.*): אלהם, though not necessary after לאמר, is its natural complement, "saying to them." — אֲלֵהֶם is written defectively for אֲלֵיהֶם as in I. 2; Num. XIV. 28 (see Grammar II. § XXX. 5[b]). — The construction וידבר . . . לאמר requires no explanation in this place (see Gram. § I. 98. 5). It is difficult to see that the combination אמר לאמר is more languid or redundant than דבר לאמר, that it cannot be supposed in the earlier and fresher stages of the Hebrew language, and that, therefore, all the passages of the Pentateuch in which it occurs (Gen. XXXI. 29; XLII. 22; XLIII. 3; XLVII. 5; Ex. VII. 8; etc. etc.) are suspicious as later and spurious interpolations,

2. Speak to the children of Israel saying, These *are* the animals which you may eat among all the beasts that *are* on the earth. 3. Whatsoever is hoofed and is

or require the suppression of לאמר (comp. *Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. IV. 27—35; V. 188, 189; VI. 159); the artificial interpretations which this view, carried out in detail, renders necessary, are little calculated to recommend it; breadth of expression is not unnatural in a primitive style; though the Pentateuch contains portions and additions of a very advanced period, the phrase אמר לאמר cannot be employed as a decisive, it can hardly be adduced as a collateral, criterion of an interpolation; and it does not occur a single time in the Book of Leviticus, which embodies the latest revisions of the Pentateuch.

**2—8.** The law commences with the quadrupeds or great land-animals, whether of the domesticated or wild kinds (בהמה or חיה). It is content with giving the general rule for the permitted classes, and illustrating the prohibited species by a few examples. It does not, like the Deuteronomist (XIV. 4, 5), enumerate the former. This difference leads to a most interesting trace of the gradual expansion of the dietary precepts. Deuteronomy begins with stating the lawful kinds of quadrupeds, evidently attempting completeness, and then proceeds to deduce from the individual instances the general rule: our section dispenses with the detail, gives at once the general rule, but scrupulously explains it by several examples, in order to prevent any possible mistake. To the earlier writer the general rule is new, to the later author it is familiar. The former is more empirical, the latter is obviously more practised in speculative abstraction. Nay, in Deuteronomy, the general rule (ver. 6) is so little in its place that it might almost be suspected as a subsequent insertion: for why was it necessary elaborately to enumerate all the clean quadrupeds, and yet to add, "every beast that is hoofed and has a two-cleft foot, and chews the cud, that you may eat"? The specification renders the rule superfluous, and the rule throws doubt on the completeness of the specification; both together are perplexing; either the one or the other would be sufficient. The levitical writer, more experienced and more circumspect, foregoes the detail; but so far from imperiling by this omission the spirit of his enactment, he preserves and protects it more effectually; for the ten names in Deuteronomy do not exhaust the quadrupeds legalised by the rule; they are simply the most common instances; they are not meant to exclude the various kindred species which are or may be known (comp. *Maim.* De Cib. vet. I. 8, 12). Moreover, the meaning of some of the Hebrew names is doubtful, of others it is obscure beyond the hope of identification. This applies in a still higher degree to the birds and the lower animals mentioned in a subsequent part of the chapter: the etymology is in many cases effaced or leads to no decided result; in the kindred dialects only a few of the words occur; and the ancient versions, often guessing rather than translating, offer little assistance. Who, then, can be surprised, that Jewish tradition, helpless and bewildered, took refuge in the view that God seized specimens of every kind of animals, and as He pointed them out to Moses, said,

cloven-footed, *and* chews the cud, among the beasts, that you may eat. 4. Yet these you must not eat of those that chew the cud, and of those that divide the

"This you may eat, and this you must not eat"; or, according to another conception, He permitted Moses to see them in revolving fire at the foot of His throne, and then the lawgiver, descending to the earth, caught animals of every species, and showed them to the Israelites, not only the great land-animals, "but also every single kind of the creeping things of the water, and every bird and insect and reptile" — and all this in the sandy and lifeless desert of Sinai, solely on the strength of the words, "*These are* the beasts" (זאת החיה)! (*Siphra* 47[b] ed. Schlossb.; *Talm.* Menach. 29[a]; *Rashi* in loc.; comp. p. 23). But the apprehensions of later Judaism, which suggested this monstrous view, were gratuitous. The general character of the unlawful animals was clear from the undoubted species and from the criteria stated; a mistake was scarcely possible, and even uncertainty could not often arise: indeed the Jewish practice never wavered; if it admitted, for instance, the goose as lawful food, it acted doubtless in accordance with the spirit of the Biblical law, whatever fancied objections may be urged against that bird (*e.g.* by *Michaelis* on Lev. XI. p. 150).

"Clean" animals are indeed those permitted, "unclean" those prohibited, by the Law; but the words are not convertible; they are used as parallel, but not as synonymous or identical terms; and the epithets "clean" and "unclean" in reference to animals were never entirely divested of their original meaning. Though asses and horses, camels and dogs were kept by the Israelites, they were to a certain extent associated with the notion of impurity; they might be turned to profitable account by their labour or otherwise, but in respect to food they were an abomination; this instinct was, in the course of time, considerably strengthened by religious ideas or doctrines; moral was joined to physical aversion, or the one was substituted for the other; the terms "clean" and "unclean" were from the natural removed to the spiritual sphere; and as regards most of the unclean, or at least some peculiarly detested animals, as the swine, later Judaism, combining both conceptions, prohibited even their very breeding or keeping, and pronounced it an unhallowed practice (p. 88). In a word, "unclean" is not merely a vague alternative for interdicted food; the designation partly retained its inherent force and original significance, and implied contempt or repulsiveness. To prove the contrary, a more fallacious argument could hardly have been used than this: "among all animals, man was the most unclean, that is, human flesh was to be eaten least of all" (*Michael.* Mos. Recht, § 202, and on Lev. XI; comp. also *Dathe* and *Rosenm.* on Lev. XI; *Kitto* on Lev. XI. 47). Is man unclean in the same sense as a prohibited animal? He may, under certain conditions, become temporarily unclean, but in the Pentateuch he is never pronounced or considered unclean by nature. Metaphors in poetical Books can have no weight in deciding a question of dogma (comp. Job XIV. 4). Indeed, while Jewish tradition proscribed as unclean all food derived from any species of forbidden animals, such as the milk of unclean quadrupeds or the eggs of unclean birds or

**hoof: the camel, because it chews the cud, but does not divide the hoof; it *shall be* unclean to you; 5. And the rock-badger, because it chews the cud, but does not**

fishes (though naturally not the honey of bees), it declared human milk clean, and permitted it even to adults, under condition that it be drunk from vessels (*Maimon.* De Cib. Vet. III. 1—5; *Yor. Deah* § 81). Eating human *flesh* was of course an abomination, but for very different reasons (*Yor. Deah* § 79. 1). That the clean animals are not identical with those fit for sacrifice, needs hardly be observed (see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 78); yet this assertion has not unfrequently been ventured, and has been coupled with very curious justifications of the logical arrangement of Leviticus: just as not all species of animals, contends one writer, are suitable for the *altar*, so are not all to be admitted to the *table* of the Israelite (*Salomon* on ver. 2) — as if the idea of connecting altar and table were of such early origin (see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 62); a portion of the sacrifices, triflingly propounds another divine, was to be eaten to promote the communion between God and Israel — therefore the laws of food follow properly after those of sacrifice! (*Gerlach*, on Lev. XI. p. 404).

On the erroneousness of the Biblical criteria of clean quadrupeds, and of the examples adduced, we have commented above (p. 53); the rule is illogical and the examples are fallacious; for non-bisulcate ruminants and non-ruminant bisulcates, are zoological fictions. Jewish tradition considers the instances of unclean animals named in our text — the camel, the hyrax, the hare, and the pig — as exhaustive, and assumes that they are the only species in the world possessing either of the two stated characteristics (*Talm.* Chull. 59[a]): this view, which seems indeed to harmonise with the words of the Bible (vers. 4—8), is, from the facts pointed out, devoid of all foundation. Hence also the Rabbinical canon that "all ruminants are cloven-footed except the camel, and all cloven-footed animals are ruminants except the swine", though approaching the truth, does not reach it, because the two exceptions, taken for granted on the authority of our passage, are imaginary. Moreover, have the Biblical criteria intrinsic value for determining the animals destined by nature for human food? If clean creatures be those "of a higher, nobler, less intensely animal organisation", why did those tests exclude the horse, the elephant, and the camel? Is their organisation lower, less noble, and more intensely animal than that of the ox, the sheep, and the goat? It is well known that ruminants, though endowed with acute senses — great range of vision, singular power of hearing and smelling, and in most cases also remarkable swiftness of foot — are low in the development of the brain, can be "tamed rather than educated", show very little intelligence, and hardly any remarkable instinct beyond the selection of food and the avoidance of danger. Are they less "calculated to degrade the life of man and to render it more beast-like" than the noble horse or the "half-reasoning" elephant? The solid foot may be a formidable weapon evincing or engendering defiant ferocity; but are horns, generally found in bisulcate animals, less formidable for defence or aggression?

**divide the hoof; it *shall be* unclean to you; 6. And the hare, because it chews the cud, but does not divide the hoof; it *shall be* unclean to you; 7. And the swine,**

and does not the divided hoof of the hindfeet frequently inflict dangerous blows? Who would approach unarmed the bulky and untameable bison which fears neither wolf nor bear, and assails its enemies both with hoofs and horns? Or who would trust the infuriated bull or buffalo? (comp. *Aristot.* An. Hist. II. ii. 9; Part. An. III. ii. 1—3). Is indeed the divided hoof, which Aristotle declares to be a defect and a weakness of nature, a decisive characteristic, since there are species of pigs with solid hoofs? (*Arist.* De Part. Anim. III. ii. 4, τὸ δίχηλον κατ' ἔλλειψιν τῆς φύσεώς ἐστιν; see p. 57 note 15). If rumination "makes the impression of tameness", why was it disregarded in the patient camel that has neither a solid foot nor horns for savage attack? It is indeed exclusively restricted to herbivorous animals, and it may favour more complete digestion: for every one knows that the food coarsely bruised by a preliminary mastication, is first accumulated in the largest of the four stomachs, or the *paunch*, as in a spacious store-chamber; that it then enters into the second stomach, or the *honey-comb*, where it is at leisure formed into little balls or pellets, which the animal brings up again into the mouth to be re-chewed; that it passes next, in a soft and half-fluid state, into the third stomach, or the *manyplics*, to the right of the paunch, to be more fully reduced; and is lastly swallowed into the fourth, or the *reed*, to the right of the third, there to be finally digested by the acid gastric juice. But is the timid hare, which is *no* ruminant, not herbivorous? and is it less inoffensive than even the cow or the ram? and does not its stomach, like that of ruminants, secrete rennet, which is held to be a proof of perfect digestion? (Comp. *Aristot.* An. Hist. III. xvi. 6, ἔχει δὲ πυετίαν κτλ.). In reality, the legislator simply confirmed and tried to systematise existing customs, the result of many ages, of climate, experience, and national life: how far he succeeded as regards accuracy, has been pointed out above (pp. 50, 59). All attempts at pointing out other reasons for the permission of some and the interdiction of other animals, are equally worthless, however they may differ in speciousness or ingenuity. Or are indeed ruminants preferable, because "chewing the cud presents the image of meditation"? And are cloven-footed quadrupeds more wholesome or more desirable nutriment, because "the undivided hoof betrays intractable stubbornness", considering that the horse belongs to the most docile creatures? Are the locusts more highly organised or less rapacious than many of the fishes and aquatic animals that were declared detestable? Yet they were expressly pronounced "clean" and permitted as food. This one fact suffices to decide the question if subjected to impartial enquiry.

The Talmud proposed additional criteria; it declared that clean quadrupeds are always distinguished by the absence of teeth in the upper jaw, and by such flesh beneath the hip-bone as can be torn both lengthways and crossways: the former test the Talmud has in common with other ancient authorities (see p. 70); the latter, strange and fanciful in itself, is

**because it is hoofed, and is clovenfooted, but does not chew the cud; it *shall be* unclean to you. 8. Of their flesh**

invalidated by the circumstance that it is shared by the wild ass (*Talm.* Chull. 59[a]). — It has been proved above that, according to Talmudical deductions, the clean domestic and the clean untamed quadrupeds (בהמה and חיה) differ from each other in several points of ritual; for the fat of the clean חיה is permitted as food, and the blood of the slaughtered clean בהמה does not require "covering" (see pp. 5, 13): it became, therefore, necessary to fix tests for the distinction of both classes, and they were derived from the formation of the horns; these must, in clean quadrupeds of the field (חיה), be either forked (מפוצלות), or notched in the manner of scales (ברורות, חרוקים) and rounded off (הדורות; see *Talm.* Chull. 59[b]; *Maim.* De Cib. Vet. I. 10; *Yor. Deah* § 80. 1). How far these signs are decisive may be inferred from the following facts. We need only allude to the difference between "persistent" or permanent horns covered with a hard, nail-like substance, and "deciduous" or annual horns, or antlers, covered with a soft skin or "velvet." Antlers are only found in the males of the Cervidae or deer-tribe, with the exception of the rein-deer, both sexes of which are provided with them. As regards their shape, the antlers are either rounded or flattened; the former kind are peculiar to the species living in the temperate and tropical zones, as the stag, the roe-buck, and the wapiti, the latter kind to the deer inhabiting the coldest climates, as the elk and the rein-deer, "as if they were destined to be used by the animal, like shovels, in clearing the snow from off its food." — The antlers of the elk, weighing 50 or 60 pounds when fully formed, are in the second year, when they are only a foot long, "dags" or "prickets" or simple dagger-shaped spikes; in the third year they are forked; and in the fourth somewhat flattened with a number of projections or "snags". Therefore, the Talmudical criteria of the horns are both incomplete and unreliable. Moreover, the text itself is doubtful, some, as Rashi, reading not הדורות *rounded*, but חדודות *pointed.*

The identity of three of the animals mentioned as possessing one of the two required criteria, is perfectly certain, both from the kindred languages and tradition, viz. the camel (גָּמָל), the hare (אַרְנֶבֶת), and the swine (חֲזִיר); but the fourth — שָׁפָן — is the subject of much dispute.

The Scriptures afford but a slender clue. We learn from them only, that the animal "is by no means strong", and "makes its house", or "seeks refuge", on rocks. It is mentioned among the four creatures, which, though "little upon earth", are yet "exceedingly wise", or have remarkable instincts, the three others being the feeble ant which provides its food in the summer; the locusts which "have no king, yet go forth all of them in hosts", and the lizard which "takes hold with its hands, and is in royal palaces" (Ps. CIV. 18; Prov. XXX. 26—28). Conjecture has indeed a wide field if called upon to fix upon an animal not large and not strong, living, and building its nest, on rocks. Yet even these few hints suffice to exclude the Jerboa (Dipus jaculus) — a hare-like rodent, with very long hind-legs, and large, tufted tail — which has frequently been identified with

**you must not eat; and their carcass you must not touch; they *shall be* unclean to you.**

our *shaphan*, as it usually constructs its dwelling in sandy or gravelly plains and subterraneous cavities; and they point rather to a species of Hyrax, probably coinciding with the Wabr (وبر) of Saadiah. The Hyrax or "rock-badger" (in Germ. Klippdachs or Schieferdachs) lives in the wild and stony parts of Africa and Asia, especially in Upper Egypt, Abyssinia, and the ridges of the Lebanon. It is a pachyderm of the size of a rabbit, attaining a length of 18 inches. It has dark, large, and vivacious eyes, with a singularly gentle and harmless, yet shrewd expression; a black and bare nose constantly moist; thick rodent teeth; a divided upper lip; and a soft, fine, and close skin kept scrupulously clean, greyish brown above and lighter below, yet changing into various other shades. Its short legs are provided with four small but broad toes in front and three behind, almost all enclosed in round and very thick hoofs, and with soft yet rough palms admirably adapted for safe and rapid climbing, but entirely unfit for digging in hard ground, or for hollowing out stones. A very short tail is almost hidden in the skin, and resembles that of the lamb, whence the animal is called by the Arabs "the sheep of the children of Israel" (غنم بنى اسرايل). The hyrax may often be seen basking in the warm sun, on the high ledges of mountains, or nimbly climbing and bounding along the sides of even the steepest and almost vertical rocks; but it disappears instantly in the clefts with apelike and tremulous yells, upon hearing the faintest sound, and especially at the approach of a dog or of other animals, among which the leopard is its most dangerous enemy. Yet, strange to say, the very sociable and gregarious creature lives peacefully together with such rapacious animals as the Manguste (Herpestes zebra) and the thorny lizard (Stellio cyanogaster). It leaves its stony heights and recesses only if these no longer afford herbage to satisfy its very keen appetite; then it descends into lower parts, though with the utmost caution, and escapes back into its accustomed and faithfully cherished abodes at the slightest suspicion of danger, which a remarkably acute sense of hearing enables it to discover. For it is entirely defenceless, incapable of offering resistance with its teeth or claws, though it endeavours to bite when caught. However, small and agile as it is, and above all so timid and weak that it is frightened away by the shadow of a flying crow, swallow, or pigeon, it belongs, according to Cuvier's careful analysis, to the same family as the elephant and the rhinoceros, and forms the proper link between these and the more slender rodents. Its flesh, which in whiteness resembles that of the young chicken, is eaten and much relished in the East, especially by the Bedouins in Arabia and in the Peninsula of Mt. Sinai, and by the Kaffirs at the Cape of Good Hope, who employ, besides, the secretions (Dassenpiss, Hyraceum) as a remedy for certain nervous disorders; but it is scrupulously shunned by the Christians and Mohammedans in Abyssinia, where the animal is known by the name Ashkoko. A modern naturalist observes: "I saw the rock-badgers often graze at the foot of clefts; and I found that their habits are exactly

like those of ruminants: for having bitten off the grass with their teeth, they move the jaws like the bisulcates when chewing the cud; yet, though I have watched them very closely, I have never noticed that they masticate their food a second time" (*Brehm*, Illustr. Thierleben, II. 724). Just as with respect to the hare, appearance misled the Biblical writer to represent the Shaphan as "chewing the cud."

Concerning the quadrupeds not provided with both criteria, the Law ordains, "of their flesh you must not eat, and their carcass you must not touch" (ver. 8); that is, even if the animal is sound, and is slaughtered in the prescribed manner, its flesh ought not to be eaten, much less if it has died of itself, or has been torn by wild beasts; in any case, the flesh is "carcass" (נבלה) and "unclean." Its very touch is defiling — defiling in every respect and for all purposes, and not merely, as is asserted by the Rabbins, for entering the Temple, for touching sacred things, and eating holy or sacrificial meat. The injunction, repeated from Deuteronomy, but in our section strengthened by the addition "they shall be unclean to you", was meant to apply to all relations of life in general, and to be valid for all times. The laws of purity were not exclusively associated with the Temple and its service; Jewish tradition indeed looked upon them solely in such connection, and therefore declared them inoperative after the destruction of the common Sanctuary; but this view, prompted by convenience and expediency, militates against the spirit of the Biblical injunctions, and entirely effaces the peculiar character of the levitical legislation.

Philological Remarks. — The words חיה and בהמה are here (ver. 2) employed in their generic sense, including the whole animal creation (see p. 50), and the verse in which they occur must be considered as a common heading to the whole chapter, corresponding to the equally comprehensive formula at the end (ver. 46). The heading is indeed less detailed than the conclusion, and might even be mistaken for an introduction to the laws on quadrupeds only (בהמה); but we may explain this from the circumstance that the parallel passage in Deuteronomy, the source of ours, limits the first words indeed to the great land-animals (...זאת הבהמה שור שה וכ׳, Deut. XIV. 4): the beginning, merely modified from an existing document, shows still the traces of the latter; while the conclusion is a free and full addition of the later levitical compiler. — It is of some importance, correctly to understand the meaning of the phrase מפרים פרסה (vers. 3 *sqq.*). The verb פרס (Isai. LVIII. 7), equivalent with פרש (Lam. IV. 4) and פרץ, is *to divide*; therefore פַּרְסָה signifies properly *divided* or *cloven hoof* (Ex. X. 26; Ezek. XXXII. 13), and then *hoof* or *foot* in general, as that of the horse (Isai. V. 28; Jerem. XLVII. 3; Ezek. XXVI. 11; *Rashi* פלאנטא, plante); hence the denominative הפריס is simply *to have a hoof* (Ps. LXIX. 32), whether it be divided or not; this general sense belongs usually also to the combination מפריס פרסה (comp. vers. 5, 6), so that the text might allude to a class of animals as מפרסת פרסה, and yet at the same time as שסע איננה שסעת (ver. 26), that is, animals that have hoofs (and not paws, as the cat, the dog, and the bear-tribe), yet "do not divide the division", i. e. are not cloven-footed; and if the meaning of *parted* hoofs is intended, מפריס פרסה is sometimes strenghtened by the addition of שֶׁסַע שֹׁסַע (vers. 3, 7). Unquestionably, however, that phrase alone

denotes also "to have *parted* hoofs"; for the swine is in Deuteronomy (XIV.8) simply described as מפריס פרסה, although our chapter (ver. 7) adds ושסע שסע פרסה; on the other hand, Deuteronomy (XIV. 7) alludes to cloven-footed beasts with מפריסי הפרסה השסועה, whereas our chapter (ver. 4) omits the latter word; and פרסה לא מפריס always denotes "to have no *divided* foot" (vers. 4—6). It is, therefore, impossible to consider the two terms מפריס פרסה and שֹׁסַע שֶׁסַע, if used together, to apply to such animals as the camel, the hoof of which is divided, but not so thoroughly that the division embraces both the upper and nether part (see *Rashi* on ver. 26; *Pfeiffer*, Dub. Vex. p. 294, *Michaelis* and *Rosenmüller* on ver. 3): in this manner some have tried to defend the correctness of the Biblical statement with respect to the camel פרסה איננו מפריס (ver. 4); but these words are not even qualified by שסע שסע, they can, therefore, mean nothing else but "it has no divided hoof", and they cannot even be rendered "sed non habet ungulas ab utraque parte fissas" (Dathe). It is to be regretted if, in attempting to vindicate the statements of the Bible, its language is distorted in support of exegetical theories. — From these remarks it is easy to judge of the various translations that have been offered of the words כל מפרסת פרסה (ver. 3); most of them have erroneously "whatsoever parts the hoof"; so Onk. and Jon. (כל דס־יקא פירסא), Sept. (κτῆνος διχηλοῦν ὁπλήν) and Vulg. (quod habet divisam ungulam, though in ver. 4 it has simply habet ungulam, and condenses in the whole of this section the Hebrew text inaccurately, e. g. vers. 33, 37, 42), Rashi and Nachman., Luther and Engl. Vers., Mendels., Johlson, and Cahen, De Wette and Knobel, Bunsen and Keil, a. o.; though some translate correctly "whatsoever *is hoofed*", as Ebn Ezra (בעלת פרסה), Rashb. (צפורן אחד כעין מנעל), and Ralbag, Arnh. and Luzzatto (fornito d'unghia), Wesseli and Wogue. — The sense of the following words ושסעת שסע פרסות certainly requires before פרסות the addition of שתי which is found in Deuteronomy (XIV. 6), for it is just the characteristic of clean animals, that their feet should be parted into *two* divisions, and not into more, as the feet of those "that go upon paws" (ver. 27, הולך על כפיו); that word is indeed reproduced in the Samaritan and Syr. Vers. and by the Sept. (ὀνυχιστῆρας ὀνυχίζον δύο χηλῶν), it is found in 6 codd. of Kennicot, 3 of De Rossi, and other manuscripts (*Michael.* Orient. Bibl. II. 212, 213), and may by some chance or mistake have been omitted in our text. — Targum Jonath., considering the addition necessary that ruminants are horned, inserts (in ver. 3) ודאית לה קרנין. — The passage in Deut. (XIV. 7) parallel to our 4th verse, has after וממפריסי הפרסה the word שסועה, which is certainly required by the context, since the two tests of clean quadrupeds mentioned in the 3rd verse are repeated in the 4th; and the Septuagint indeed adds here also καὶ ὀνυχιζόντων ὀνυχιστῆρας. — The second criterion מעלת גרה (ver. 3) is added to the first by way of asyndeton, without the copulative ו, and has almost the character of an apposition or of a qualifying relative sentence, "whatever cloven-footed animal that chews the cud"; hence the greater force seems to rest on this latter as the fundamental test, which is indeed the more essential of the two, as it partially decides the internal organisation, the food, and the habits of the quadruped. — We might certainly translate, "all cloven-footed, *that is*, *all* ruminant

quadrupeds", and thus harmonise the statement with science: but this the clear detail which follows forbids. — The correct reading in the next verse (the 4th) is undoubtedly מַעֲלֵי הגרה, as all ancient versions render, not מַעֲלֵה הג׳, which some codd. of Kennic. and De Rossi offer, evidently misled by the following מַעֲלֵה; yet in Deut. XIV. 7 a similar anomaly occurs, מַעֲלֵה גֵרָה הֵמָּה. — The Wabr or Hyrax Syriacus (Germ. Klippdachs, Schieferdachs) is more and more recognised as the equivalent for שָׁפָן; it is so understood by Buffon (Hist. Nat. XIII. 148), Bruce, Shaw, Seetzen, Oken, Laborde (Journey through Arab. Petr. pp. 106—109), Winer (Real-Wört. II. 507), Rödiger (in *Gesen.* Thesaur. p. 1467), J. Wilson (Lands of the Bible II. 28), Knobel, Bunsen, a. o.; comp. also *Brehm* l. c. II. 721—726. Even etymology and the kindred dialects seem to favour this view; for "the hiding animal" (from שָׁפַן or צָפַן *to conceal*) is the appropriate name of a creature excessively timid and instinctively retreating into fissures and caves at any unwonted sound or sight; and by the southern Arabs the Wabr (وبر) is called ثُفْن i. e. שפן (*Fresnel*, in Journal Asiat. 1838, p. 514). — None of the older interpretations seems acceptable, whether שפן be taken as coney (so the Targum and Rabbins טבזא or טוזא, who fancifully connect *Shaphan* with *Spain* known as rich in rabbits, Syr. חגסא, Abulwal., Luther, Engl. Vers., a. o.), or as Jerboa (يَرْبُوعٌ), the dipus (mus) jaculus (comp. *Brehm* l. c. II. 191—194; so Vulg. choerogryllus, see *infra*, Bochart — Hierozoic. I. pp. 1002—1017 —, Oedmann, Hasselquist, Dathe — mus ursinus —, Michaelis, Rosenmüller — Bibl. Alterthumsk. IV. 2. pp. 213—222 —, Gesenius, Zunz, Luzzatto, De Wette, a. o.); or as Fenek (فنك Arab. Vers.), a sort of marten, the Veverra aurita of Blumenb.; etc. The Septuagint renders שָׁפָן in our passage by δασύποδα ("rough-foot") or hare, and אַרְנֶבֶת by χοιρογρύλλιος, which, as Jerome observes, resembles both the mouse and the bear, and is, therefore, also called ἀρκτομῦς. According to a Talmudical tradition, the translators avoided the familiar term λαγώς; and they seem to have done so from fear of giving offence to their patron, king Ptolemy, a descendant of *Lagus*, by including among the unclean animals one so closely resembling his ancestor's name. The Talmud (Megill. 9b) assigns a reason which is untenable; it contends that they wrote "rough foot" (שעירת רגלים, so must be read, instead of צעירת ר׳), and not "Arneveth" (ארנבת), because the latter was the name of Ptolemy's wife or mother; but supposing even that the word "Arneveth" recalled the sound of Berenice (who was neither the king's wife nor his mother), it could never have been employed in a *Greek* version. In twelve other passages, the translators were considered to have deviated from the original text for reasons of expediency; and it was, therefore, said, "The day when the Scriptures were translated into Greek, was as fatal for Israel as the day when the golden calf was made, since the holy text could not be rendered with accuracy" (*Talm.* Sepher Torah I. 9; *Mechilt.* בא, sect. 14, fol. 19b ed. Weiss; see also *De Veil*, Transl. of *Maimon.* De Sacrif. pp. 449, 450). In Ps. CIV. 18 שפן is translated by λαγωός; and it may be observed that, though Aristotle ordinarily uses δασύπους for hare, Pliny (VIII. 55 or 81) distinguishes it from lepus, taking the former probably as a particular species of hare. — We have already alluded to the unhappy

9. These you may eat of all *creatures* that *are* in the waters: all those that have fins and scales in the waters — in the seas and in the rivers —, these you

emendation of the Septuagint which renders כי מעלה גרה הוא, with reference to the hyrax and the hare (vers. 5 and 6), ὅτι οὐκ ἀνάγει μηρυκισμόν, and thus attempts to redeem the scientific accuracy of the Biblical statement by the addition of οὐκ (see p. 54). — An instructive instance, showing that a general rule may in Hebrew be expressed either by the participle, the future, or the past, occurs in vers. 4—7, viz. מפרים, יפריס, and הפריסה (see Gramm. I. §§ 93. 3; 94. 7; 100. 5). In accordance with the breadth of style usual in the levitical legislation, the description of the camel, the hyrax, and the hare is repeated three times with all but identical words, "it chews the cud, but does not divide the hoof" (vers. 4—6); whereas the Deuteronomist, more concise in legal enactments, characterises the three animals in one common statement (Deut. XIV. 7). — יִגָּר (ver. 7), in pausa for יִגַּר, is most likely the fut. Kal of גרר (verb med. tsere, hence גֵּרָה past Kal, Deut. XIV. 8) *to draw* or *to bring up*, instead of יָגֹר (which the Samarit. Codex has; comp. יְגֹרֵהוּ Hab. I. 14), pathach being, in the second syllable, irregularly used for cholem, as in יָחַד (Prov. XXVII. 17), of חדד *to be sharp*, comp. also יִמַּר, אֵקַל, תֵּשַׁם, אֵיתַם; and תַּ, גַּל, שַׁךְ (Gram. § 62. 3; LXII. 3[a], [b]); it is less probably the fut. Niphal, though the kindred dialects use passive modifications in the same sense (Arab. جر IV and VIII, Syr. אתגורר); but hardly the fut. Kal of נגר, which root does not occur in the meaning here required; the noun גֵּרָה with which that form is joined (גרה לא יגר) is almost decisive in favour of the first explanation; it is formed from the Kal of גרר, after the analogy of רִנָּה, בִּזָּה, זִמָּה, חִנָּה, and other nouns derived from verbs ע״ע, and denotes "that which is brought up again", viz. from the (second) stomach into the mouth to be re-chewed, that is, the cud, exactly as the analogous nouns quoted have passive meaning, "that which is taken as spoil", "that which is devised" etc. Synonymous with גרר גרה is the more usual phrase העלה גרה *to bring up the cud* (vers. 3—6; Deut. XIV. 3—7), or elliptically גרר (Deut. XIV. 8, וְלֹא גֵרָה); Sept. ἀνάγειν μηρυκισμόν, which latter word, like the Latin rumen and ruminare, is also etymologically connected with the meaning *to draw* (μηρύειν, ῥύειν).

**9—12.** The regulations on quadrupeds are followed by those on fishes, or rather on aquatic animals generally. The Deuteronomist indeed seems to have the former alone in view; but our author, taking a more comprehensive range, includes all "creatures that teem in the water" (שרץ המים), and all "living beings (נפש החיה) that are in the water" — the Seal- and Whale-tribes (pennipeda and cetacea), most of the Amphibia, as the Turtles, the Lizards, and the Frogs (chelonii, sauri, and batrachia), the Crustacea, Mollusks, Radiata, and the lower marine aquatics. Nor is this the only distinction between the earlier and the later Book. The law in Deuteronomy runs simply thus: "These you may eat of all that are in the waters — all that have fins and scales you may eat, but whatsoever has no fins and scales you may not eat; it shall be unclean to you." But our verses dwell upon the "abomination"

**may eat; 10. And all those that have no fins and scales in the seas and in the rivers, of all creatures that people the waters, and of all living beings that *are* in**

(שקץ) of all unclean aquatics with a repetition meant to be emphatic, but so redundant, that ancient and modern expounders deemed it necessary to search for hidden and distinct meanings in the identical terms. The re-iteration, "They shall be an abomination to you: yea an abomination they shall be to you" (vers. 10, 11), was supposed to imply, that the Hebrews, till then accustomed to shun those animals from a natural instinct, were commanded to do so in future from a sense of religious duty (Michaelis, Wogue); or it was said to mark as unclean all food with which any part of those creatures has by chance been mixed, and to which they have imparted a taste (Siphra); or to warn the Hebrews not only against eating them, but also against profiting by them in any way (Targ. Jonath.). Is it necessary to remark that these and similar interpretations, solely prompted by the desire of investing pleonasms with some gradation or variety, are in no manner justified by the words or the tenour of the text? — The probable reasons why fishes with fins and scales were deemed more wholesome than those without both these organs, and why, therefore, in the course of time, the former kinds were pronounced clean, and the latter unclean, have been stated before (p. 52); nor need we point out again the notions and feelings which urged the rejection of other aquatic animals as loathsome or even detestable (p. 78). Jewish tradition assumed the existence of finless fishes, and prohibited the eel as unclean, erroneously supposing it to be devoid of scales (see p. 58). It fixed, moreover, additional criteria. For it declared that clean fishes have a complete and continuous vertebral column (שדרה or שדרותא), unclean fishes merely single joints united by a gelatinous cord; for this reason, it pronounced as unclean the cartilaginous fishes — the shark-tribe (plagiostomi) and the sturgeons with their caviare (eleuthero-branchi), the lamprey and the nine-eyed eel (cyclostomi); whereas it permitted as clean the osseous fishes with scales, especially of the order of "soft-fins" (malacopterigii), as the salmon and trout, the capellan and greyling, the herring, anchovy, and sardine, the pike- and carp-families, the cod, hake, and haddock, the sole, turbot and plaice; and so also the order of "spiny-fins" (acantopterigii), as the perch, the mackerel, and the tunny. Some Talmudical teachers asserted that "the unclean fishes are viviparous (משריצין), the clean ones oviparous", no spawn being found in the former; whereas others observed more correctly, that "both unclean and clean fishes throw out spawn; but the former species mature the young while the eggs are still in the parent fish [that is, they are ovo-viviparous]; whereas the latter leave the eggs to be developed in the sand" (*Talm.* Avod. Zar. $40^a$; Bechor. $7^b$, $8^a$): these remarks, inaccurate in their sweeping generality, have a certain foundation in fact; for many of the cartilaginous fishes, and a few of the osseous species, as the anableps, a kind of loach, and the eel, are partially viviparous; while the ray is ovo-viviparous, since its eggs, black and parchment-like, flat, angular, and elongated at the ends, and called

the waters, they *shall be* an abomination to you: 11. Yea, an abomination they shall be to you; you must not eat of their flesh, and you shall have their carcasses in

"fish-mice", are matured in the interior of the fish, and their production nearly coincides with the birth of the young brood. — Again, the eggs, the roe, and the swimming bladder (שלפוחיתא) of clean fishes were considered to be oblong, but pointed at the one and rounded at the other extremity; those of unclean fishes either pointed or rounded at both sides alike. And lastly, the head of clean fishes was supposed to be more or less broad, that of the unclean kinds rather pointed at the end (comp. *Talm.* Avod. Zar. 40; *Rashi* in loc. and on Nedar. $30^b$; *Yor. Deah* § 83; *Lewysohn*, Zoolog. des Talm. §§ 7, 15, 24, 303, 304). That these rather singular distinctions have no connection with the Biblical signs, and at best apply to individual instances only, needs not be pointed out. The Greeks and Romans more simply and more rationally considered fishes wholesome or unwholesome according to the places in which they usually live, whether in rivers or lakes, in stagnant, slimy, or muddy water, or the sea; and according to the nature and quality of their food, whether consisting of nutritious herbs or of putrid and weakly roots (compare *Galen.* de Alimentor. Facult. III. 25).

Philological Remarks. — Some, believing that the laws on fishes are introduced abruptly (את זה, ver. 9), have connected our verses with the preceding portion by the copulative ו (ואת זה, comp. ver. 13); this reading is found in the Samarit. text, and in one codex of Kennic., and it is rendered by the Sept., Syr., and Arab.; many codices and translations have also in ver. 15 וְאֵת instead of אֵת (comp. Deut. XIV. 14), and וכל instead of כל in vers. 12, 20, 42; (comp. Deut. XIV. 19); while others have in ver. 23 כל instead of וכל (comp. *De Rossi* Var. Lect. I. 94—96): all these variations are of no moment whatever. — The generic term "water" (מים) is subdivided into two parts, namely, the "seas" (ימים) and the "rivers" (נחלים vers. 9; Sept. χειμάῤῥοι winter-torrents, Vulg. stagna); hence to express the whole notion, the text uses either "water" alone (vers. 9, 10, 12), or "seas and rivers" alone (ver. 10), and employs the one parallel with the other (ver. 10); therefore the Masorites justly marked the second בַּיַּמִּים in ver. 9 with the distinctive accent revia (Sept. inserts inaccurately in ver. 9 καὶ between ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι and ἐν ταῖς θαλάσσαις, and adds in ver. 10 unnecessarily ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν; Vulg. in ver. 9 tam in mari quam in fluminibus). Yet the enumeration cannot be considered strictly exhaustive, and the rule of clean and unclean fishes applies of course to those also found in ponds, marshes, reservoirs, and the like (see *Talm.* Chull. $66^b$, $67^a$; *Ebn Ezra* in loc.). Moreover, this detailed division occurs in Leviticus only, and is not found in Deuteronomy, where מים simply is used once (XIV. 9). — There can be no doubt as to the meaning of the two chief characteristics of clean fishes, סְנַפִּיר and קַשְׂקֶשֶׂת; the former (of uncertain etymology) is *fins;* it is rendered by Onkel. and Jonath. ציצין (i. e. plate- or fringe- or wing-like appendages; comp. ציץ and ציצת; *Talm.* Bab. Bathr. $73^b$ שיצי), and similarly by the Sept. πτερύγια and Vulg. pinnulae, and

abomination. 12. Whatsoever has no fins and scales in the waters, that *shall be* an abomination to you.

13. And these you shall have in abomination among the fowls; they must not be eaten, they *shall be* an abomination — the eagle, and the ossifrage (lammer-

it is explained by *Rashi* "something like wings with which the fish swims" (comp. *Mishn.* Chull. III. 7, סנפירים הפורח בהם; *Talm.* Chull. 66; *Targ. Jon.* on Deut. XIV. 9, ציצין למפרח; also *Nachman.* in loc.); and קשקשת (of קשש or קשה *to peel* or *to scale off*) is *scale* (used collectively, or in plur. as שריון קַשְׂקַשִּׂים *a scaled mail of coat*, 1 Sam. XVII. 5, and קַשְׂקְשׂוֹת, Ezek. XXIX. 4); it is translated by Onk. קַלְפִּין (from קלף to *peel off*), by Jon. חַרְסְפִיתִין (from חסף or חרסף *to scale*; comp. *Midr. Rabb.* Num. XIX. 5, "the feet of the cock resemble the scales of fishes", לחספניתא דנונא), by the Sept. λεπίδες, and Vulg. squamae; and it is explained by the Mishnah (l. c.) הקבועין בו something attached to the fish (or הקליפות הקבועות בו *Yor. Deah* § 83. 1). Jewish tradition declares, that such scales are meant that can really be *peeled off*, or removed from the skin, whether by the hand or a knife; it considers one fin and one scale sufficient; and holds such fishes clean which, though not actually having fins and scales, may be expected to get them later, or which possessed them when in the water, but lost them when brought to the land. — שקץ הם לכם does not mean "they are" but "they shall be an abomination to you", just as טמאים הם לכם (ver. 8) means "they shall be unclean to you" (comp. vers. 4—7, etc.); and thus the artificial explanations above alluded to lose their foundation. — Targ. Jonath. renders the beginning of the 11th verse, "and their juice (צִירֵיהוֹן) and their sauce (רוֹטְבֵיהוֹן, *sic*) shall be an abomination to you" (comp. *Talm.* Chull. 120[a]).

**13—19.** With respect to birds, the legislator confined himself to a specification of the prohibited kinds; he gave no common characteristics; he even omitted the general rule or introduction of the Deuteronomist, "All clean birds you may eat" (Deut. XIV. 11). But instead of the mere interdiction, "These are they which you shall not eat", he employed strong and almost vehement language, "These you shall have in abomination (תשקצו) among the fowls; they must not be eaten; they shall be an abomination" (ver. 13). Yet we cannot doubt that he had distinct criteria of the unclean orders in his mind, since he repeatedly qualified the names by adding "after its kind" (למינו, etc.). Even through the veil that conceals the exact meaning of many of the Hebrew terms, we may discover a certain system in the enumeration. The first third comprises the carnivorous birds of prey which live upon flesh and carcass (raptatores), as the eagle, the vulture, and the raven (vers. 13—15); the second third embraces the ostrich and the various kinds of crepuscular predaceous birds, or owls (vers. 16, 17); and the last, with one exception, includes the waders or marshbirds (grallatores). This very arrangement, however imperfect, forms one of our scanty helps for ascertaining the identity of the names. It clearly suggests that the author intended to proscribe all birds of prey, subsisting less on vegetable food than on carrion and all kinds of putrid matter; all those that live and delight in darkness, whence he in-

**geier), and the vulture, 14. And the falcon, and the kite after its kind, 15. And every raven after its kind;**

cluded even the bat, which belongs to the mammalia; and those which dwell, or seek their food, near unclean places, such as marshes and morasses. The list, therefore, though not complete, does not leave us entirely without guidance, especially if we consider that all the birds mentioned occur probably in western Asia, and were eaten.

The Hebrews held in natural abhorrence the birds of prey — birds mostly dark and sombre in plumage; violent, fierce, and cruel; voracious and nearly insatiable; repelling by a monotonous and discordant voice; and above all armed with the most formidable weapons for attacking, grasping, and tearing their prey, — with the short, arched, hooked, and pointed beak; and the powerful and largely developed, fang-like talons, strongly bent and sharp. These characteristics eclipsed the remarkable attributes of many families of the class — their perfect structure, their wonderful eye and ear, their courage and strength, their surprising intelligence so conspicuous in the falcon-tribe, the mutual affection of the couples and their young; and in decrying their voracity, it was forgotten that it beneficently helps to destroy the pernicious hosts of rodents and insects, cleanses the streets of African and Asiatic towns, and thereby often averts pestilence.

1. The first bird named — נֶשֶׁר — is *the eagle*: this the kindred dialects, all ancient versions, and numerous allusions of the Bible raise beyond a doubt. It is true, the eagle is in some passages declared to feed upon carrion (Job XXXIX. 30; Prov. XXX. 17), and in one to be bald-headed (Mic. I. 16); but the common opinion that the eagle consumes only what it has killed itself, and disdains dead bodies, has been proved a fallacy; and as it is the largest and noblest, one of the most highly endowed, and in fact the chief representative of its class, its name may be applied to other birds of prey also, such as the vulture. A few species only are found in Asia, as the "stone-eagle" (Aquila fulva), the strongest and boldest; the golden eagle (Chrysaëtos), the swiftest and most agile; and the fish-hawk (Pandion haliaëtus), the most expert fisherman, that forms the connecting link between the eagles and the kites (Milvi): a far larger number of varieties occur in other parts of the globe, as the imperial eagle (Aqu. imperialis), the much smaller screaming eagle (A. naevia), and the dwarf-eagle (A. minuta), in the southern and south-eastern regions of Europe; the rapacious hawk-eagle (Pseudoaëtus Borellii), the mighty fighting eagle (Spizaëtus bellicosus), and his smaller kinsman the crested eagle (Lophoaëtus occipitalis), in Africa; the Urutaurana (Pternura tyrannus), and the fiercest and most dangerous of all, the Harpy (Harp. destructor), in South-America; and the arrow-tailed eagle (Uroaëtus audax), in Australia. Eagles, especially young ones, are eaten by some rude Asiatic and African tribes, and esteemed as dainties (see p. 98); to the Hebrews they were to be an abomination, for they combine all the detested characteristics of the winged "robbers" or *raptatores*: "their young ones also drink blood, and where the slain are, there are they"; yet they were included among the marvels of creation described in the Book of Job (Job XXXIX. 27—30; comp.

**16. And the ostrich, and the *tachmas*, and the sea-gull, and the hawk after its kind, 17. And the eared owl,**

Exod. XIX. 4; Deut. XXXII. 11; see *Brehm*, Illustrirtes Thierleben, III. 402—406, 444—482).

2. With regard to the second bird — פֶּרֶס — the chain of proofs is sufficiently complete. The etymology — from פרס or פרץ to *break* — leads to the *ossifragus*, and this, as we learn from Pliny (X. 3), was the Tuscan appellation for the *aquila barbata*, which can hardly be any other bird than the bearded griffin or *lammergeier*, belonging partly to the eagles and partly to the vultures, and therefore aptly called *gypaëtus* ("vulture-eagle"). Greek writers, from the earliest to the latest, mention it under the analogous name of Aigypios (αἰγύπιος) or "goat-vulture", which is by Homer employed as a metaphor for an impetuous warrior rushing headlong upon the terrified enemy (comp. *Hom.* Il. VII. 59; XIII. 531; Od. XXII. 302; *Herod.* III. 76; etc.); it is identical with the Greek Phinis or Phene (φίνις or φήνη, *Dioscorid.* II. 58; comp. *Hom.* Od. III. 372; XVI. 217; *Aristot.* De Mirab. p. 191 ed. Tauchn.), although in earlier times the Aigypios and the Phene were distinguished (*Hom.* Od. XVI. 217), the latter being supposed to protect and to feed the young ones deserted by the former (*Hom.* Od. XVI. 217: *Aristot.* H. An. VI. vi. 1). The bird could hardly have received a more fitting name than "bone-breaker". For in the first place, it delights particularly in the bones of vertebrates, and can subsist upon them almost exclusively; and then, it breaks or comminutes even the hardest of them in a powerful stomach secreting a gastric juice of a marvellously solvent force; moreover, when it finds that the bones are too large to be devoured, or despairs of obtaining their marrow, it dashes them from a great height upon some well-selected pointed or projecting rock, and thus literally breaks them: the poet Aeschylus is supposed to have thus been killed by a falling tortoise. But the lammergeier is by no means that dangerous and rapacious robber it has frequently been represented to be by imaginative naturalists; it does not attack sheep, goats, or dogs, or any quadruped larger than a hare, since neither its beak nor its foot is very powerful; it never ventures to approach children, much less full-grown persons; it is, in fact, one of the most harmless species of its tribe; it is dreaded neither by shepherds nor their cattle; it peacefully shares with the vultures their carrion-feast, satisfied with the bones which they disdain; and it has had too long to bear execration for misdeeds which in reality are perpetrated by the fierce and pitiless stone-eagle. The root of the beak is surrounded by tufts of bristle-like feathers, which partially conceal the lower beak also, and may well be termed a beard. The body is strongly built but elongated, with a large head, short neck, and long and pointed wings. The plumage, which in the earliest years is almost entirely of a dusky brown intermixed with grey, gradually changes into black or dark-brown on the upper side, and yellow or white in the lower parts, occasionally with dark spots, especially at the breast. Its flight is extremely quick and even impetuous, without any flapping of the wings, and resembles in gracefulness that of the larger falcons. The silvery eye is unrivalled for power and penetration; not only the

**and the frigate bird, and the night-owl; 18. And the cormorant, and the pelican, and the *racham*, 19. And**

iris lies bare, but also the hard outer coat (sclerotica), forming a broad soft ring beautifully coloured. The sense of smelling also is singularly developed, but not so the brain, which is proportionately small and simple, and does not bespeak great intelligence. The lammergeier is, in fact, neither remarkable for his instincts, nor for strength and courage. It is found almost in all parts of the three old continents, though the European differ from the Asiatic and African species considerably in size and habits.

We shall for the sake of easier survey and reference insert the "Philological Remarks" at once after each bird, marking them by brackets.

[The name פֶּרֶס is translated *ossifrage* by the English Version, Bochart, Dathe, De Wette (Beinbrecher), Knobel, Fürst, and Bunsen; the etymological sense of "breaker" is rendered by Onk. עָר, Targ. Jerus. עַרְעָר, and Abusaid كاسر, though it is difficult to say, whether they intended to point precisely to the gypaëtos; still more indistinct are the renderings of Jonath. עִרְזָא, of Sept. and Vulg. גְּרִיפִין and gryps, Sam. Vers. בזאה, Syr. ܥܙܐ, and Saad. عقابا (a black eagle). Other translations seem unacceptable; the sea-eagle is included in נשר (Gr. Ven. ἁλιάετος, Kitto, Luzzatto l'aquila marina, Knobel — on Lev. p. 448 — who fluctuates between sea-eagle and lammergeier); the vulture and the hawk are no doubt intended by the following names (Gr. Al. גְּרִיפִין, Boothroyd, Taylor, Luther Habicht); and the condor is only found in the high-lands of South-America (so Rosenmüller, and the translation of Onkel עָר has been understood "the bald bird"). In Spanish the lammergeier is also called "bone-breaker" (queberanta huesos; comp. the French orfraye); and German naturalists designate it promiscuously Bartgeier, Bartadler and Bartfalk, Lämmer-, Gemsen-, Gold-, Greif- and Jochgeier (see *Brehm* l. c. III. 542—555).]

3. If any degree of systematic order may be assumed in our list, the next bird — עָזְנִיָּה — is the *vulture*, since eagle, lammergeier, and vulture form the regular succession of tribes in the class of raptatores. The author of the dietary code could not possibly omit at once the largest and the most repulsive of unclean birds, which combines all their fierce and loathsome, without sharing any of their generous or kingly qualities. For even the least of the vultures is not smaller than an eagle of average size; baldness of a part of the head and neck gives them in most cases a hideous appearance; their flight, though slow, is remarkably persevering, ambitiously high, and perpetually roaming; in keenness of sight they vie with the most gifted of birds, and surpass them in power of smell. But their intelligence is not considerable: they are shy, but not prudent; irritable and violent, but not bold or courageous; sociable, yet by no means peaceful; combative and mischievous, yet cowardly; by turns indolent and tenaciously active; clumsily awkward, but nimbly vivacious if roused by the prospect of booty; greedy and ravenous, but capable of abstemiousness for whole weeks, — birds of strangely contradictory attributes. They are emphatically carrion-eaters, and rarely attack living prey; they delight especially in corpses of mammals, yet do not disdain birds, amphibia, and in-

**the heron, the ibis after its kind, and the hoopoe, and the bat.**

sects; their meals, from which they usually rise enveloped in dirt and bespattered with blood, present a scene of horrid strife and combat, of hideous clamour, tumult, and confusion. The species which the author had principally in mind, are probably the gyps ("Gänsegeier"), and the famous *Percnopterus stercorarius*, known under a variety of names, as the holy or Egyptian vulture, or "Paraoh's chicken", so often figured on the monuments of the ancient Egyptians, who regarded the bird with religious awe, not only because, as a most active scavenger, it saves the towns from pestilential epidemics, but because it was supposed to watch over its young with the most affectionate devotion during a hundred and twenty days in every year, and even, if necessary, to feed them with the blood of its thighs; it was, therefore, selected to express the notions of mother and merciful (comp. *Horapoll.* I. 11). More than any of its class, it resembles the raven by its form, the large and rather pointed wings, and the long but blunted tail; while the Greeks compared it with the stork, and named it accordingly (ὀρειπελαργός; *Arist.* H. A. IX. xxii. 2). It is found in the southern countries of Europe, nearly in the whole of Africa, and in most parts of western and southern Asia, where it is eaten by some tribes, rejected by others. If its appearance be not quite so repulsive as that of some of the larger vultures—though the bald face of the small head, the projecting and bare crop, the dirty and untidy coat, form no attractive sight — it is utterly detestable for its loathsome habits, and especially for the kind of food it chooses (comp. *Arist.* Hist. An. l. c.; *Plin.* X. 3). Other species are never or rarely met with in western Asia, as the huge condor, and the gorgeously feathered Royal vulture (Gyparchus) principally found in the elevations of South-America, and the giant of the family, the "Ear-vulture" (Otogyps) frequent in Africa.

[It will be evident from the preceding remarks that עָזְנִיָּה can probably not be taken as "Sea-eagle" or erne (Sept. ἁλιαίετος, Vulg., Michael., De Wette, Bunsen), nor ospray or fish-hawk (Luther, Engl. Vers.), nor the eagle melanaetus or valeria (Bochart, Dathe, Fürst, Luzzatto), nor falcon (Targ. Jon. בַּר נִּצָּא, explained in Aruch אלקיני). Whether עָזְנִיָּה has any etymological connection with עז strong (like the Latin valeria *Plin.* X. 3), must be left undecided (comp. Onk. עַזְיָא, Sam. V. עזיה; Saadiah عنقا, a term opposed by Ebn Ezra, as signifying something that does not exist in reality, and explained by Kamus "the huge and fabulous gryph, which rules over the birds"). Nor is it possible to ascertain whether the Hebrews shared the opinion of some ancient nations that there are no male vultures, but only females, which conceive through the wind (comp. *Horapoll.* I. 11; *Aelian.* N. A. II. 46; *Plut.* Quaest. Rom. 93), and whether thus the feminine form עָזְנִיָּה is to be accounted for (comp. דָּאָה ver. 18 with רָאָה in Deut. XIV; see *Brehm* l. c. III. 534—542, 555—585).]

4 and 5. As regards the next two birds, the דָּאָה and the אַיָּה, there can hardly be any reasonable doubt that they are meant for the *falcon* and the *kite*, which represent two other chief tribes of the raptatores, and which could not be passed over in our text. For the falcons (falcones), at once

the boldest and noblest of all birds, and the most perfectly organized of the birds of prey, subsist upon live animals which they seize with their talons; and though deserving admiration for their courage and agility, their rare intelligence and remarkable instincts, they belong to the worst and most sanguinary of robbers. And the chief representative of the kite-tribe (milvi), the hen-harrier (milvus regalis), a mean, unroyal bird, is ravenously voracious, eats small mammals and birds, lizards and serpents, frogs and toads, locusts and beetles; attacks young fowls and geese, pheasants and hares; and impudently robs even bolder birds, as falcons, of their prey; though by largely destroying noxious insects and the swarms of rodents, it is often useful to man. Both the falcon and the kite are, in a great variety of species (hence לְמִינָהּ), diffused over nearly all parts of the globe; and the etymology of the Hebrew names agrees fully with these equivalents.

[For the root ראה, applied not only to the impetuous and dartlike flight of birds of prey (Deut. XXVIII. 49; Jer. XLVIII. 40; XLIX. 22), but to the moving of God on the wings of the wind (Ps. XVIII. 11), admirably conveys the chief characteristic of the falcon (comp. *Brehm* l. c. III. 406—431); nor is the name אַיָּה, from אוה or איה *to desire with greed*, less appropriate for the insatiable and omnivorous kite (comp. *Brehm* l. c. pp. 482—502). The derivation from אי in the meaning of *howling* or *crying out* — the *clamorous* bird — does not seem so striking; moreover, the root is never used in that sense throughout the O. T. The other identifications which have been proposed for אַיָּה are *vulture* (Sept., Luther, Winer, Bunsen, Engl. Vers.), *kite* (Ar. Erp. حداة, Vulg. milvus, Bochart, Dathe, Kitto, Knobel, Luzzatto nibbio), and *hawk* (Michael., Taylor); and for אַיָּה *vulture* (Vulg.) or *falcon* (Bochart — Arab. يايا —, Gesen., Knob., Bunsen), *owl* (Ben Gannach, Saad. صدى), and *magpie* (Kimchi אגס"א agasso, gazza).]

6. The sixth bird — עֹרֵב — is unquestionably the *raven* with all its numerous species (לְמִינוֹ): how fully it deserves to be placed among the unclean birds on account of its shameless aggressiveness and immoderate edacity, needs not be repeated in this place (see Comm. on Gen. p. 195; comp. *Brehm* l. c. III. 334—371).

[The reading ואת (inst. of את) before כָּל־עֹרֵב, which occurs in the text of Deuteronomy (XIV. 14), and is here expressed by many ancient versions, is the more appropriate, as the raven concludes the first third of the list, the birds of prey.]

7. The following name — בַּת הַיַּעֲנָה — which begins the second portion of the catalogue, has by nearly all ancient versions been rendered *ostrich*, and there is no reason for questioning the correctness of this translation, which fully agrees with the allusions made in the Old Testament to the real or supposed habits of the bird. It is there represented to live among desolated ruins and dreary solitudes, and to make them resound with its doleful wails, and it is described as stupid (it is still an Arabic proverb "more stupid than an ostrich"), and as heartlessly indifferent to the fate of its eggs, leaving them in the sand to be hatched by the sun, or to be trodden upon by the beasts of the desert (comp. Isai. XIII. 21; XXXIV. 13; XLIII. 20; Jer. L. 39; Mic. I. 8; Job XXX. 29; XXXIX. 13—18; Lam. IV. 3). However, this last reproach is undeserved; it probably originated in the fact that the ostrich-hens, after having filled their nest with eggs

(for several hens lay in the same nest), deposit those which they lay afterwards apart at some distance, unmindful of what may become of them; but the birds bestow the utmost care upon the eggs in the nest; in some cases the male and the female sit upon them alternately; but more frequently the male in particular and even exclusively, while the one that does not happen to sit, guards the nest and procures the food; if the male leaves the nest for a short time, he carefully covers the eggs with sand; at intervals the female turns the eggs gently and cautiously, a process which is daily performed with great regularity. Nor do the parent birds neglect their offspring, of which they are tenderly fond, as even ancient writers testify (*Aelian*, N. A. XIV. 7). Accurate observation does not bear out the view formerly entertained that the eggs laid separately are meant either to satisfy the rapacity of intruders, or to serve as the earliest food of the young brood; for the ostrich has neither the intelligence for the one nor the forethought for the other. It is sufficient to know that the Hebrews regarded the ostrich as an unkind, dismal, and silly bird, and associated it, as perhaps even its Hebrew name implies, with the dreariness and the terrors of the wilderness; they may have been aware that it occasionally devours fowls and other small vertebrates, exactly like a bird of prey; they counted it, therefore, among the unclean animals, and shunned its flesh, which was eagerly eaten by whole tribes of Ethiopia, by large classes in India, and also by the Romans, who deemed ostrich-brain a peculiar delicacy; and it is still extensively eaten, especially in Arabia, and in the interior of Africa. The emperor Heliogabalus is curiously reported to have said that "the Jews were bidden by their laws to eat it" (dicens praeceptum Judaeis ut ederent, *Lamprid.* Heliogabal. 28, 32; *Strabo* XVI p. 772; *Diod. Sic.* III. 28; *Aelian*, N. An. XIV. 7). Whether they considered the ostrich, as the Greeks did, as a sort of unnatural hybrid, half bird, half quadruped, cannot be proved (comp. *Aristot.* De Part. Anim. IV. 14). Though not found in Palestine itself, it is not rare in the Arabian, nor even in the East-jordanic deserts, where it may formerly have been still more frequent; for it is well known that the ostrich, eagerly chased by the Bedouins, has all but disappeared in districts where it once abounded.

[בַּת הַיַּעֲנָה is probably "the daughter", that is, according to a common Oriental usage, the "inhabitant" of the desert (وعنة, like ابو الصحارى "pater desertorum"), another name for ostrich (comp. *Michael.* Suppl. IV. 1127); some, connecting it with the Syriac אחיעך to be greedy, take it as the *gluttonous bird*, or with יָעַן in the supposed meaning of howling or wailing (Mic. I. 8, etc.; comp. רְנָנִים Job XXXIX. 13; Sam. בְּרַת עֲנִיתָא). Though originally denoting the female bird, it is unquestionably used as an epicene (Isai. XIII. 21; Job XXX. 29; comp. Chald. בַּת נַעֲמָא vulture; the mascul. יָעֵן occurs in Lament. IV. 3; comp. *Ebn Ezra* on Exod. XXIII. 19); some indeed suppose that בת היענה is the female, and the next name תחמס the male ostrich (as in Arab. ظليم "the impious", so Bochart, Gesen., De Wette, a. o.); but it is not probable that the two sexes of the same species should have been forbidden separately. Nearly all translators have understood בת היענה as ostrich, a few only render it, against all probability, by *owl* (so the Engl. Vers., Ful-

ler, Oedmann, a. o.); comp. *Brehm*, l. c. IV. 522—534.]

8. *As* regards the next name — תַּחְמָס — we confess our inability to suggest an identification. Neither the etymology, which vaguely leads to a "violent" or "rapacious" bird, nor the ancient versions, which conflictingly render owl or swallow or the sea-bird gannet, allow a safe conclusion, and the opinions ventured by modern scholars can be no more than conjectures.

[The term תַּחְמָס has been taken as *swallow* (Onk. צִצָּא, Saad., Ar. Erp., Dathe, and perhaps Jonathan חַטְפִיתָא, though this word signifies properly *raptatrix* or robber); or *gannet* (Gr. Ven. καταῤῥάκτης); or *owl* (Septuag. γλαύξ, Vulg., Luth., Michael., Oedmann strix otus, Winer, Bunsen); or *night hawk* (Engl. Vers., Kitto); or *falcon* (Luzz.); or *male ostrich* (Boch., Gesen., De Wette); or *cuckoo* (Knob.). But the whole list contains no such small and harmless bird as the swallow; the hawk, the falcon, and the ostrich, are mentioned before, and the owl and the sea-birds afterwards; and the cuckoo is simply a hazard, based on the belief that this bird ejects its foster parents from the nest, or eats their eggs and their young (*Arist.* H. A. VI. vii; IX. xx; *Ael.* N. A. III. 30).]

9. The following bird — שַׁחַף — has by some ancient versions been rendered *sea-gull* (larus), and though this translation is not intrinsically cogent, it may at least be adopted as probable. The gulls have aptly been called the "ravens of the sea"; for in their nature and habits, they indeed resemble the ravens. Like these they are almost omnivorous, and their greed seems wellnigh insatiable. They do not only eat fishes and insects, but they devour all smaller animals of the water; in the manner of fowls and pigeons they scrape up and collect whatever the shore supplies; like the vultures, they feed upon carrion, whether fresh or putrid; and they dart upon living booty like birds of prey — reasons enough why they should have been shunned as food by the Hebrews, though, diffused as they are over all parts of the globe, they were probably not spared by tribes inhabiting sea-coasts; at present the eggs of gulls and the flesh of the young birds, are eaten and much valued in some northern countries, as Norway and Greenland.

[Other translations of שַׁחַף, besides *gull* (so Sept., Vulg., Boch., Michael., Dathe, Gesen., De Wette, Buns., a. o.), are *cuckoo* (Luther, Engl. Vers.), or *sea-swallow* (tern, sterna, Kitto, a. o.), or *horn-owl* (Geddes, Boothroyd), or *hawk* (Knob., the Sam. has שופה or שאפה, and Saad., Ar. Erp., and Abus. render شاف or ساف, supposed to denote a kind of hawk), or some *lean* bird (comp. שַׁחֶפֶת *consumption*, שְׂחִיף *thin board*, Ezech. XLI. 6). On the sea-gull see *Brehm* l. c. IV. 867—885.]

10 and 11. In reference to the tenth and eleventh name — נֵץ and כּוֹס — we find a remarkable unanimity among ancient translators; these, though differing in the exact species, render nearly all *hawk* and *owl*, and it would be gratuitous to deviate from their tradition, which agrees, moreover, with the Biblical statements that the one, as a migratory bird, turns at the approach of winter with unwearied wings to more southern climes (Job XXXIX. 26), and that the other inhabits deserted ruins, being the type of loneliness and misery (Ps. CII. 7). The aversion with which the hawks were regarded, is not surprising; for while lacking the generous qualities or remarkable gifts of other birds of prey, such as the eagle and the falcon,

they yield to none in audacious rapacity directed, with incredible eagerness, upon both mammals, birds, and amphibia, and unsparing even of their own parents, mates, and offspring. They are in many varieties (לְמִינֵהוּ) spread over all parts of Asia, where several tribes deem them desirable food. — And the owls, especially those kinds that live not so much in forests as among the rubbish and fragments of crumbling edifices, combine various features which may well account for their being included among unclean birds; for they recall the notions of darkness and dreary solitude, and they repel by their ghastly shrieks; while some of them, dauntless and dangerous birds of prey, attack not only insects and mollusks, mice and rats, but also ducks and geese, crows and ravens, rabbits and hares, and even larger animals. Some species of owls, abounding in Palestine and Syria, are in great request for their flesh, which is considered palatable.

[נֵץ (Sept. ἱέραξ, Vulg. accipiter, Saad., Pers., Ar. Erp. باز, بازى, Aruch, Nachman. אשטו״ר autour, Kimchi אשפרוי״ר, from נצה or נצץ to fly, the "swift-winged", (ὀξύπτερος or ὠκύπτερος, comp. *Hom.* Il. XV. 237, 238; Od. XIII. 86; ὤκιστος or ἐλαφρότατος πετεηνῶν) has only by a few translators been rendered otherwise than hawk, namely *vulture* (by De Wette), or *falcon* (by Winer falco peregrinus), or *sparrow* (by Dathe). — The species of owl between which the translators fluctuate in their rendering of כּוֹס, are *screech-owl* (strix noctua, Jerome, Jonath. in Deut. and Targ. in Ps. CII. 7 קָוּפְּא, Rashi צואיט״ש chouettes), the *eared owl* (strix otus, Sept., Aquil., Theodot., νυκτικόραξ, Vulg. in Ps. l. c. nycticorax, Syr. עודא, Michael., Dathe), the *horn-owl* (Bubo maximus, "Uhu", Saad., Abus., Ar. Erp., Pers. بوم, Onk. קַדְיָא, Sam., Jonath. צַדְיָא, Vulg. bubo), or the common *barn-owl* (strix flammea, Kitto, Luther Käutzlein). — Some, however, interpret כוס by *pelican* or *cormorant* (Boch., Gesen., Fürst, Luzz., deriving the name from the "pouch" or "bag" hanging from the throat like the Latin truo from trua), others by *sea-gull* (Taylor a. o.). But it has been observed that the sitting owl, widening towards the upper part, has a *cup*-like appearance, which would also account for its Hebrew name (comp. *Thenius* on 1 Sam. XXVI. 20). The reading כיס found in some manuscripts, is no doubt erroneous (comp. *Michael.* Suppl. p. 1236), and the proposed reading בום, merely because the large owl or bubo is in Arabic بوم, is objectionable. On the hawk see *Brehm* l. c. III. 431—444, and on the owl ibid. pp. 586—624.]

12. In the list of Deuteronomy, which, as we have tried to render probable, is the foundation or rather the original of that of Leviticus, the owl (כוס) is followed by a name — יַנְשׁוּף — the etymology of which points to another crepuscular bird, and is perhaps a different kind of the order of owls found in very numerous varieties throughout all parts of Asia; and if the one term (כוס) represents the large *bubones* or "eared owls", the other (יַנְשׁוּף) denotes the smaller and less rapacious *striges* or "night-owls"; this harmonises with the Biblical allusion that the bird lives in deserted ruins, in company with the raven and similar birds (Isai. XXXIV. 11). It is not easy to see why the author of Leviticus departed, in this point, from the arrangement of his predecessor, and separated two birds which probably belong to the same class, unless it be that he desired to place together two almost synony-

mous names signifying piety and mercy (חֲסִידָה and רָחָם).

[We derive יַנְשׁוּף (or יַנְשׁוֹף in Isai. XXXIV. 11) from נֶשֶׁף darkness, night (Isai. V. 11; XXI. 4; etc.), taking it as the "night-bird" (noctua, Onk., Jon., Syr. קִיפּוֹפָא night-owl, comp. Targ. Ps. CII. 7, where כּוֹס is rendered by that term, Rashi צ״בי— hibou, Ebn Ezra, Kimchi "a bird which flies about in the dark," Bochart bubo, Engl. Vers. great owl, Michaelis Käutzchen, Dathe noctua, Knobel, Bunsen Uhu); others trace it to the root נָשַׁף in the sense of blowing, and understand a bird "uttering a sound like the blowing of a horn", such as the *ardea stellaris* or Agami (Rohrdommel or Trompetenvogel; Gesenius), or *heron*, or *crane*, or *ibis* (so Sept., Vulg., Oedmann, De Wette, Kitto), or *sea-crow* (κορώνη), or *fowl* (Luther Huhn); but most of these translations do not agree with the Biblical statement above referred to.]

13 and 14. The next two names — שָׁלָךְ and קָאָת — may, with some probability, be interpreted *cormorant* and *pelican*, both remarkable for their marvellous voracity and their rapacious habits — qualities in themselves sufficient to condemn them as unclean in the eyes of the Hebrew legislator. The cormorant not only chases fishes with impetuous and arrow-like swiftness, but lurking in the water, darts upon swallows and other birds as they flit by, or selecting its prey on the land, pursues small vertebrates and snatches them (שלך) with fatal certainty. It is frequent everywhere in northern and southern Europe and in Africa, in North-America and the West-Indies, in middle and in southern Asia, where it is successfully trained for fishing, especially by the Chinese. Its flesh, unpalatable to the taste of Europeans, except the Laplanders, is on account of its fatness deemed a rare delicacy by the Arabs. Partly greediness, and partly forethought for its young, impel the cormorant to stuff its crop and stomach almost to suffocation; and returning to the nest, it often disgorges dozens of fishes to feed a numerous family. This last peculiarity of "vomiting up" the contents of the stomach, is still more prominent in the pelican, which probably owes to it its Hebrew name (קָאָת from קִיא). The cormorant is supposed to keep conchiferous animals in its stomach, till they are warmed, and then to cast them forth again, in order to open the valves more easily and obtain their contents (comp. *Aristot.* Hist. An. IX. xi. 10; *Plin.* X. 40 or 56; *Ael.* N. A. III. 20; *Talm.* Chull. 63[a]). It is stamped as an aggressive and formidable robber by a long and powerful beak with its hooked and curved point, and its peculiar pouchlike appendage. Though it inhabits both hot and temperate climes, and is spread over the whole globe, it is in some parts, as in northern and middle Africa, found in incredible numbers. Unable to dip into the depth of the water on account of the air-filled sack beneath the beak, it lives upon the prey which it seizes on the surface of shallow rivers or lakes; as a rule, it eats indeed chiefly fishes and young swimming birds, but devours them in such vast quantities, that it may well be called insatiable. Generally selecting for its nest solitudes or isolated ruins, it is, like the owl, the picture of abandonment and misery (Ps. CII. 7; Isai. XXXIV. 11; Zeph. II. 14). Though its flesh has an oily taste, it is eaten by the Arabs; but the bird has been declared sacred by a Mohammedan law, which originated in the legend, that when the holy mosque in Mecca was

being built, the busy workmen, unwilling to delay the completion of the holy edifice by fetching water from a distance, were amply provided by hosts of pelicans which brought the water in their pouches.

[The תִּנְשֶׁמֶת is variously rendered as the *falcon* (Arab. شاهين) or *porphyrion* or purple water-hen (Sept. πορφυρίων, Kitto porphyrio hyacinthinus), or *pelican* (Oedmann pelec. onocrotalus), or *heron* (Gr. Ven. ἐρωδιός, Bunsen Purpurreiher), or *swan* (Vulg., Engl. Vers., De Wette, Luzzatto), or *bat* (Rashi קלב"א שורי"ץ chauve souris; comp. *Talm.* Chull. 63[a]; Luther), or *chameleon* (Gesen.), or *owl* (Onk. בְּוֵתָא, בּוֹתָא, or בַּבְתָא — the reading בותא seems corrupted —; Jon. אוּתְיָא, i. e. ὠτός ear-owl, and צַדְיָא i. e. صدا bubo, Syr. כבוכבי, i. e. κικκαβή or κοκκαβά night-owl; Gr. V. γλαύξ, Rashi, Kimchi, Bochart, Fürst, Knobel, strix stridula or strix flammea), or *goose* (Michaelis, who believes that goose-fat was especially interdicted to the Hebrews as increasing their tendency to skin diseases); and Ebn Ezra explains "a bird at which the beholder shudders" (ישום). About תִּנְשֶׁמֶת in the sense of chameleon see on ver. 30.—Greater unanimity prevails with respect to קָאַת, which many translate *pelican* (so Sept., Vulg. onocrotalus, i. e. ass-brayer with reference to its unpleasant cries, Engl. Vers., Bochart, Michael., Dathe, De Wette, Zunz, Fürst), but others *cuckoo* (Jon., Syr. קָקָא — comp. Physiologus Syrus ed. Tychsen, p. 110 —, Arab. قيق or قوق, Luzzatto), or the *bittern* or *miredrum* (ardea stellaris, Luther, Rosenmüller, Bunsen), or a kind of *partridge* (Kata قطا Knobel), or *swan* (Cassel, der Schwan p. LIII). On the cormorant and the pelican see *Brehm* l. c. IV. 923—933.]

15. With respect to the next bird — רָחָם, or רָחָמָה in Deuteronomy — we feel considerable perplexity. The analogy of Arabic would lead to a species of vulture (رخم or رخمة), as indeed Saadiah and other Arabic interpreters render; and the etymology which points to a "merciful" bird, seems to corroborate this meaning, since the vulture was in the ancient world reputed for exceeding affection towards its young (see *supra* p. 144). But are we permitted to suppose planless confusion in our list, which, if that were the correct sense, would begin with birds of prey, proceed to the "Runners" (as the ostrich), then to the crepuscular birds (the owls), next to the "Swimmers" (as the cormorant and pelican), and then return again to a chief species of birds of prey? Though the hawk (נֵץ) would have found a more appropriate place before the raven (עֹרֵב), the enumeration exhibits, on the whole, a certain well-considered order. We are, therefore, inclined to take רָחָם also as a species of pelican, which deserves, or was considered to deserve, the appellation of the "merciful" bird at least as much as the vulture; for "the pelicans", so writes one of the best and latest observers, "are as good-natured as they are intelligent; they live peacefully with all animals, and seem to be quite satisfied if they are left unharmed" (*Brehm* l. c. IV. 931); and as regards kindness to their young, it struck the ancients as so extraordinary that they invented the most marvellous fables, for instance, that pelicans throw themselves into the burning flames to rescue their young, or that, if unable to procure food for the latter, they rip open their breast to nourish them with their own life-blood; and the large pouch which is capable of holding about thirty pounds of water, was supposed to have been given to them by nature as a store-house to supply their off-

spring in times of need (comp. *Horap.* I. 54). That a "compassionate" creature to which such fine qualities were attributed, should have been classed among the unclean animals, may be understood by considering its association with the dreariness of ruins and waste solitudes, and by its proverbial and unconquerable gluttony, to which it not unfrequently sacrifices its habitual good temper and love of peace; and the aversion may have been confirmed by its voice, which resembles that of the unclean ass, whence the bird was designated "onocrotalus" or ass-brayer.

[Guided by the analogy of the Arabic, many have taken רָחָם as *vulture* (vultur percnopterus, so Engl. Vers. gier eagle, Dathe, Michael., Rosenm., De Wette, Winer, Knobel, Fürst, Bunsen, Luzzatto), while others have identified it with the *swan* (Sept. κύκνος, Kitto), or *porphyrion* (Vulg. purpurio), or *stork* (Luther), and even the *nightingale* (Pers. بلبل). Onkelos has יַרְקְרְקָא, a bird of "greenish" colour, supposed to denote a species of vulture, Jonath. and Syr. שַׁרְקְרָקָא, that is, "the hissing" bird, probably the *bee-eater* (merops); and the Talmud (Chull. 63ᵃ), modifying the etymological sense, contends that if the bird arrives and settles upon some tree crying *rakrak*, it is a sign that "mercy" (i. e. rain) is about to descend upon the earth (באו רחמים לעולם). The feminine רָחָמָה, which is found in Deuteronomy instead of רָחָם, is the earlier, and seems the more appropriate reading, because the characteristic affection of the pelicans towards their young was deemed most conspicuous in the females.]

16. Now follows, in the original list of Deuteronomy, a name — שָׁלָךְ — the etymology of which, like its Greek equivalent (καταῤῥάκτης) points to a bird that *darts* and *rushes* upon its prey, and which, therefore, may well be taken to mean the chief representative of the family of "fish-darters" (piscatrices). These, the most perfect of "web-footed birds" (Steganopodes), to which the pelican also belongs, are pre-eminently remarkable for their mastery in dart-like diving, and in this no species of the family excels so much as the "frigate-bird" or "man of war" bird, which fully deserves its name as "the swift-winged eagle of the sea" (tachypetes aquilus); for it surpasses in rapidity of flight even the tern and the gull: circling round in the air like the eagle or the vulture, it suddenly sweeps down from the giddy height, whenever its keen eye espies some porpoise or dolphin with a fish or some other favourite food; it forces from them their prey, and pursues them plunging into the depth of the sea; and so sure does it feel of its booty that it often drops a fish it has caught two or three times, to seize it again till it can hold it conveniently. A creature which shares so many characteristics of the most detested of the birds of prey, and which is found everywhere in the warm and the temperate zones, could well be included among the forbidden kinds.

[Most of the ancient and modern translators render שָׁלָךְ by some web-footed darter or some diver (urinator), as *fish-catcher* (Onk., Jon., Syr. שָׁלֵינוּנָא; comp. *Talm.* Chull. 63ᵃ, השולה דגים מן הים), or *pelican* (Gr. Ven., Knobel), or more particularly the *pelicanus Bassanus* (Bochart, Oedmann, Michaelis, De Wette, Fürst, Bunsen, Sturzpelikan), or *crab-eater* (Vulg. mergulus, Arab. غم; Dathe, Luzz.), or *cormorant* (Gr. Ven. in Deut., Engl. Vers., Kitto, a. o.); while some have *swan* (as Luther). On the frigate-bird see *Brehm* l. c. IV. 913—916.]

17. The following bird — חֲסִידָה — is mentioned in the Scriptures as a migratory bird that observes the seasons with nice precision, flies high "between earth and heaven", and builds its nest on the cypresses of mountain heights, such as the Lebanon, and whose kindness is placed in strong contrast to the cruelty of the ostrich (comp. Jer. VIII. 7; Zech. V. 9; Job XXXIX. 13; Ps. CIV. 17). It is remarkable that modern interpreters understand almost uniformly the *stork*, while many ancient versions have *heron* (Sept. ἐρωδιός); it is difficult to see why the former abandoned a wide-spread tradition, unless they did so because they believed that the appellation of "pious" bird (חֲסִידָה) was most suited for the stork, whose parental and filial devotion has been extolled by writers of all ages (comp. *Plin.* X. 23 or 31; *Ael.* N. A. III. 23; X. 16; XI. 30). But this cannot be deemed a decisive argument; moreover, storks seldom, if ever, build their nests on trees. No valid objection can, in fact, be raised against the old translation of heron, especially if we take the noblest representative of the family, the famous *white* or *silver heron* (λευκερωδιός, herodias alba), which may well have struck observers as kind and good-tempered, if they compared it with its nearest relations, as the common heron (ardea cinerea), which, as a rule, are malicious, quarrelsome, and destructive. The silver heron is distinguished by its slender body, long neck, and weak bill, and especially by a plumage of resplendent white, and large and beautiful back-feathers, the well-known heron-plumes. It is found in the south-eastern parts of Europe, almost in the whole of Asia and northern Africa, near secluded lakes and morasses, where often vast numbers are congregated and present a splendid sight. It flies higher and more rapidly than most birds of the order of "Waders" or "Stilt-walkers" (Grallatores). For its nests it selects the tops of the loftiest trees, and seems to prefer the thicket of a high cane-brake only in regions where it deems the exposed trees unsafe. In England, the flesh of the common heron was formerly considered a delicacy, and heron-hawking was a favourite pastime of the wealthy, wherefore the bird and its eggs were protected by laws and fines.

[The name חֲסִידָה is rendered *heron* by the Greek translators (Septuag., Aquil., Theodot., Gr. V., ἐρωδιός), the Vulgate (herodio), perhaps Onkel. (חִוַּרְתָּא "the white bird"), Kimchi, Luther (Reiger), Winer, Fürst, a. o.; but *vulture* by Targ. Jon. (דַּיְתָא חִוַּרְתָּא, "the white vulture"; comp. *Talm.* Chull. 63[a] דיה לבנה); *hawk* by Michaelis; *kite* by Vulg. in Jer. VIII. 7; *stork* by Rashi (ציגוני״א cigogne), Bochart, Engl. Vers., Gesen., Kitto, De Wette, Zunz, Luzzatto, Bunsen, a. o. On the white heron see *Brehm* l. c. pp. 700—705, and on the family of Ardea in general *ibid.* pp. 694—717.]

18. The etymology of the next name — אֲנָפָה — points vaguely to an "angry" bird (Gr. Ven. θυμοτρίς), and it would indeed be hazardous to venture upon any distinct species unwarranted by tradition. Now the Greek translators render *charadrios* (χαραδριός) proverbial for its greediness, the Arabic interpreters have *parrot*, and the Targum *ibis* (אבו threskiornis religiosa). Among these versions the last-named seems to deserve the preference, for the ibis belongs to the "Waders" like the heron, occurs in a variety of wide-spread species (לְמִינָהּ), and was eaten as a dainty; whilst the identity of charadriosis uncertain, as it fluctuates between the

lap-wing, the plover, and several other birds; and the parrot is not found in Palestine, and was hardly known in the countries of the Mediterranean before the time of Alexander the Great. It was certainly most appropriate to proscribe as unclean a bird divinely honoured by neighbouring nations. For, appearing in Egypt almost simultaneously with, and thus announcing, the rising of the wealth-creating Nile, the ibis was deified like the river itself, and held sacred to Thoth. It was deemed, moreover, most beneficent by killing serpents, lizards, and other noxious animals, and for this quality it was so famous that, according to Josephus, Moses, when marching against the Ethiopians, took with him a number of ibises as a protection against the reptiles (Ant. II. x. 2). Greek divinities, and especially Hermes, were supposed to have frequently appeared in the form of the ibis, which was believed to have invented various arts and useful cures, to live to a fabulous old age, or never to die, and to lay four eggs "according to the four phases of the moon." Therefore, while alive, it was protected with religious scrupulousness, and when dead, it was most carefully embalmed, and entombed at Hermopolis: the pyramid of Sakahra, enclosing thousands of ibis mummies piled up in urns or in chambers, and the mummies that have been found in Thebes, Abydos, and Memphis, still bear witness to the funeral honours that were bestowed upon the bird (comp. *Herod.* II. 67, 76; *Plin.* VIII. 27 or 41; X. 12 or 15, 28 or 40; *Ael.* N. A. X. 29; *Strab.* XVII. I. 40; *Am. Marc.* XXII. xv. 25; *Wilkins*, Anc. Eg. II. 122). It is remarkable that it is at present very rarely seen in Egypt, but frequently in the southern parts of Nubia. Its head and neck are bare and of a black colour, the eyes crimson, and the feathers mostly white with occasional shades of yellow, blue, and dark. Though, on the whole, peaceful and unaggressive, it is not free from that vicious irritability which characterises the whole order, especially when anxious to satisfy its voracity, which is fatal to insects, especially beetles and locusts, and also to mollusks and small snakes.

[There can be no doubt that the correct reading is וְהָאֲנָפָה (with ו), which is found in Deuteronomy, and has in our passage been rendered by the ancient translators: for it seems inadmissible to take הָאֲנָפָה as an adjective belonging to הַחֲסִידָה, "the tufted heron", whereby the significant number of *twice ten* birds would be reduced to nineteen; moreover, אֲנָף in the sense of tuft, like עָנָף, is extremely doubtful. Other translations of אֲנָפָה, besides the three mentioned above (viz. χαραδριός, parrot, and ibis), are *falcon* (*Talm.* Chull. 63[a], דיה רגזנית the wrathful falcon), a kind of *eagle* (Bochart زمج), *heron* (Rashi הירון, Engl. Vers.), *jay* (Luth. Reher), *crane*, *curlew*, *woodcock*, or *kite* (Kitto on ver. 19). Arguments against the parrot are given in *Sommer's* Bibl. Abhandlungen, I. 255, 256; on the sacred ibis see *Brehm* l. c. pp. 658—663.]

19. The next bird — הַדּוּכִיפַת — belongs to a different class, the "Searchers" (Investigatores); for the *hoopoe* (upupa, epops) is unquestionably meant. According to the Talmud, it bears its Hebrew name, "because its crest is thick" (שהודו כפות, Chull. 63[a]); and in fact, a fan-like crest forms its most striking characteristic, to which may be added an extremely long and slender bill with an excessively short and stunted tongue, variegated plumage, large and broad wings, and a blunt tail. It is found in the wooded

plains of the greater part of Europe, northern Africa, and middle Asia down to Cashmere. In the warm latitudes, the dirty bird delights, like the vultures, in carcasses and garbage, feeds with predilection upon insects found in or near dunghills and mire; and deserves, therefore, fully to be classed among the "unclean" species; it is, moreover, quarrelsome with its own kind and with other birds, though it may be tamed to a great degree of familiarity with man, and was among the ancients reputed for its filial tenderness (*Ael.* Natur. Anim. III. 26; comp. *Horapoll.* II. 92). The nauseous smell of parents and offspring during the brooding time, and for weeks after they leave their loathsome nest, gradually wears off, and in the autumn their flesh, in taste like that of quails, is in much request; yet it is not eaten by the Mohammedans; among them, as among the Jews, the "hudhud" (هدهد) is the subject of many cherished legends; it is supposed to have procured for Solomon the wonderful worm *shamir*, which was indispensable to him for the erection of the Temple, and to have rendered him many other important services.

[The etymology of הַדּוּכִיפַת is uncertain, and the different derivations, which it would be useless to mention, lead to no safe inference; besides *hoopoe* (so Sept. ἔποψ, Vulg. upupa, Saad., Ar. Erp., Abus., Pers., Rashi הרופ"א huppé crest, Luther, Michael., Dathe, De Wette, Kitto, Luzzatto, Bunsen, a. o.), the word has been rendered *mountain-cock* (tetrao urogallus, "Auerhahn"), belonging to the gallinaceous birds or "Scratchers" (Rasores; comp. *Brehm* l. c. pp. 335—347; so probably Syr. תרנגולא ברא "wild cock", Onk. and Jon. נַגַּר טוּרָא lit. "mountain-workman", "mountain-pecker", comp. *Talm.* Gitt. 68[b], Gr. Ven. ἀργιαλεκτορίς, Bochart gallus agrestis seu montanus), or the *wild peacock* (פואון שלבייא paon sauvage); while Anan the Karaite and his followers understand the common cock, and hence count the gallinaceous birds to the unclean species which must on no account be offered on the altar (see *Ebn Ezra* in loc.; comp. *Fürst*, Karäerth. I. 53). On the hoopoe see *Brehm* l. c. pp. 22—26, and on דוכיפת, נגר טורא, etc. *P. Cassel*, Schamir, Ein archäologischer Beitrag, pp. 72—94.]

20. The last name — עֲטַלֵּף — has by a common tradition been understood to mean the *bat*; for the Hebrews, like the Arabs, classed this animal among the birds, because the membranous expansion which distinguishes it bears a resemblance to wings and bestows the power of flight (see *infra* p. 157). The bat was by some tribes eagerly caught and eaten, especially salted.

[Few only have rendered עֲטַלֵּף otherwise than *bat* (as Syr. *peacock* טוסא, Luther *swallow*), and the correctness of that translation can hardly be doubted.]

---

If we once more survey our list, we find, that those birds were stamped as unclean which are remarkable for rapacity and bloodthirstiness, for fierce impetuosity and insatiable greed, for cruelty and reckless destructiveness, those that live upon carrion and putrid food, and those that recall the notions of night and darkness, of desert, solitude, and decay.

The writer left it to his readers to deduce the signs and to apply them in every single instance. He preferred stating the unlawful, and not, as his predecessor did with respect to quadrupeds, the clean kinds (Deut. XIV. 4, 5), because he hoped thus to teach more briefly, since the number of

clean birds is supposed to be preponderating, and also more distinctly and more accurately, since even a few of the birds mentioned clearly suggest their disqualifying characteristics. These have by Jewish tradition been described in great detail. Evidently examining, on the one hand, such species as the ossifrage and the vulture, and on the other hand, such as the pigeon and turtle-dove, it declared unclean (1.) the birds which strike (דרס) with their claws, whether they do so in order to hold down their prey firmly for the purpose of consuming it, or to tear and to devour it while still alive; (2.) those which, in standing upon an extended rope, "divide their feet", that is, place two toes on the one and two on the other side, and not three in front and one behind; and (3.) those which snatch their food in the air, and eat it without first dropping it on the ground. But it pronounced clean the birds which have (1.) "a prolonged toe" (אצבע יתירה), that is, probably a middle front-toe more prominent than the rest, and are thus enabled to dig out grains from the ground; (2.) a crop (זפק) to receive the food for preliminary soaking; and (3.) a strong and muscular second stomach or gizzard (קורקבן), whose inner coat, covered with a slimy mucous membrane, can be peeled off from the fleshy part with the hand, without the aid of a knife. Yet it was soon discovered that these three signs can in themselves not be relied upon as decisive, for they would, for instance, legalise the raven, which is expressly mentioned among the prohibited kinds; hence they were not considered final, unless the bird is, besides, known not to "strike", and is by a sure tradition regarded as clean (see *Mishn.* Chull. III. 6; *Talm.* Chull. 65ᵃ; *Yor. Deah* § 82; comp. *Aristot.* Hist. An. II. XII. 14, 15). Again, Jewish doctors established this distinction that the eggs of clean birds have the yolk in the middle and the white around it, and that they are narrower on one and broader on the other end; while those of unclean birds have the white in the middle and the yolk around it, and are at the end equally narrow or equally broad (*Talm.* Avod. Zar. 40ᵃ; Chull. 64ᵃ). But the "striking" (דריסה) was ultimately taken as the infallible, as it is the most obvious, test invariably stamping the bird as unclean; for it was looked upon as a proof that "the blood of the bird, heated on account of its innate cruelty, causes the internal organs to be blackened and burnt up, and engenders fierceness of temper" (*Nachman.* in loc. fol. 90ᵇ). Anan, the Karaite, taught that "the clean birds lick the water and drink, and feed their young"; but many members of his sect held these criteria to be as illusory as those set forth by tradition (comp. R. Aaron II in his Commentary on Leviticus — כתר תורה — fol. 25ᵇ, edited by R. Jud. Savaskan, Eupatoria — גוזלווא — 1866).

Philological Remarks. — Targum Jonathan inserts here (ver. 13) the Rabbinical signs of unclean birds above referred to ("those that have no ציבעא יתירא, nor a זפקתא, and whose קורקבן cannot be peeled off"); comp. also *Siphra* 50ᵇ (מה הנשר מפורש אין לו זפק וכו'); *Maim.* De Cib. Vet. I. 16. The Talmudical criterion of דריסה has, with less probability, been explained to mean impinging the claws in smaller birds; or snatching with the talons the prey from the ground before it is taken into the mouth, or seizing and devouring it in the air while flying; and the אצבע יתירה is usually understood as a separate toe or talon behind the rest, which acceptation is excluded by the fact that such toe

is found in most of the eagles, and in other notorious birds of prey. How many species the author actually intended to prohibit, it is impossible to say; the number 24 stated in the Talmud (Chull. 63), is imaginary, since it is simply made up of the twenty species really enumerated, and the *four* repetitions of the term "after its kind" occurring in the list. — The passage of Deuteronomy (XIV. 12—18) corresponding to ours, specifies not 20 but 21 birds, or "three heptads" (*Sommer*, Bibl. Abhandl. I. 253; comp. *Kurtz*, Opferc. p. 6): namely instead of וְאֶת־הַדָּאָה וְאֶת־הָאַיָּה Deuteron. reads וְהָרָאָה וְאֶת־הָאַיָּה וְהַדַּיָּה. It seems natural to conjecture that הראה and הדיה are only orthographic modifications of the same word, א and י being occasionally interchanged (see Gram. II. p. 57), and that והראה has crept into the text of Deuteronomy by some mistake, unless the compilers of Leviticus omitted it on purpose, in order to produce the significant number of 20 animals (see p. 59). Ebn Ezra (on Lev. XI. 14 and Deut. XIV. 11) proposes, without proof, to take דאה as a generic term comprising the two species ראה and דיה, or איה and דיה. The Talmud (Chull. 63[b]) chooses to consider ראה and דאה as identical, the one derived from the *vision*, the other from the *flight* of the bird, which opinion has been adopted by later writers (as Man. ben Isr., Bochart, Rosenm., a. o.), and been supported by the analogy of דודנים and רודנים (Gen. X. 4 and 1 Chr. I, 7); ריפת and דיפת (Gen. X. 3 and 1 Chr. I. 6); דעואל and רעואל (Num. I. 14 and II. 14); and above all וַיֵּרָא and וַיֵּדֶא (2 Sam. XXII. 11 and Ps. XVIII. 11); but these variations, as is especially evident from the last instance, really imply different readings in the earliest manuscripts or traditions. The Samaritan codex has הראה both in Levit. and Deuter., and omits הדיה in Deuter. (so also the Sept., Ar. Erp., and some masor. manuscripts of Kennic.). Knobel's opinion (Levit. p. 449), that דיה is an addition later made in Deuter. from Leviticus, is based upon the assumption that it occurs in Levit., where, however, it does not occur; and Keil's suggestion (Lev. p. 75), that the list in Leviticus, meant to be merely illustrative, could in Deuteronomy be fitly increased by one or even more animals, is a convenient evasion, the weakness of which needs hardly be pointed out. See also *Hartmann*, Forschungen, pp. 230, 231. — The order in which the birds are enumerated is not identical in Deut. and Levit.: the difference with respect to דאה and איה has just been stated; and שלך, which here stands immediately after כוס, is in Deuter. placed considerably later, and follows only after רָחָם (or rather רָחָמָה, see p. 151). The Sept. deviates, besides, from the masoretic sequence in transposing the word נֵץ (ἱέραξ) in Levit., though not in Deuter., and giving it an earlier place after ערב (κόραξ, ver. 15); the transposition does not, however, extend to the whole verse (as is assumed by Michaelis, in Orient. Bibl. II. 213), and the omission of the 15th verse in the Cassel manuscr. (*Michael.* l. c.) is simply a mistake of the copyist. — If the more frequent use of את as sign of the accusative be peculiar to the later stages of the Hebrew language, it is curious to notice that, in our verses, that particle occurs 9 times where it is omitted in the parallel passage of Deuteronomy, that in fact, in our verses, it is but once wanting (in והאנפה ver. 19). This is the most important of the minor differences of the two texts; for we can lay no stress upon the reading הַדַּיָּה in Deut. instead of the masculine

20. All winged creeping things that go upon four, *shall be* an abomination to you. 21. Yet these you may

form רָזִים, nor upon the occasional omission of the connecting particle ו in the one Book or the other.

**20—25.** The "winged creeping things" (שֶׁרֶץ הָעוֹף), to which the Deuteronomist alludes with a few passing words, merely prohibiting them for food as unclean (XIV. 19), are next treated of by the levitical writer with evident care. But his statements present considerable difficulties. What are "winged creeping things"? Are they insects? We must answer, No; for they are distinctly described as "going upon four feet" (הַהֹלֵךְ עַל־אַרְבַּע) or as "having four feet" (אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ אַרְבַּע רַגְלַיִם); whereas the insects have invariably six, two on each of the three jointed rings of the thorax. It is, in fact, an essential point in the definition of insects that they have six feet. The authority of Aristotle has been appealed to. But that authority which, were it even favourable, would prove nothing against nature, is opposed to those who invoke it. For Aristotle remarks: "Some insects have the *first* pair of feet larger . . . in order to wipe off with them whatever falls upon the eyes, as we see the common flies and bee-like insects do; and the *last* pair is larger than the *middle* one, partly to be more serviceable for walking, and partly to enable the insects to rise more easily from the ground when about to fly." Indeed flies, as is well known, use their hairy legs as a kind of brush, wiping with the foremost pair the dust from the eyes, and with the hindmost from the wings, after which they cleanse the legs themselves by rubbing them against each other: but those observations of Aristotle manifestly pre-suppose *six* feet; moreover, the author adds distinctly, "*All* creatures of this kind have six legs, including those that serve for leaping (ἑξάποδα δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα πάντα εἰσὶ σὺν τοῖς ἁλτικοῖς μορίοις; De Part. Anim. IV. VI. 1, 5); and all recent investigations have confirmed the fact, that "three pairs of locomotive limbs are characteristic of perfect insects" (*Huxley*, Elem. of Comp. Anat. p. 57). Again, even if, for argument's sake, we lay no stress upon the number of feet, we must ask, Are all insects winged? It is well known, that the class includes several wingless species, viz. not only the females of some kinds, as the female or working ant (belonging to the hymenoptera), and the females of the mantis, the earwig, the cockroach, and others of the order of orthoptera, but both males and females of a part of the order hemiptera (the louse, bug, a. o.), and the flea (one of the diptera). In fact, the only four-footed animals with wings are bats, and these are in our very chapter counted among the birds (ver. 19), though they really belong to the mammalia. There are indeed a few animals provided with a membranous expansion or broad fold of skin along the flanks, or between the fore and hind legs, and also between the two hind-legs themselves, as the "Flying Dragon" (draco volans), a harmless lizard, the "Flying Lemur" (Galeopithecus or colugo), and the "Flying Squirrel" (Pteromys). But that extension of skin can in no sense be designated a wing; it is by those creatures merely used as a kind of parachute, to sustain themselves while leaping from branch

**eat of all winged creeping things that go upon four [six] — *those* that have *strong* upper joints above their**

to branch, and it does not qualify them for continuous flight. What then are "the winged creeping things"? Fortunately, the Biblical text is sufficiently explicit to dispel all doubt and to permit a clear inference. It mentions as lawful species of the "winged creeping things" several kinds of *locusts*. Now, these are winged; they have six feet; two of them are indeed peculiarly formed, but their exceptional structure is by no means so important as to constitute a new class of animal. The locusts are insects; their right of being numbered among them has never been questioned; and insects are undoubtedly meant by "winged creeping things", since they both walk or crawl and fly. The Chaldee translation of Jonathan exemplifies these animals by the fly, the wasp, and the bee; Jewish tradition has invariably taken the same view; Rashi explains the term by "small and diminutive creatures that crawl upon the ground, as the flies and hornets, the gnats and locusts"; and Maimonides includes in it "fly, gnat, hornet, and bee" (De Cib. Vet. II. 5). We are, therefore, compelled to conclude (1.) The fact that wingless insects exist was disregarded by the writer, whether he believed that the wings are an unessential criterion of insects, or not; and (2.) The words "all that walks upon all four", and "all that has four feet" are incorrect. Six feet are required by the context, and six must here be read and understood. But it remains to enquire — How did this extraordinary mistake originate? Is it attributable to the traditional text or to the author? All ancient versions, without any exception, render *four* feet; this reading seems, therefore, as old as the diffusion of the Hebrew text itself, and it would be arbitrary to suppose that four was inserted by the copyist instead of six. But we believe we are able to prove that the mistake is due to the author, and even to show how he was betrayed to fall into the error. Let us turn to the parallel passage in Deuteronomy (XIV. 19, 20). After the enumeration of the unclean birds, it continues: "And every winged creeping thing (שרץ העוף) shall be unclean to you; they must not be eaten: all clean fowls you may eat." It will be observed (1.) That the text in Deuteronomy does not qualify the creatures by the number of their legs, to which it does not allude at all; and (2.) That the "winged creeping things" are manifestly *birds*; for they are introduced in the midst of commands relating to birds (comp. vers. 11 and 20); on any other supposition the last words "all clean fowls you may eat" would be unintelligible. These two important differences lead to the following conclusions. The Deuteronomist understood the words rendered "winged creeping thing" (שרץ העוף) as "unclean bird"; he evidently placed the terms "clean birds" and "clean fowls" (צפור טהורה and עוף טהור) in juxtaposition to "unclean bird" (vers. 11, 19, 20), as a calm examination of the passage must convince every reader; that the words שרץ העוף bear such meaning, nay demand it in the context, requires no proof, for שֶׁרֶץ denotes the unclean animals of all classes and species generally (see p. 50). Thus the text in Deuteronomy is clear and consistent. Now, the writer of Levi-

feet *in the hindmost legs*, to leap therewith upon the earth; 22. These of them you may eat: the migratory

*ticus*, who had Deuteronomy before him, obviously believing the general injunction "every unclean bird shall not be eaten" (Deut. XIV. 19) superfluous after the detailed enumeration of the unclean species (see p. 128), restricted that injunction to the *last* of the species mentioned, the *bats* (עֲטַלֵּף); he was perhaps aware that bats are no bipeds, and had been wrongly placed among the birds; he described them with sufficient accuracy as "winged creeping things that go upon four"; and the great number of species of the bat-tribe, that were actually eaten, may have made such addition appear desirable. But the phrase שרץ העוף could easily and naturally be applied to the smaller "winged creeping things", or to insects: therefore a later reviser, desirous of inserting the permission of eating locusts, took the verse "all winged creeping things that go upon four, shall be an abomination to you" to refer to insects, perhaps understanding the phrase "walking upon all four" to refer to any indefinite number of legs (see *infra*); and he introduced that verse as a general rule, from which he excepted the locusts as lawful food. Thus the mistake of attributing four feet to locusts and to all other insects, remains; but we can account for its origin, we see that it crept into the Pentateuch at a late period, and that it is a result of the very peculiar and complex manner in which that work was gradually completed and concluded. The veil will never be withdrawn from the composition and growth of the Law, unless it is admitted, that the levitical precepts form the latest additions, and are, in spirit and detail, more advanced than those of Deuteronomy. But with this conviction as a guide, the mystery is lessened, and may in time be entirely solved. How, on the opposite view, the omission, in Deuteronomy, of all mention of clean locusts can be explained, it is difficult to see. Could a recapitulation, however compendious, suppress an important and a striking feature which might have been inserted with a few concise words? In any summary of the dietary laws — and they are stated in Deuteronomy with considerable fulness — the permitted species of the "winged creeping things" would unquestionably have been alluded to, had that summary been made from a work such as Leviticus, containing a provision in favour of those insects (see also p. 124). How the locusts, "unclean" (שֶׁרֶץ) in every respect, a ravaging scourge while living, and often the cause of dire pestilence by their sudden death, could be allowed for food by an apparently unwarranted deviation, has been explained above (p. 126).

The four sorts of locusts here specified are not easy of identification; but so much is certain from the addition "after its kind", made in each instance, that certain chief genera are intended (see Philolog. Remarks). Jewish tradition maintains, that 8 species of clean locusts are literally implied in the text, and that there exist altogether 800 species (*Talm.* Shabb. $90^b$; Chull. 65; Taan. $22^b$; *Maimon.* De Cib. Vet. I. 21—23). The Mishnah (Chull. III. 7) thus describes the criteria of the clean kinds: they have four legs, four wings, and springing legs

**locust (*arbeh*) after its kind, and the locust *solam* after its kind, and the locust *chargol* after its kind, and the locust**

(קרסולים), and their wings cover the greater part of the body; and having these four signs, they must be known under the name *chagav* (חָגָב): which rules, explained, qualified, and expanded in the Talmud (Chull. 65, 66; Av. Zar. 37), no more lead to a distinct conclusion than the surmises of subsequent Jewish writers, some of whom place the springing legs "near the neck"! (see *infra*). Indeed later and stricter casuists entirely forbid locusts, because it is at present impossible to distinguish the clean from the unclean species (comp. *Rashi* in loc.; *Yor. Deah* § 85).

It is well known that locusts are extensively eaten in various forms of preparation. They are roasted on red-hot coals or on an iron plate, or dried in the oven or in the sun on the roofs of houses, when they keep and remain eatable for years; they are cooked alive by being thrown into boiling water copiously mixed with salt and then dried in the sun, after which their heads, feet, and wings are plucked off, and their bodies freed from the salt; or they are boiled, or stewed, or fried in butter, and so spread on unleavened bread; or they are ground to flour in hand-mills, or pounded into powder in stone mortars; the flour and the powder, usually mixed with corn-flour, are made into a dough by kneading them with water, and then baked into cakes or bread; or the powder is sprinkled with milk and so consumed (*Herod.* IV. 172). They are eaten both in years of famine and of plenty, and in seasons of scarcity they form not rarely the only nourishment for whole tribes (*Diod. Sic.* III. 29); they are relished by the natives, especially at breakfast, though more often by the poor than by the rich, and more by the Arabs than the Turks; they are neither disagreeable in taste which resembles that of shrimps and prawns or sprats, nor, as a rule, injurious to health; often they have even been employed medicinally, and taken with wine, have been considered efficacious against the sting of scorpions (*Diosc.* II. 57). Hence they are commonly offered in the market, or ordinarily sold in shops by the measure, either in sacks and baskets, or drawn on strings, and they find ready purchasers. The Jews in Yemen buy and eat them freely, and believe that locusts are the "birds" (שלו) which God sent the Israelites as food in the desert; and this questionable opinion is shared by some western scholars (as Ludolf, Niebuhr, and Oken). It is remarkable that the inhabitants of the peninsula of Mount Sinai, where the Hebrews are said to have received the dietary laws, are the only Bedouins "who do not use the locust as an article of food" (*Burckhardt*, Bedouins, p. 376): however, the dietary laws of the Pentateuch were not given in the peninsula of Mount Sinai, but in Palestine, and were suggested by much later habits and exigencies.

While our author was following the guidance of Deuteronomy, he coupled the prohibition of the unlawful animals with the simple injunction, "Of their flesh you must not eat, and their carcass you must not touch" (vers. 8, 11); but now, taking his own path, he is unable to conceal a more advanced age and a more developed system. He ordains repea-

*chagav* after its kind. 23. But all *other* winged creeping things which have four feet, *shall be* an abomination to

tedly, "Whoever touches their carcass shall be unclean until the evening; and whosoever bears ought of their carcass, shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the evening" (vers. 24, 25, 28, 31, 40, 41). Thus a nice gradation is established between touching and carrying an unclean carcass, and a decided ceremonialism is everywhere manifest; for the levitical spirit had begun to pervade religion and all relations of life. But an additional and a very remarkable difference is apparent. Another levitical legislator was not satisfied with measures of lustration so lenient, in cases of defilement by unclean carcasses; he looked even upon involuntary or inadvertent pollution as an offence to be expiated by a signal act of religious penance; and he ordained a sin-offering for any such emergency whatever (v. 2, 3). How this rigorous and oppressive law was abandoned, has been pointed out in another place (see Comm. on Lev. I. 41, 42, 509).

Philological Remarks. — The meaning of the term שרץ העוף cannot be doubtful as regards the language, whatever difficulties it may offer with respect to the sense: it is "a creeping thing with wings"; the *Scpt.* renders literally ἑρπετὰ τῶν πετεινῶν; and so *Onk.* and *Jonath.* רחשא דעפא; *Bunsen* not inaptly "alles geflügelte Kleingethier"; inaccurately *Vulg.* omne de volucribus; *Luther* "was sich reget unter den Vögeln"; *Rosenm.* insecta salientia; indistinctly *Michaelis* "alles Mittelding von Geflügeltem"; *Nachmanides* explains, "The winged creatures with four legs, the neck and head of which are bent downward, as in reptiles, and do not, as in birds, rise upward"; but he omits to give instances of animals so peculiar; *Jonathan* who, as has been stated above, inserts after these words, "the species of flies, and the species of wasps, and the species of bees" (comp. *Talm.* Chull. 65, 66), adds at the end "but bee-honey may be eaten"; for Jewish tradition, though as a rule strictly adhering to the canon, that whatever comes from an unclean creature is itself unclean (see *supra* p. 129), declared the honey of bees unobjectionable, because it is not the direct produce of the insects, but a preparation from the gathered juices of herbs (comp. *Talm.* Bechor. 7[b]; *Maimon.* De Cib. Vet. III. 3; *Yor. Deah* § 81. 8). — In ver. 42, Targ. Jonath. renders the words וכל הולך על ארבע וכ' "all that go upon all four from the serpent to the centiped (or milliped נַדַּל) which has many feet" (a class connecting the crustacea with the insects); while the Talmud (Chull. 67[b]) understands by הולך על ארבע the scorpion, which belongs to the spider-tribe. Hence the phrase "going upon all four" הולך על ארבע, as in some modern languages, evidently pointed to the low or crawling movement of the body near the ground, rather than to the exact number of feet: therefore, whereas in ver. 20 it is taken literally, it is in the following verse unmistakably applied to insects with six legs, although these creatures are immediately afterwards described as אשר לו ארבע רגלים, which words permit no other interpretation than just "four legs." — The correct reading (in ver. 21) is unquestionably the Keri אשר לו כרעים, not the Kethiv אשר לא כר'. The decisive argument against the latter reading is, that it is opposed to fact and nature, for locusts *have*

you; 24. And by these you are rendered unclean; whosoever touches their carcass shall be unclean until the even-

"כרעים above their feet to leap therewith" (see *infra*). The sense of לוֹ is expressed by all ancient translators; לוֹ is found in the Samaritan codex, and in many manuscripts of Kennic. and De Rossi (comp. Var. Lect. I. 94, 95); while the reading לא, taken in its usual sense, would be utterly unintelligible in the context, though it has been expressed by Luther a. o., and supported by early Jewish casuists who translate, "which, though having no כרעים at the time, grow them later" (*Talm.* Chull. 65[a]). If לא is to be retained, it must be considered as identical in meaning with לוֹ, and as differing from it merely in orthography; it is not impossible, as has been conjectured, that לוֹ, being in ancient times often written לוא, with א *otiosum* (see Gramm. II. p. 59), was in some cases, by a questionable application of *scriptio defectiva*, written לא. Certain it is, that the same Kethiv and Keri (לא and לוֹ) occur in several other passages also, where the Keri לוֹ is required by the sense (Exod. XXI. 8; Lev. XXV. 30; 1 Sam. II. 3; Isai. IX. 2); while in others (as Job XLI. 4) the Kethiv לֹא, and in others again (as 1 Sam. XX. 2) the Keri לא is preferable (comp. also 2 Sam. XVIII. 12 —Keth. וְלֹא, Ker. וְלוּ; Mic. II. 11 —Keth. לוּ, other reading הלוא; and on the Masoretic interchange of לא or לוֹ with לוּ see *Geiger's* Jüd. Zeitschr. VI. 21—31). No uncertainty is possible as to the entire phrase in which the characteristic of the locusts is set forth, אשר לו כרעים ממעל לרגליו לנתר בהן על הארץ, that is literally, "which have thighs above their feet to leap therewith upon the earth". It must be observed, (1.) Those words do not describe the locusts' legs generally, but only the third or hindmost pair, for these alone differ in their use and structure from the legs of other insects. (2.) These legs consist indeed, like those of all insects, of three joints and no more, but the second joint, which is above the *tarsi* or the series of smaller segments terminating the foot, is, in locusts, particularly long and powerful, and is used by them to stem themselves on the ground, and by these means to leap considerably, in some instances 200 times their full length (comp. Job XXXIX. 20). (3.) This second joint must be understood by כרעים, which fully admits this sense (see Comm. on Levit. I. 478), while the lowest set of joints, or the tarsi, is appropriately expressed by רגל, the foot in the stricter sense. (The Arabs call the two springing legs simply *feet*, *Nieb.* Arab. 170.) Therefore, the words under discussion might be thus paraphrased: — the insects that have in their hindmost legs the second joint, or that above the proper foot, so strong as to be able to leap therewith upon the earth. Impossible meanings have been attributed to the words ממעל לרגליו: they have been explained to signify "over and above" or "besides the feet", yielding the translation "all that, besides the feet, have two hind-legs" (so *Sommer*, Bibl. Abh. I. 259, Bunsen, Luzzatto), as if ממעל ל' could ever have that meaning (Isai. VI. 2 is no parallel at all), and as if the locusts alone of the class שרץ העוף had six feet; or "above the four ordinary legs, near the neck" (as Rashi, Bartenurah, and other Jewish writers surprisingly interpret), whereas the springing legs are the lowest or last, and not the

**ing. 25. And whosoever bears *ought* of their carcass, shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the evening.**

highest pair on the thorax (comp. *Aristot.* De Part. An. IV. vi. 5); or "rising above the proper legs", that is (as Bochart, Michaelis, and others explain), the locusts have besides the *four legs* upon which they walk or creep along, two much larger and higher springing legs, which, if the creatures sit or walk, not only project above the proper legs, but also above the back; but (1.) כרעים cannot mean the entire legs including the three parts or joints, for they are invariably expressed by רגלים, and (2.) the elliptical sense attributed to כרעים ממעל לרגליו is entirely against the Hebrew usage. Most of the interpreters render the words so literally that their translations are not less indistinct than the Hebrew original itself (Sept. ἃ ἔχει σκέλη ἀνώτερον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῶν; Onkel., Jonath., Engl. Vers., "that have legs above their feet", Dathe, De Wette, a. o.); the Vulgate expresses the sense imperfectly (habet longiora retro crura), entirely omitting ממעל לרגליו; and Luther erroneously ("und nicht mit zweien Beinen auf Erden hüpfet", see *supra*): — בָּהֵן refers to כרעים which is *feminine* (comp. Am. III. 12), for the locusts leap by means of the middle joint, not by the proper foot (or tarsi), which is short and weak. The reading בהם, therefore, in the Samaritan Codex and some manuscripts, is not acceptable.

Just as the Arabs eat some kinds of locusts and reject others, and as the Persians even divide all locusts into "lawful" and "forbidden" classes, so the levitical legislator permitted to the Hebrews only some of the many genera which have frequently, though somewhat conflictingly, been described by old and modern travellers and naturalists. These distinguish the green and the yellow, the red and the grey, the light and fat, the flying and the leaping locust; and the subgenera are so numerous, that an approximate identification of the four species mentioned in our text is perhaps all that can ever be expected. As a rule, the larger kinds only, which are comprised under the old generic name of Acridia, are eaten; they have short antennae not pointed at the end, and their prothorax is knobbed underneath and raised above. The female of the "Muken" (مكن) is especially esteemed both as palatable and nutritious. It is well known that locusts are the favourite food of fowls, pigs, and monkeys, but above all of some birds, as the starling and red thrush (turdus roseus), and especially the *Samarmar* or *Samarmog* (سمرمر), a black bird somewhat larger than our sparrow, which devours a vast number, and kills many more, whence it is kept and scrupulously protected in provinces liable to the locust plague; for a similar reason, jackdaws were, in Thessaly and Illyria, fed at the public expense, because they destroy both the eggs of the locusts and their young brood (comp. *Ael.* Nat. An. III. 12; *Plin.* XI. 29 or 35; *Ritter*, Erdkunde, VIII. 796, 798, 804).

1. The אַרְבֶּה (from רבה to *be multiplied*, to *be many*) seems to point with some distinctness to the "migratory locusts" (acridium migratorium or gryllus gregarius), which often fly in stupendous swarms over various parts of Asia and elsewhere, voraciously devastating all vegetation (see Comm. on Ex. pp. 160—163); "like the locusts in multitude" (כארבה לרב) was

a proverbial phrase used to denote vast numbers (Judg. VI. 5; VII. 12; comp. Jer. XLVI. 23; LI. 14; Nah. III. 15, 17); and the migratory locust is still called by the same name (ארבה) in some parts of Asia (*Nieb.* Arab. p. XXXVII).

2. The סָלְעָם (from the Chaldee root *to consume*, perhaps kindred with the Hebrew בָּלַע), is the "Devourer" (like יֶלֶק and חָסִיל, see *infra*), a large and destructive kind, which it would be mere hazard to define, especially as the word סלעם occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament.

The same applies 3. to חַרְגֹּל (comp. Arab. حرجل *to run rapidly*) the "Leaper", evidently an unwinged species, the eggs of which, if worn at the ear, were supposed to be a remedy against ear-ache (*Mishn.* Shabb. VI. 10).

And 4. the חָגָב (comp. Arab. حجب *to cover* or *hide*) seems to mean a class of locusts which *cover* the ground so completely as to *hide* it; they resemble, therefore, the אַרְבֶּה in their prodigious swarms, but differ from it in being unwinged; though small and insignificant in appearance (Num. XIII. 33; Isai. XL. 22), they may become a scourge laying waste the fields (2 Chr. VII. 13); and they were certainly so common that they were used as the generic term, not only for the clean but for all locusts in general (*Mishn.* Chull. III. 7; VIII. 1; Terum. X. 9; Edej. VII. 2; VIII. 4).

How far these criteria afford a basis for exact identifications, may easily be estimated, if our imperfect knowledge with respect to this subject be considered. Yet for the sake of completeness we subjoin a survey of the principal conjectures that have been ventured.

1. אַרְבֶּה — *Samar.*, *Onk.*, *Jon.*, *Sifra*, *Talm.* גּוֹבָא (Hebr. גּוֹב perhaps the most comprehensive designation for locusts, Am. VII. 1; Nah. III. 17; Arab. جان), or גובאי, a kind of locust having neither tail nor "hump" (i. e. the anterior part of the head does not rise, hump-like, between the antennae), whether the head be round or oblong (comp. *Talm.* Chull. 65, Berach. $40^b$; Sot. $49^b$; Taan. $22^b$); *Syr.* קמצא (locust generally; comp. قمص *to leap*, *to run in galop*); Ar. جراد (locust); *Sept.* βροῦχος; *Vulg.* bruchus; *Gr. Ven.* ἀκρίς; *Engl. Vers.* locust, *Dathe* locusta, *Michael.* Heuschrecken nach der ersten Häutung, *Luzz.* locusta.

2. סָלְעָם — *Onk.*, *Syr.* רְשׁוֹנָא, *Jon.* רִשְׁונָא, *Sifra*, *Talm.* (Chull. 65) רָשׁוֹן, *Sept.* ἀττάκης, *Vulg.* attacus; *Talm.* (Chull. 65, 66) "a species having a hump but no tail"; *Gr. Ven.* πάρνοψ (gryllus eversor) *Saad.* and *Abus.* دبا (*dybbe* or *dybben*, a winged species not eaten by the Arabs because unwholesome, *Nieb.* Arab. p. 172); *Ebn Ezra* "Rockscaler" (מין יעלה בסלעים); *Ar. Erp.* اشون (comp. Onk., Syr.); *Engl. Vers.* bald locust; *Michael.* Heuschrecken nach der zweiten Häutung.

3. חַרְגֹּל — *Onk.*, *Syr.*, *Saad.*, *Abus.*, *Ar. Erp.*, חַרְגְּלָא; *Jon.*, *Sifra*, *Talm.* (Chull. $65^b$), נִיפּוּלָא or נפול; *Talm.* l. c. a species having both a "hump" and a tail; Samar. רגילה (the *walking* or *leaping* locust); *Sept.* ὀφιομάχης, and *Vulg.* ophiomachus ("the serpent-killer"), an unwinged species attacking serpents in the neck; comp. *Plin.* XI. 29 or 35; *Gr. Ven.* ἀττέλαβος (comp. *Arist.* Hist. Nat. V. XVII. 2; XXIV. 3; *Plin.* XXIX. 4 or 29, adversantur scorpionibus locustarum minumae sine pennis, quos attelebos vocant; *Cyrill.* and *Hieron.* ad Nah. III. 17); *Engl. Vers.* beetle; *Michael.* Heuschrecken nach der dritten Häutung; *Bunsen*, Grashüpfer (Gryllus verrucivorus or papus).

4. חָגָב — *Sam.*, *Onk.*, חֲגָבָא; *Jon.* שַׁרְבָא דדיא נִדּוּנָא (a kind of locust called Nidduna), or (in Num. and Isai. ll. cc.) קַמְצָא; *Sifra* גדיין (the "Leaper"); *Talm.* (l. c.) גדיאן, or a species having

a tail but no "hump"; *Sept.* ἀκρίς, *Vulg.* locusta; *Saad., Ar. Erp.* جندب, and in Num. l. c. جراد, the general name for locust; *Engl. Vers.* grasshopper; *Michael.* Heuschrecke nach der vierten Häutung; *Luzzatto* grillo; *Bunsen* Heupferd.

Some translators (as Luther, Dathe, De Wette, and Zunz), attempting no version whatever, retain the Hebrew terms, and we have partially followed their example. The fourfold addition of למינו or למינהו may be explained from passages like Joel I. 4 and II. 25, where as sub-genera of אַרְבֶּה are mentioned גָּזָם, יֶלֶק, and חָסִיל (comp. Ex. X. 13, 19 with Ps. LXXVIII. 46; CV. 34; see also 1 Ki. VIII. 37; Nah. III. 15, 16; 2 Chr. VI. 28); although attempts have been made to prove, that the four terms both in Joel and in our passage merely represent four different metamorphoses or ages of the chief or migratory kind of locust (so *Credner* and *Meier* on Joel ll. cc., *Michaelis*); in our law certainly the insertion of "after its kind" which follows each name militates against such an opinion (comp. *Oedmann*, Sammlungen, II. 113 *sqq.*; *Hitzig* on Joel). — ולאלה (in ver. 24, "and *by these* you are rendered unclean") clearly points to the preceding injunctions — to those on the "winged creeping things" (vers. 20 *sqq.*); it is possibly even meant as a conclusion to the whole anterior section on the unclean quadrupeds, fishes, birds, and שרץ העוף; for the detail with respect to this last class of creatures (vers. 21 *sqq.*) was probably the earliest addition made to the original law as preserved in Deuteronomy (see p. 125). It is impossible to refer ולאלה to the *following* verses (so Siphra, Raschi, Luzzatto), because, in that case, the commands on "winged creeping things" would be incomplete, as they would be without provisions with respect to touching or carrying their carcasses; while, on the other hand, the commands on the unclean quadrupeds (vers. 26 *sqq.*) would have such regulations *twice*, and in the identical words (vers. 24, 25, and vers. 27, 28). — Later Judaism, holding the washing of garments insufficient when carcasses of unclean animals have been carried, supposed that, in such cases, the command of bathing the body is always implied as a matter of course, and is only omitted for the sake of brevity (in vers. 25, 28, 40; so Ebn Ezra, Nachman., a. o.); indeed some Codices of Kennicot and the Samaritan text add in vers. 25 and 40, ורחץ במים after יכבס בגדיו, and in ver. 40 some copies of the Sept. insert καὶ λούσεται ὕδατι (comp. *De Rossi* Var. Lect. I. 95). Considering the full and studiedly minute detail of our chapter, it is not probable that so important an injunction would have been suppressed, had it been deemed requisite; even in describing the lustrations necessary after having *eaten* of an unclean carcass, the text makes no mention of bathing; it uses in fact the identical formula with regard to carrying and eating (ver. 40); and even Ebn Ezra (on ver. 39), evidently weighing this circumstance, remarks that "he who carries the carcass of an ass, defiles himself as much as he who eats of it, since both carry it alike, the one externally, the other internally." Yet the vast difference between these two modes of "carrying carcass" could not fail to strike Ebn Ezra himself, and he declared soon afterwards (on ver. 42), with other Jewish authorities, that "the consumed food turns to flesh in the body of the consumer" (see p. 124). It is only in a later section that bathing is prescribed after partaking of unlawful food; it is there insisted upon with manifest emphasis (XVII. 15,

26. Every beast whatsoever that is hoofed, but is not clovenfooted, nor chews the cud, *shall be* unclean to you: every one that touches them shall be unclean. 27. And all *animals* that go upon their paws, among all the beasts that go on four, they *shall be* unclean to you; whosoever touches

16; see *infra* notes on vers. 39, 40); and it is ordained in several other cases of deflement, either alone or together with washing of garments (see "The Laws of Purification" before ch. XII). Rabbinical interpretation decided that deflement is caused in all cases by *carrying away* or removing an unclean carcass, whether it be touched or not; but that in case of merely *bearing* without removing it, deflement ensues only if it has been touched (comp. *Rashbam* on ver. 28) — which subtle distinction is without Biblical support; so *Jonath.* דריוסיט, Michaelis "wer es wegträgt, es auf die Seite zu schaffen", Luzzatto chiunque alza (anche senza contatto) del loro cadavere. — Uncleanness is caused by carrying *any portion* of the carcass, מנבלתם, and not only by taking up the whole body, את נבלתם; the latter reading occurs in vers. 28 and 40, and is, in our passage, expressed by the Sept. and Syr., and found in some Codd.; the difference is unimportant, since both readings nearly coincide in sense.

**26—28.** The quadrupeds have before been treated of (vers. 2—8), and it might seem with sufficient perspicuity and completeness. However, it appeared to the levitical author, that quadrupeds had indeed been fully considered in reference to the laws of diet; but this aspect was to him of minor importance compared with ritual cleanness or uncleanness in connection with food; therefore, he inserted, from this latter point of view, some characteristic regulations with respect to quadrupeds both of the clovenfooted and the one-hoofed orders (bisulca and solidungula, ver. 26), and to those furnished with claws (unguiculata, ver. 27). He speaks of the unclean species only; he does not even mention eating; he forbids touching and carrying the dead bodies; and prescribes, in cases of deflement, the same lustrations as before, viz. uncleanness till the evening and washing of garments, but not bathing of the person (see *supra*). He certainly deserves the credit of strict consistency. It is well-known that all the proper carnivora and the rodentia are unguiculated; but in some of their species the hands and feet are so united with the limbs above, that the animal bears upon its soles, that is, "walks upon its palms" (הלך על כפיו), whereby it acquires a firmer footing, but loses in agility; these are the *plantigrades*, to which belong the insectivora (as hedge-hog and mole), the bear, the elephant, and the hippopotamus. But in other cases, the bones of the feet are so connected with those above as to form with them nearly a continuous line, in which case the animal rests solely upon the points of the toes; these are the *digitigrades*, to which belong most of the carnivora, as the cat, the dog, the lion, and the wolf. Whether our text separates these two kinds of animals, or whether it groups some of the latter kind with the former, cannot be decided; certain it is that Jewish tradition confounds both, and reckons among the plantigrades both the bear and the lion.

their carcass, shall be unclean until the evening; 28. And he that bears their carcass, must wash his clothes, and be unclean until the evening: they *shall be* unclean to you.

29. And these *shall be* to you the most unclean among the creeping things, that creep upon the earth: the weasel

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — The particle לְ in לְכָל־ (ver. 26) has the force of generality comprising all the animals of the class mentioned (comp. vers. 42, 46; V. 3, 4; XVI. 16; Gen. IX. 10; Ex. XXVIII. 38; Num. XVIII. 9); or it may be taken in the sense of "in reference to" (Gram. § 105. 3); it is in any case unnecessary to adopt the easier and therefore suspicious reading וְכָל, offered by several codices, and conveyed by some translations (as the Syr.): the Sept., combining both readings, renders καὶ ἐν πᾶσι (וּלְכָל־). — Misled by the erroneous conception of הפריס פרסה, which was supposed always to mean "to have a *parted hoof*", whereas it often signifies "to be hoofed" in general (see on ver. 3), many translators have failed to express the correct sense of the twenty-sixth verse; some understand animals "that *divide* the hoof but are not *thoroughly* clovenfooted", such as the camel was considered to be (so Onkel., Engl. Vers., De Wette, a. o., see *supra* p. 134); the Septuagint, assuming a mistake in the Hebrew text, renders ושסע איננה שסעת by καὶ ὀνυχιστῆρας ὀνυχίζει, omitting איננה; and others unscrupulously leave out אשר היא מפרסת פרסה (so Dathe). — It is a matter of course that unclean animals defile by their touch only when dead, in whatever way they may have died or may have been killed (Rashb., Nachman. בין מתים בין שחוטים), for asses, horses, camels, and other "unclean" animals could be freely employed; many codices have indeed בנבלתם instead of להם (*De Rossi*, Var. Lect. I. 95); and the Sadducees actually extended the prohibition to the living animals (comp. *Ebn Ezra* in loc., see also *supra* p. 129). — The words הולך על כפיו denote the plantigrade animals, having a foot like a hand (כף, comp. 1 Sam. XXV. 29; Sept. ἐπὶ χειρῶν αὐτῶν; Targ. Onkel. על ידוהי; Jonath. על ידוי).

**29—38.** Of the large class of "creeping things" (שרץ), which are all unclean, only those with wings have hitherto been considered (vers. 20—25); but those "creeping on the earth" could not be passed over in a code meant to serve as a complete guide (see p. 51). Among the latter class, certain species were held to be preeminently polluting, and appeared to require regulations of exceptional strictness. They are here introduced so exclusively in reference to levitical purity, that eating, which is out of the question, is not even mentioned. We have before pointed out the character of these extraordinary ordinances (p. 102); they will be sufficiently understood from the Summary and the translation; and no one can fail to be struck by their casuistic minuteness and subtlety. A few remarks only are needed in this place. Touching the carcass of the eight animals causes uncleanness till the evening; and carrying it probably requires washing of garments, though that contingency is not mentioned. Vessels of wood and metal, and stuffs and textures of any kind, upon or into which such carcass falls, are to be cleansed by water; but vessels of earthenware, which were unglazed among the Hebrews, are to be broken,

**and the mouse, and the land-lizard after its kind, 30. And the water-lizard, and the hardun, and the gecko, and the**

since the uncleanness of the carcass is supposed to penetrate into the utensils through their pores and to taint them irremediably (see Comm. on Levit. I. pp. 543, 544): in any case, the contents of the vessel become unfit for use. Now if *dry* food falls into an earthen vessel defiled by contact with a carcass, it is thereby not contaminated; but if the food has been prepared with water, it is considered to imbibe by the moisture the unclean matter absorbed in the vessel, and is therefore, if put or dropped into such utensil, forbidden as unlawful. For similar reasons, any drink is disqualified that is poured into a vessel so polluted, of whatever material the vessel may be, whether of wood, metal, or earthenware; for the fluid is in all instances believed to draw out, and to mingle with, the latent impurity. Analogies to these peculiar ordinances are not wanting. If a Brahman touches a human bone moist with oil, he can only be purified by bathing; but if the bone is not oily, stroking a cow suffices, or looking at the sun, in addition to sprinkling the mouth with water (*Manu* V. 87; see notes on XV. 1—15, esp. ver. 12). A Mohammedan is not defiled by touching with a dry hand a dry corpse, but is unclean if either the hand or the corpse is moist (*Nieb.* Beschreib. v. Arab. p. 40); and he considers himself impure even by the touch of a dog's wet nose (see p. 96). — As the baking and cooking utensils were, as a rule, simply earthenware, they were also thoroughly polluted by the contact with unclean carcasses, and were in such case to be broken in pieces as utterly unfit for further use (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 482, 483). The heat to which they are ordinarily subjected, was held, like the water in other cases, to preserve the impurity and to communicate it to the victuals prepared in them. Wells, cisterns, and similar receptacles, are not contaminated by carcasses, because the water, constantly renewed, neutralises or infinitely dilutes the defiling matter: whether practical considerations, such as the scarcity of water in eastern climates, helped to recommend this apparent leniency, it is difficult to decide; yet the carcasses themselves, when taken out of the water, remain unclean, and defile those who touch them. Dry seeds were considered, not to be pervious to impurity by contact, whereas seeds soaked in water were deemed to be so; therefore, the former remained clean, if touched by a dead body, the latter were defiled; and a similar distinction between defiling objects in a dry and moist state still prevails among the Arabs and other nations. In this manner the strange playfulness of these ordinances is brought to a fit conclusion. They bespeak an age of decline, when the freshness and enthusiasm which create new ideas had vanished. Their non-introduction by the Deuteronomist is, therefore, not owing to his "late time" supposed to have no longer required them, but to very different reasons (see p. 126). That the eight animals here enumerated were looked upon as causing peculiar and intense defilement second only to that produced by a human corpse, cannot be doubted from the tenour and phrasing of the commands; and the matter has by Jewish tradition invariably been so considered. According to the Talmud and

*chomet* (lizard), and the chameleon. 31. These *shall be* to you the most unclean among all creeping things: whosoever

Targum Jonathan, not only their carcass, like that of other unclean creatures, pollutes both men and vessels by mere contact, but even their skins are defiling, whereas the skins of other unclean animals may be freely touched and used (see on vers. 39, 40); they infect earthenware vessels even when falling into them alive, whereas the other "creeping things" cause pollution only if dead; and stripes are forfeited by eating a piece of their flesh not larger than a lentil, whereas the seize of an olive is the ordinary measure with respect to other unclean meat (comp. *Maimon.* De Cib. Vet. II. 6 sqq.; *Hotting.* De Jur. Hebr. pp. 209, 224; also *Targ. Jonath.* in vers. 29, 31, 32).

But why were those creatures regarded with such exceptional abhorrence? Why were they described and treated as the incarnation and the very types of uncleanness? This question can only be answered when the Hebrew names have at least approximately been identified.

1. With regard to the first animal —חֹלֶד—, tradition fluctuates between the mole and the *weasel*; but probability is in favour of the latter, for this alone suits the passages of the Mishnah and the Talmud in which that term (חולדה) occurs. And the weasel (mustela vulgaris) deserves indeed to be classed among the most obnoxious animals. Though the smallest and most slender of the carnivora, it yields to none in fierce courage and bold rapaciousness. It sometimes even attacks horses and men, and seems in the East to have been considered dangerous to sleeping children and human corpses (*Talm.* Shabb. $151^b$; *Rashi* on Taan. $8^a$). Among the birds of prey, it fears the largest only, such as the hawk; to the others it is no contemptible opponent; and it engages in desperate fights with much stronger quadrupeds. It is indeed a truly formidable robber; aided by its diminutive size and remarkable agility, it causes fearful ravages among the smaller mammals, such as mice and rats, moles and hamsters, hares and rabbits, which it kills for their blood rather than their flesh; it wages successful war against fowls and pigeons, larks and other birds, and all kinds of insects; against lizards, deaf adders, and water snakes; against fishes and frogs; and it even knows how to obtain the flesh of the lobster. In fact, hardly any of the smaller animals escape its indefatigable aggressiveness; for it is a master in running and climbing, jumping and swimming, turning and eluding; it glides into the smallest holes, and makes its way through the narrowest fissures; and it possesses every possible facility for giving effect to its insatiable destructiveness. In addition to this, the aversion entertained against the weasel was fostered by strange fables and inventions; for instance, that it conceives through the ear, and brings forth its young through the mouth — a fiction based on the simple observation that the mother carries her very small offspring from place to place in her mouth, as the cat does (see *supra* p. 60) —; or that its very touch causes ulcerous eruptions, especially in cows. If it be added that the weasel has a strong and disagreeable smell, that it selects for its retreats mostly dark recesses, as caverns, hollow clefts of walls and rocks, the

touches them, when they are dead, shall be unclean until the evening. 32. And upon whatsoever *anything* of them

interior of dunghills, the holes of the mole where it hides bright objects which it delights in stealing, and that it was superstitiously employed for divination (*Talm.* Sanh. 66[a]): it will not be difficult to account for the intense dislike with which it inspired the Hebrews. For, to sum up, it is rapacious and thievish, drinks blood with predelection, is repulsive in smell, and lives in darkness. All this weighed too heavily with the Hebrews to be counterbalanced by the beneficent effects of the weasel's destructiveness, which is largely directed against rats and fieldmice.

[The fact, the force of which cannot be denied, that the Arabic name for *mole* is still خلد or خلدة, as חֹלֶד is rendered by the Arabic translators (Saad., Abus., Ar. Erp.), is outweighed by the consideration that not mole but *weasel* is applicable in the passages of the Mishnah and Talmud, in which it is said that the חולדה kills other beasts of prey larger than itself and fowls (*Mishn.* Tohar. IV. 2, 3; Chull. III. 4; *Talm.* Chull. 52[b]; see, however, Pesach. 8[b]), and succeeds mainly on account of its pointed and hooked teeth with which it breaks through the skull and its skins (*Talm.* Chull. 56[a]), that it lives in deadly enmity with the cat (*Talm.* Sanh. 105[a]), is of surprising shrewdness and cunning, laps water from a vessel (*Mishn.* Par. IX. 3), and feeds voraciously, and even excessively, upon flesh (*Talm.* Pesach. 9[a]; comp. *Brehm* l. c. I. 544—549): yet it must be observed that the word אישות (*Mishn.* Moed Kat. I. 4), which undoubtedly is mole (בריה שאין לה עינים, *Talm.* in loc. 6[b]), is in the Talmud of Jerusalem explained by חולדה (viz. אישות זו חולדה, fol. 80[b] ed. Krotosch.). In some other passages, the "large weasel" or the ermine (mustela erminea) seems to be intended (*Mishn.* Kilaim VIII. 5, חולדת הסנאים mustela rubrorum; *Talm.* Bab. Kam. 80[a]; comp. *Lenysohn*, Zoologie des Talmud, pp. 94, 95). חֹלֶד (from חלד *to glide, to creep in*) has, besides, been rendered *mole* by Bochart, Dathe, Michaelis, De Wette, Zunz, a. o.; but *weasel* by the Sept. (γαλῆ) and Vulg. (mustela), Onkel. (חֻלְדָּא), Syr. (ככושא), and Jon. (כַּרְכּוּשְׁתָּא, comp. *Talm.* Sanh. 105[a]), Rashi (מושטיל"ה, moustille) and Kimchi (מושטיל"א), Luther and Engl. Vers., Gesen. (see Thesaur. pp. 474, 475), Sommer (Abhandlungen, I. 260—263), Knobel, Luzzatto, Bunsen, a. o.]

2. The next name — עַכְבָּר — is undoubtedly the common *mouse*, or more especially the *field-mouse*. The latter was so much dreaded for the ravages it causes in fields and meadows, that it became the very type and picture of destruction. The word mice is in the Bible simply explained as "destroyers of the earth" (1 Sam. VI. 5). When the Philistines, after having seized the Ark of the Covenant, were smitten with pestilential boils, they sent as an offering of atonement, besides golden emerods, golden figures of mice, the former denoting the special misfortune from which they were suffering, the latter characterising that evil as ruinous devastation in general (1 Sam. VI. 5; comp. V. 6); for we are not warranted to assume that the Philistines had been visited by a plague of mice also. The mouse was the Egyptian hieroglyphic for destructiveness (ἀφανισμός), "because, gnawing at all things, it damages and spoils them" (*Horap.* I. 50); and it would be unnecessary to repeat the testimonies of ancient

**falls, when they are dead, that shall be unclean; whether *it be* any vessel of wood, or garment, or skin, or sack, what-**

and modern writers as to the fearful havoc that has often been wrought by the most edacious and prodigiously prolific field-mice, engendering famine and disease, and forcing the inhabitants to emigrate (comp. *Boch.* Hieroz. I. lib. III. c. 34). Among the Greeks, mice were sacred to Apollo in his attribute as destroyer (Ἀπόλλων — ὡς ἀπολλὺς τὰ ζῶα, *Macrob.* Sat. I. 17). The fatal injury they inflict upon all kinds of fields was recognised in later Judaism by the permission granted to proprietors to kill them by any means on the middle days of Passover and Tabernacles (*Talm.* Moed Kat. 6[b], 7[a]; comp. *Orach Chajim* § 537. 13); they received the appellation of "wicked mice" (עכבריא רשיעיא), because, whenever they see grain, they call all their tribe together and feast till nothing is left (*Talm. Jer.* Bab. Mets. 11[a]); and even the common mice stood in great disfavour because "an evil instinct" compels them to gnaw at objects which they cannot eat, as garments, wood, and skins, and to bite even into human corpses; and a person eating food that has been touched by a mouse, was believed to suffer loss of memory (*Talm.* Horay. 13; Shabb. 151[b]). Hence at certain heathen rites, especially those performed in honour of the dead, the flesh of mice was freely eaten, though it may otherwise have been shunned; and after the Babylonian exile, the Jews, adding new superstitions to their many old forms of idolatry, practised that custom also, and conciliated death, the most implacable of all destroyers, on graves and in cavern tombs (Isai. LXV. 4; LXVI. 17; Comm. on Lev. I. p. 376). Moreover, a thievish propensity manifested by pilfering coins, rings, and other bright objects (*Talm.* Sanh. 29[b]), avoidance of day and light, and a predatory life in secret holes, probably strengthened the antipathy with which the restless destructiveness of the mouse impressed the Hebrews.

[All ancient versions, we believe without an exception, render עַכְבָּר by *mouse*; and there is no reason whatever to understand *springing hare* or *Jerboa* (Dipus jaculus, so Bochart, Gesen., Rosenm., Knobel, Bunsen, a. o.), a clean and harmless animal, which would hardly have been counted among the detested and polluting creatures, and the chief species of which (Pedetes caffer) is mainly found in the southern parts of Africa (comp. *supra* p. 132; *Brehm* l. c. II. 191—194). Whether the etymological meaning of עַכְבָּר is "destroyer of the field" or "of corn" (עכל בר, Bochart, Gesen., a. o.), must remain undecided.]

3. Perhaps the most interesting and most extraordinary of all the Reptiles are the *Sauria*. In the earlier periods of the earth's history, they peopled the water in the hugest and most wonderful forms, and in looking at the petrified remains of the Ichthyosaurus or the Pterodactylus, we are astonished to find that these gigantic monsters combine the peculiarities of amphibia, fishes, and birds. Their present representatives are indeed smaller in size and simpler in structure, but still most remarkable for their number, shape, and habits. Of the three classes in which the Sauria are naturally divided — the Armed lizards (Loricata), the Scaly lizards (Squamati) and the Snake-lizards (Annulati), the second have the most numerous varieties and are most

**soever vessel *it be*, wherein *any* work is done, it must be put into water, and it shall be unclean until the evening;**

widely diffused, and it is probably families of Scaly lizards which are intended by the next words, "and the צָב after its kind": for lizard or "land-crocodile" is the most uniform rendering of the ancient versions; and a certain harmless kind of yellow lizard, known as lacerta Aegyptia, about 18 inches long, living in deserts but never in the water, and eaten by some Bedouin tribes in Africa and Syria, is still called *dhab* or *dhob* (ضَبّ). But it would be difficult to fix upon one particular species, and we must include the whole tribe, the characteristics of which are indeed such as to justify its place in our list. The body of the lizards is certainly, as a rule, divided into head, neck, trunk, and limbs, but sometimes the limbs, if not entirely wanting, are so stunted, that the creatures resemble serpents. They move with agile rapidity, and by the aid of their tails are capable of taking considerable leaps. Many of them display their activity chiefly in the night, and their eyes are organised accordingly. They devour their food entire without mastication, apparently unmindful what they devour; a few only are satisfied with vegetable nourishment; most of them are beasts of prey, and murder and eat unhesitatingly their own young or other members of their order; the larger kinds assail all vertebrates, seize upon small and even larger mammals, and on birds or their nests, upon reptiles, amphibia, and fishes, and all kinds of the lower and smaller animals; in fact, "every lizard sees in any weaker creature of whatever class or tribe a welcome prey"; yet they have themselves many formidable enemies — the martens and serpents, vultures and eagles, hawks and buzzards, owls and ravens, and not a few marsh- and water-birds. They eat enormously, though they can bear hunger for an astonishing length of time; some subsist without water for months, and to most of them the dew gathering on leaves or stones suffices. They are partly oviparous, partly ovi-viviparous, and bestow no particular care upon their offspring. Some of the larger kinds are eaten, and their flesh is declared palatable, though an old and unfounded prejudice branded some of them as venomous. It is unnecessary for our purpose to describe the numerous species, or even to characterise the different families of lizards — the Egyptian Warans (Polydaedali), the Ameivae, the Lacertae, and the rest, especially as it is uncertain how many of them the term "after its kind" (לְמִינֵהוּ) is intended to include. It is enough to have indicated those features of the order which, bearing upon the object of our enquiry, may well have struck the Hebrews as repulsive.

[Some ancient translators reproduce the Hebrew word צָב (so Onkel. צַבָּא, Saad., Ar. Erp., ضَبّ), because this was in their time the current name for a species of lizard; the Sept. has κροκόδειλος χερσαῖος (comp. *Plin.* XXVIII. 8 or 30 crocodilus terrestris), and the same animal seems to be intended by the Syriac חרדנא, Jonath. הַרְדּוֹנָא, and the Samar. ערדונה (comp. Arab. حردون; see *infra*, and in general, *Bochart*, Hieroz. I. 1043 *sqq.*; *Brehm* l. c. V. 92 *sqq.*). Other translations of צב are *toad* (Rashi in loc. קרפו״ט crapaud "resembling the frog", or on *Talm.* Av. Zar. 40ª כוכי״ל coquille, Luther, Luzzatto rospo, a. o.; comp. *Lewysohn*, l. c. pp. 230, 231).

and *then* it shall be clean. 33. And any earthen vessel, into which *anything* of them falls, whatsoever *is* in it shall be

or *tortoise* (Aruch, Engl. Vers., a. o.), or *crocodile* (Vulg.).]

4. With regard to the next creature — אֲנָקָה — we feel no slight diffidence; the ancient versions disagree entirely; the etymology of "groaning" or "sighing" animal leads to no certain trace, and we have only the one slender clue that a large and strong river-lizard is in Abyssinia called *Angueg* or *Anguga* (*Ludolf*, Lex. Aeth. s. v.): if the Hebrew term אֲנָקָה be identical with this name, it might be taken to represent the water-lizards, while the preceding word (צָב) would denote those tribes that live on the land. It is well known that the former kinds particularly utter a moaning or hissing sound, and some of them a croaking similar to that of frogs. Any attempt to determine the species would be the merest hazard.

[The divergence in the translations of אֲנָקָה is indeed great; some render *shrewmouse* (Sept. μυγάλη, Vulg. mygale, Bunsen Spitzmaus), others *hedgehog* (Rashi הריצון hérisson; see *Rashi* on *Talm*. Chull. 122[a]; prob. Onk. יַלָּא, comp. *Lewysohn* l. c. p. 100), or *ferret* (Engl. Vers.), or *toad* (Luzzatto la botta dal suono lugubre), or *chameleon* (Gr. Ven.), or Waral (Ar. Erp. ورل), or *lacerta*, or *lacerta Gecko*, or *lacerta Nilotica*; Targ. Jon. has פַּלְּיָא חִוְיָא supposed to mean the *green lizard* (Fleischer, in Levy's Chald. Wörterb. II. 573, reads פַּלְיַית חִוְיָא which he explains to mean a beetle "looking after serpents", to free them from vermin; but a beetle is not שֹׁרֵץ עַל־הָאָרֶץ).]

5. Not more certain is the identity of the following name, כֹּחַ, which seems to point to some strong and powerful animal; many ancient versions understand a kind of lizard, and Saadiah and Ben Gannach point more distinctly to the *hardun* (حردون, Stellio vulgaris), about a foot long, of various shades of yellow intermixed with darker spots; the body is slender and the tail comparatively thin, but provided all around with prickly scales; it is most frequent in northern Africa and the neighbouring countries, and is often seen, in dozens together, on stones and walls of houses, on which it climbs with remarkable adroitness, now stopping cautiously, and now briskly moving on, and then alternately raising its head and bending it down; which "nodding" of the head Mohammedans formerly considered as an irreverent mimicry of their pious devotions, and they therefore hated and persecuted the animal. Serpent tamers try their art on the hardun also.

[Many translate כֹּחַ by *chameleon* (so Sept., perhaps on account of the literal sense of χαμαι-λεων "a lion on the ground", a creeping lion in strength כֹּחַ, Vulg., Engl. Vers., Bunsen), others *moloch* (Luther) or some other kind of lizard (*Rashi* ap. Kimchi s. v., Gr. Ven. σαύρα, Bochart genus lacertae stellioni simile or the Waral, Dathe and Rosenm. lacerta, Kitto lacerta scincus or scincus officinalis, possessing a remarkable faculty of burrowing and concealing itself in the sand of its native deserts, and believed to have many curious medicinal properties, see *Brehm* l. c. V. 159, 160), or *frog* (Knobel, relying upon questionable similarities of sound with כֹּחַ, such as قر frog, قرق and κοάξ, the imitative sounds of the frog's croaking, etc.), or *mole* (Luzzatto).

unclean; and the *vessel* itself you shall break. 34. Of all food which is eaten, *that* on which water comes [in such

On the hardun see *Brehm* l. c. V. 141, 142.]

6. The next term mentioned in our list — לְטָאָה — appears, in the later Jewish works, to be used as the generic appellation for all lizards, and it would, therefore, be most precarious to specify a particular family or kind: according to the Talmud, it has a thick, though soft and smooth skin; it lays eggs in which the yolk and white are not separated; occasionally it seems dead, but may be revived by pouring cold water over it; and its tail, if cut off, moves spasmodically for some time afterwards (comp. *Talm.* Shabb. 107[b]; Chull. 122[b]; Avod. Zar. 40[a]). The ancient translations are not more distinct; they simply render "lizard", except that the Syriac fixes upon the salamander, which does not answer to the Talmudic description. Yet if we were sure of the authenticity of the Greek and Latin rendering (ἀσκαλαβώτης and stellio), we should be justified in singling out the *gecko*, which was made the subject of many absurd fables originating in its alleged venomousness, and which, on account of its supreme ugliness and its nocturnal and predacious habits, was held in general aversion. The most far-spread species is the "wall-gecko" (platydactylus fascicularis), which is found in all countries on the Mediterranean; it is but five inches long, including the tail; the head is rough, the eye remarkably large, convex, and bronze-coloured, and the back dotted with small star-like warts (hence its Latin name stellio), each consisting of three or four small tubercles. It lives on walls and in rocks, on trees and in all parts of houses, and often in large numbers together. It is active only at night, when, in pursuit of prey, it astonishes the observer by climbing with incredible nimbleness along perpendicular walls, and running, with the back downwards, along high ceilings, sometimes remaining suspended for whole minutes, and then darting forth again to seize some insect with unfailing certitude. It owes this wonderful faculty not, as has been supposed, to some slimy or glutinous substance on the feet, but to the peculiar velvetlike "leaves" or folds of skin inserted between most flexible toes, and enabling the animal to produce a vacuum, and thus to sustain itself by suction.

[The name לְטָאָה (from לטא in the meaning to cling, to hold oneself, comp. Arab. لطأ and لطى) is either preserved in ancient versions (Onk., Jon., Sam.), or rendered lizard (Sept. ἀσκαλαβώτης, Vulg. stellio, Rashi לי"ש ררה lézard; and so Luther, Engl. Vers., Bochart a small species of وحرة, Geddes gecko, Luzzatto, a. o.); or it has been understood to mean *salamander* (Syr. צרוריתא, perh. Saad. عظاءة, Bunsen), or *tortoise* (Knobel, comparing the Hebrew לטאה with the Arab. لطا which is properly frog), or a kind of *weasel* (*Siphra* fol. 52[a] ed. Wien, Rabbi Jehudah says "the לטאה is similar to the חולדה"; comp. *Talm.* Chull. 122[b]). On the gecko see *Brehm* l. c. V. 145—155.]

7. If we may trust a later Jewish tradition, the next creature — חֹמֶט — is the *snail*, for in this meaning, and comprising the testaceous kinds in contradistinction to שַׁבְּלוּל which denotes the naked ones (Ps. LVIII. 9), the word is used in Talmudical wri-

**earthen vessel], shall be unclean: but all drink which is drunk, shall be unclean in *such* vessel of whatever kind.**

tings, and understood by Rabbinical authorities (*Talm.* Chag. 11[a], and *Rashi* in loc.). We could certainly not be surprised, if the author, unbiassed by the glittering shells of many species, included in his list the clammy, slothful, and torpid creatures, which occur almost everywhere in an incredible number of varieties. But can he be supposed to pass with a bound from Reptiles to Mollusks, and then to return again to the Reptiles, since the next and last animal is most probably also a lizard? Those who presume a systematic arrangement, will rather accede to those ancient versions that render simply lizard without defining the species, which it would indeed be impossible to fix on the strength of the vague etymological meaning "contraction" or "compactness" (خمط).

[A few only of the ancient translators render חֹמֶט by *snail* (Samar., Gr. Ven., Rashi לימצ״א or לימצ״ה limace, which term, however, denotes the naked snails, whereas the testaceous kinds are called limaçon, and so Engl. Vers., De Wette); others have some kind of *lizard* (Sept. σαύρα, Vulg., Syr. חולטט, Saad., Ar. Erp. chameleon حرباء, Luther Blindschleiche; comp. Chald. חוּמְטָא dense darkness, Bochart the blue "sand-lizard" حلكا, חֹמֶט being supposed to mean sand, like the Talmudical חומטון sandy tract Shabb. 31[a], Bunsen Sandeidechse), or *tortoise* (Luzz. tartaruga).]

8. The last of the eight most abhorred animals — תִּנְשֶׁמֶת, once before mentioned among the unclean birds (ver. 18) — may with some confidence be interpreted as the *chameleon*; this animal certainly deserves the name of "breather" par excellence (from נָשַׁם); for it eagerly inhales the air with open mouth, and often, especially when irritated, fills its immense lungs till the body is largely dilated, and becomes transparent; it frequently remains in this state for hours; and when it gradually breathes forth the air, it collapses and appears to consist only of skin and bones. The ancients supposed it to live entirely on air (*Plin.* VIII. 33 or 51; XXVIII. 8 or 29). In the formation of the head and the tongue, the feet and the skin, it differs essentially from all other kinds of lizard, the list of which it fitly concludes. Remarkable above all are its eyes, either of which can move independently of the other, so that while one looks upwards the other can look downwards — a flexibility in which the chameleon is singular among all animals, and which enables it to survey at once a very large area. Hardly less marvellous is its changeableness of colour, which is caused by two different pigments in and under the skin, the one white and yellow, the other dark-brown; and as both change their relative position or mingle with each other in consequence of excitement or fear, hunger or some other physical cause, they produce the various shades of white and yellow, brown and black, red, grey, and violet; though some parts of the body are exempted from these changes, and always keep their ordinary greyish-green colour. The common chameleon (ch. vulgaris) is found in many parts of Africa and Asia, and if eaten boiled, is considered to counteract leanness, if eaten dried to be a remedy against fever. It remains for days in lazy and almost mo-

**35. And every *thing* whereupon *any part* of their carcass falls, shall be unclean; oven and stove shall be broken;**

tionless torpor, clinging to the trunk of some tree, yet all this while it vigilantly looks out for prey, which it seizes with its dartlike tongue. Though capable of bearing hunger for months, it is greedy when occasion serves. In Spain it is kept in rooms as an efficient destroyer of troublesome flies. With the members of its own tribe it often engages in deadly feuds.

[From the time of Bochart, תִּנְשֶׁמֶת has by many scholars been taken as *chameleon* (so Dathe, Gesen., De Wette, Knobel, Fürst, Luzzatto); but not a few ancient and modern interpreters render *mole* (so Sept. ἀσπάλαξ, Vulg. talpa, Onk. אֲשׁוּתָא, Rashi טלפ"א taupe, Luther, Engl. Vers.); the Syriac has *centipede* (רידא, an aquatic crustacean), Jonathan *salamander* (סַלְמַנְדְּרָא), and Saad. *gecko* سام احرص "veneno lepram inducens", the gecko being supposed to be most venomous. On the chameleon see *Brehm* l. c. V. 116—123.]

Why then were these eight animals, six of which belong to the lizard-tribe, held in such intense disgust? Because they recalled notions which to the Hebrew mind, especially in the Persian period, were singularly repugnant — the notions of night and darkness, of rapacity and destructiveness, and, all those creatures having very small feet, of low and grovelling brutishness. They required to be guarded against all the more strongly, because most of them select their haunts in the very abodes of men. Some may, moreover, have caused aversion by their repulsive appearance, and some were shunned because believed to be dangerous even by their touch, though the fear is utterly unfounded, and the majority are useful on account of their constant warfare against the insect world. With these reasons we must rest satisfied, if we desire to avoid doubtful speculations; thus it is impossible to prove whether the Hebrew legislator denounced the lizards because they were by impostors used for magical frauds and miraculous cures, accounts of which are given both by ancient and modern writers, especially with respect to Egypt. But it would be entirely unwarranted, because un-Biblical, to suppose that the Hebrews attributed the eight animals, not to the Creator of the Universe, but to some malignant or rival deity (see *supra* p. 63; comp. *Sommer*, Bibl. Abhandl. I. 269, 270).

Philological Remarks. — The article before the adjective, with ב following, expresses the superlative (Gramm. § 89. 5, 6); thus הטמא בשרץ or הטמאים בכל השרץ (vers. 29, 31) is "the most unclean among the creeping things": the signal uncleanness inherent in the eight animals necessitates signal precautions. The usual translation, "these also shall be unclean to you", besides disregarding the article in הטמא and הטמאים, leaves the very remarkable enactments which follow entirely unaccounted for; comp. also *Sommer*, Bibl. Abh. I. 260. — במותם (ver. 31) is simply "when they are dead" or "after their death" (comp. ver. 39), and הנגע בהם במותם is equivalent in sense with הנגע בנבלתם; for it is indifferent with respect to their defiling effect, whether the animals enumerated have died of themselves or have been killed. Other explanations are necessarily artificial; f. i. "not only if they have died previously, but also if they die while

**they *are* unclean, and they shall be unclean to you. 36. Yet a well and a cistern, *any* receptacle of water, shall be clean:**

falling into the vessel" (Keil). — Targ. Jonath. expresses the Talmudical view that the eight creatures cause uncleanness only through an entire limb detached from their living body (דאיברייא דידהון דאיתפסה; comp. Jonath. in ver. 39, and *Sifra* in loc. אבר הגוייש מן החי). The particle מן in מכל (vers. 32, 34) has a partitive sense, meaning literally "any of all vessels of wood", "any of all the food" (as in IV. 2, etc.; see Comm. on Levit. I. 498). — The term שַׂק is sufficiently clear from a parallel passage (Num. XXXI. 20), where it is replaced by מַעֲשֵׂה עִזִּים "stuff made of goats' hair" (comp. Matth. III. 4; Revel. VI. 12, etc.; Rashb. קלית של ציצת עזים; Vulg. cilicia i. e. covering made of — Cilician — goats' hair; *Varro*, R. R. II. 11); therefore בֶּגֶד is any texture of whatever kind except of horsehair; כלי עץ and עור (skin or leather of any sort, perhaps vessels of skin, not exclusively "trunks or baskets covered with skin") are intelligible in themselves; though by transposing the former and placing it before כל כלי, the sequence of the words would be more logical. — The verb in יֵעָשֶׂה מְלָאכָה (masculine) is to be accounted for by the impersonal construction (Gram. §. 77. 16). — On the fact that the text employs (in ver. 33) יִטְמָא, and not טָמֵא, the Mishnah (Sot. V. 2) fancifully bases the conclusion, that an object, which has become unclean by falling into an earthen vessel contaminated by שרץ (which is "the first" or "the father of the uncleanness" ראשון or אב הטומאה), renders, in its turn, any third object unclean by contact (ככר שני מטמא את השלישי) — which is by the Talmud restricted to the case when the third object is תרומה: but it needs hardly be observed, that יטמא and טמא are used without difference of meaning (comp. vers. 24 and 25, 27 and 28, etc.); moreover, it would be necessary to read יְטַמֵּא (the causative), instead of יִטְמָא. — As a curiosity, and to characterise a school of interpreters which might have seemed impossible in our time, the explanation of Baumgarten may be quoted (Comm. II. 159): "The command that earthen vessels must be broken, appears to have been suggested by the consideration that, as the earth was specially placed under the curse (Gen. III. 17), the earthen utensils are specially liable to the reception of uncleanness"! — That "Moses" was "unfavourably disposed to earthen cooking utensils", and desired to accustom the Hebrews rather to the use of copper ones, which "are solid wealth", and could not be dangerous to a very cleanly people (*Michael.* in loc. and in Mos. R. IV. pp. 220, 221, 223), can neither be inferred from our passage nor from a preceding one (VI. 26); the great cheapness of earthen vessels and the comparative rarity of cases such as stated in the text, could hardly render the law oppressive in reality, however rigid it may be in spirit. — Talmudical speculations as to the instances when the interior of vessels becomes unclean, and when the exterior, may be found in Chull. 24[b], 25[a]; Pesach. 20. Our text mentions, for intelligible reasons, external defilement only in reference to wooden or metal vessels, and internal pollution only in reference to earthenware; but vessels of the former description required cleansing with water, those of the latter kind were to be broken, whether the carcass fell

**but he who touches their carcass, shall be unclean. — 37. And if *any part* of their carcass fall upon any sowing**

*upon* or *into* them: this latter difference had no influence whatever upon the treatment of the utensils. — The words וכל כלי חרש (ver. 33), standing in juxtaposition to מכל כלי עץ (in ver. 32), begin the sentence emphatically, as an absolute nominative, though thereby an irregular construction or inversion is necessitated ("and every earthen vessel, whatsoever is in it"; see Gram. § 75. 5); and it was probably this irregularity which induced the Vulgate to leave out the words כל אשר בתוכו, by which omission a normal construction is effected (וכל כלי חרש ... יטמא). — The word מהם (ver. 33, "anything of them") proves that here also not the living animals, but their carcasses are alluded to, so that במותם must be supplied as in ver. 26; comp. ver. 32. — The 34th verse is indeed not without obscurity, on account of its elliptical brevity; but the sense seems unquestionable from the context. Both parts of the verse, of course, treat of vessels defiled by an unclean carcass, but the first part refers to earthen vessels, like the whole of the preceding verse, and the second part to "vessels of whatever kind" (כל כלי), which words have antithetical force: thus the difficulty disappears, we can dispense with the numerous strained explanations that have been ventured, and we certainly do not require the alteration of מים into מהם, the supposed original reading (so Vater). אשר יבוא עליו מים is simply "that on which water comes" (comp. ver. 38; so Onk., Sept., Vulg., Rashi, Keil, a. o.), not "*such* water" (so Luth., Engl. Vers., Rosenm., De Wette, Knobel), for if the water before mentioned, in which the defiled vessels were cleansed, were meant (ver. 32), not מים but המים, or rather מן המים, would be demanded; nor "water from such vessel" (*Augustin.* Quaest. in Lev. XXXVII, Bunsen); for the antithesis is with בְּכל כלי, and we have to supply rather "*in* such vessel", viz. of earthenware. In the second half of the verse, the Masorites have indicated the correct interpretation by the distinctive accent (zakeph-katon) on ישתה, thus separating this word from the following בכל־כלי. The meaning is, therefore—drinkable fluids become unclean, if put into any vessel polluted in the way described, irrespective of the material, whether this be porous or not. The usual version, offered by most ancient and modern translators (Onk., Jon., Sept., Vulg., Luth., Buns., a. o.), "all drink which may be drunk in any such vessel", though indistinct, may imply the right sense; but erroneous are the renderings "all drink which is drunk out of such vessel" (De Wette, Knobel); or "drink that is to be drunk out of a vessel" (Michael.), where כל in כל כלי is not translated at all; or "all drink that is preserved in any vessel" (Dathe), which attributes to ישתה an impossible meaning; or the explanations "if such a dead animal has fallen upon the food or the drink", but the carcass had before fallen into the vessel, while the food and drink are in themselves clean; or "every drink that is drunk out of any vessel, and is poured into such unclean *earthen* vessel, becomes unclean" (Rashi, a. o.), where the ellipsis would be unparalleled, and מכל כלי extremely languid, if not superfluous. — Both תנור and כירים (ver. 35) are, from the context, evidently *vessels*, and that *earthen* vessels, not only

**seed, which is to be sown, it *shall be* clean. 38. But if *any* water be put upon the seed, and *any part* of their carcass fall thereon, it *shall be* unclean to you.**

because they can be broken in pieces (יֻתָּץ), but because they are ritually considered and treated like the earthen vessels mentioned ni the preceding verses; they are probably portable or moveable, especially the latter: for תַּנּוּר (ver. 35) is *oven*, principally for baking bread (comp. XXVI. 26), or *baking-pot* for making thin, usually unleavened cakes (comp. II. 4; *Sept.* aptly κλίβανοι; see Comm. on Lev. I. 482, 483); and כִּירַיִם (kindred with כּוּר furnace, כִּיּוֹר brasier Zech. XII. 6, or stewpan 1 Sam. II. 14) is a portable *stove* or *chafing dish* heated within, and probably furnished with a lid, or consisting of an upper and a lower part (whence the dual form of כִּירַיִם; *Sept.* appropriately χυτρόποδες; comp. *Hes.* Op. 746). *Onkelos* retains both words; *Targ. Jonath.* renders the second by תַּפְיָין i. e. fire-pot (comp. *Levy*, Chald. Wörterb. II. 548, 581); the *Syr.* by בית תפיא, that is, the place on which the pot is put; *Arab.* مستوقد hearth; *Ebn Ezra* range for baking and cooking; *Luther* Ofen oder Kessel; *Engl. Vers.* oven or ranges for pots; *Bunsen* and *Knobel* Backtopf and Dekelpfanne (or Kasserole); *Michaelis* less plausibly Backofen and Casserol-Löcher (explaining: "the Orientals commonly dig, or rather construct by brickwork, round holes in the ground, in which they cook, roast, and bake"). The Mishnah (Shabb. III. 1, 2) distinguishes three kinds of ovens (1.) the כירה, which is oblong, so made that two pots can be placed upon it, and that the fire burns beneath both (whence the dual form כִּירַיִם is accounted for); (2.) the תנור, wide at the bottom and narrow at the top, devised to keep the heat longer; and (3.) כופח, a square and hollow structure made for one pot only to be placed upon it, with a small aperture at the top, and keeping the heat better than the כירה, though not so well as the תנור (comp. *Talm.* Shabb. 38[b], 125[a]; *Mishn.* Kelim V. 1 *sqq.*). — The singular of the verb יֻתָּץ (ver. 35) *following* the nouns תנור וכירים is more uncommon than the reverse order, although in that case also the verb may be taken impersonally (see Gramm. § 77. 15). — The words מקוה מים (ver. 36) are a generalising apposition to the preceding phrase מעין ובור "a well and cistern, any receptacle of water" (comp. Ebn Ezra in loc.); they ought, therefore, not to be provided with the copulative וְ (so the *Sept.* καὶ συναγωγῆς ὕδατος; *Luther* die Brunnen und Kölke und Teiche; a. o.; more correctly, as regards the sense, *Vulg.* et omnis aquarum congregatio). Jewish tradition urges that, to enjoy immunity from pollution, the receptacles of water must, what *de facto* usually is the case, be fixed in the ground (*Rashi* המחוברים לקרקע, *Luzzatto* che non sia mobile), because then only sufficient changes in the water can be expected to counteract the effect of the carcass. — The words ונגע בנבלתם יטמא "and he who touches their carcass, shall be unclean" (ver. 36), cannot express a general rule respecting the unclean carcasses here treated of; for that rule has before been clearly stated (ver. 31); after which follow special regulations the continuity of which would be interrupted, unless those words be taken to form a part of them. In connection with the first half of the verse, they can only mean that, though the water into which the carcass has fallen remains clean,

39. And if any beast, of which you may eat, die, he that touches its carcass shall be unclean until the evening. 40. And he that eats of its carcass shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the evening; and he that

the carcass itself preserves its uncleanness, and pollutes those who touch it, whether in the water or after its removal from it. The wording may be abrupt, and the regulation itself curiously subtle, but neither the one nor the other justifies us in rejecting, as a spurious interpolation, a sentence, the spirit of which is completely in harmony with the whole of this portion (comp. *Talm.* Nedar. 75[b]; Targ. Jonath.; Rashi; Luzzatto; a. o.). But it is against the Hebrew usage to explain, with Ebn Ezra, "and *the water* that touches their carcasses, shall be unclean"; for מים has in the first part of the verse too subordinate a grammatical position to be supplied as the subjective case in the second; besides, in the first part the water is declared clean, for the terms מעין and בור do not merely point to the receptacles, but mainly to their contents, or the water, as the qualifying words מקוה מים prove. — The "seeds" (זֶרַע) here treated of (vers. 37, 38) are evidently, as most interpreters admit, such as are intended to be sown, but are not yet put into the ground (זֶרַע זֵרוּעַ אֲשֶׁר יִזָּרֵעַ). If the water of a well or a cistern cannot be permanently defiled, how much less living plants which constantly derive new elements of growth from below and new moisture from above. Therefore the Biblical enactments bear out the Rabbinical rules, "Whatever is fixed in the ground (מחובר) does not take uncleanness", and "Plants are incapable of uncleanness unless they have been gathered", for "else there would be no clean plant whatever, since there is none, near or upon which some unclean creeping thing is not found" (*Siphra* fol. 56; *Talm.* 118[b] and *Rashi* in loc.). Targum Jonathan renders explicitly, "If any part of their carcass falls upon any seed that is sown in the manner in which it is commonly sown, that is, in its dry state, it is clean" (בְּאוֹרְחָא דִי יִזְדְּרַע בְּנִגּוּבֵיהּ דְּכֵי). Luzzatto, taking זרע as a "vegetable product", and hence אשר יִזָּרֵעַ as "that has been sown", explains "quel prodotto attacato al suolo è puro"; which would imply a questionable ellipsis. It is clear from these remarks that the words וכי יֻתַּן מים וכ׳ (ver. 38) cannot be understood, as Ebn Ezra intimates, of the watering of the fields. The noun זֵרוּעַ is *vegetable* (Isai. LXI. 11), like זֵרֹעַ (Dan. I. 12; comp. זֵרְעֹן ibid. ver. 16). — Some codices omit כל before זרע in ver. 37, while they add it in ver. 38 (*De Rossi*, Var. Lect. I. 95) — which would unnecessarily complicate the meaning of the passage. Jewish tradition extends these regulations to fluids of any kind, besides water (spring- or rainwater), whether the fluid drop upon the seed, or the seed fall into the fluid (*Siphra* l. c.).

**39, 40.** With respect to quadrupeds, the levitical compiler found in the earlier document nothing but the general and qualified interdiction, that those not possessing the two lawful criteria are "unclean", and "that their flesh is not to be eaten and their carcasses are not to be touched" (Deut. XIV. 7, 8); and he reproduced the prohibition in its due place (vers. 4—8). Yet he read in that document this command also: "You shall not eat of anything that dies of itself (נְבֵלָה); thou shalt give it

**bears its carcass shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the evening.**

to the stranger who is in thy gates, that he may eat it; or thou mayest sell it to the alien" (Deut. XIV. 21). He could not pass over so important a provision, especially as, in its tendency, it bears a close affinity to all his peculiar theories. But he confined himself to the first part, or the prohibition enjoined upon the Hebrews; he did not repeat the second part, or the permission granted to the non-Hebrews. This liberty was against his convictions and feelings, or against those of his time. In a later portion of Leviticus, the eating of נְבֵלָה is expressly forbidden to the "native Hebrew and the stranger" alike (באזרח ובגר XVII. 15); the latter was, by his example, not to become dangerous to the former. Again, Deuteronomy does not even allude to the uncleanness caused by eating נבלה; but our author declares that the mere touch of it engenders a state of impurity which lasts till the evening; and for carrying or eating it, he ordains washing of garments, by which alone the contamination can be removed. So much had the ceremonial spirit advanced within the period intervening between the composition of the two Books. But that spirit made progress within the limits of the Book of Leviticus itself. In a subsequent portion, an additional lustration is prescribed for *eating* נבלה, namely bathing (XVII. 15). It was evidently and naturally considered, that the defilement caused by eating impure food is infinitely greater than that produced by carrying it; and hence this intelligible gradation was fixed: touching נבלה is simply attended by uncleanness which *eo ipso* ceases in the evening; carrying requires washing of garments; and eating demands both washing of garments and bathing; in any case cleanness is only restored at the end of the day. But as the priests, the holy mediators between God and His people, were specially to live in purity, the law, more rigorous with respect to their conduct, ordained that they must bathe even after *touching* any unclean carcasses (XXII. 5, 6). Moreover, the law on animals torn by wild beasts (טרפה), was equalised with that on animals that have died of themselves. And then, finally, even an impressive menace could be added in cases of non-compliance with these ceremonial precautions — "he who does not wash his garments, nor bathe his flesh, shall bear his iniquity" (XVII. 16). Yet here also we look in vain for the slightest allusion to the necessity of a sin-offering (see *supra* on vers. 20—25). Thus the law of נבלה had passed through a variety of stages, each of which bears the stamp of its time, and which, in their totality, illustrate the course of levitical development (see also pp. 14—18). — Jewish tradition strictly limited these regulations to quadrupeds (בהמה), domestic or wild, and did not extend them to birds or fishes: the text mentions indeed the first order of animals only, whether involving the most important or the most frequent cases; but there is hardly a reason why the other two classes should be exempted from the general rules; the characteristics of נבלה apply to all alike, hence all should defile or not defile in the same manner. The birds were, by tradition, at least subjected, like the quadrupeds, to the obligation of ritual "slaughtering" (שחיטה, p. 22); while the treatment of fishes was left without such ceremonial precepts.

41. And every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth, *shall be* an abomination; it shall not be eaten.

Rabbinical expositors connected the laws of purity with the sacrificial system; but not even in carrying out this unwarranted principle, did they proceed consistently; for if the fishes remained unnoticed because they were excluded from the altar, the birds might be expected to be viewed in the same light as the quadrupeds; for just as a few birds only were fit for the altar, so also were but a few quadrupeds. More in harmony with the nature of נבלה, Talmudism put stress upon touching the "carcass" of an animal that died of itself, and declared the flesh only as polluting, but not "the skin, nor the bones, nor the sinews, nor the horns, nor the claws" (see *Talm.* Chull. 77[b]; 117[b], and *Rashi* in loc.): there is indeed a difference, in the degree of corruption or decomposition, between the organic and the inorganic parts of such animal; yet not even the latter can be considered entirely sound, that is, they cannot be held perfectly clean. Expediency everywhere mitigated the rigour of abstract levitism.

Philological Remarks. — The quadruped becomes נבלה if dying from any cause whatever, and not merely in consequence of a limb being torn off from the living body (so Targ. Jon. אין יתנשׁח אי־ב־א; comp. on ver. 32). — The Sept. renders בנבלתה τῶν θνησιμαίων, in the plural, and so some manuscripts have בנבלתם and מנבלתם.

**41—43.** Among the large number of "creeping things" (שרץ), which, with the one solitary exception of locusts, are all unclean, a portion only have been legislated upon in the preceding sections (vers. 20—25, 29—38); the levitical writer could not possibly leave the rest unnoticed; for the "creeping things" were the special objects of his aversion; and he treated of them in a last supplement, and in a comprehensive and nearly complete classification. With an emphasis almost vehement, he expresses his loathing of "all that goes upon the belly", as the Serpents and Worms, of "all that go upon four", as the Reptiles, and of "all that have many feet", as the Crustaceous animals and the Spiders (see p. 52); and he is anxious to imbue the Hebrews with the same feeling of detestation: "Do not make yourselves abominable", he exclaims, "with any creeping thing that creeps, nor make yourselves unclean with them, that you should become unclean thereby." He expressly warns them against eating those creatures, but does not mention touching or carrying. He excepts no single class or species; all alike are held up to unqualified disgust (לכל השרץ, ver. 42). It is, therefore, certainly against the spirit of these injunctions, that Talmudical teaching excludes from their operation, and pronounces unobjectionable, the small worms, supposed to be bred by *generatio originaria*, in vegetables, fruit, and certain kinds of food, such as the weevils or mites in peas, beans, or lentils, worms in dates and berries, the maggots in cheese, and the vermin discovered under the skin or in the flesh of fishes: all these creatures were permitted merely because they cannot be called "creeping on the earth": and therefore they were declared to become unclean if they leave the object in which they were generated, and crawl about freely (comp. *Talm.* Chull. 67[b]; *Siphra* fol. 57[a]; *Targ. Jon.* Deut. XIV. 19; *Yor. Deah* § 84;

42. Whatsoever goes upon the belly, and whatsoever goes upon four, up to whatsoever has many feet, in fact all creeping things that creep upon the earth, these you shall not eat; for they *are* an abomination. 43. Do not make yourselves abominable with any creeping thing

*Maimon.* De Cib. Vet. II. 14 *sqq.*). However, the principal stress does not lie upon the place in which those creatures "creep", but upon the fact of their "creeping." Here again necessity compelled the abandonment of a rigid theory. A similar difficulty was differently solved by the Brahman who dashed to the ground the microscope, which revealed to him living creatures in vegetables.

Philological Remarks. — From the detailed enumeration of the species belonging to the large order of שרץ (p. 52), it will be obvious how far the Talmudical statement is correct, that הולך על גחון points to the serpents, and כל to the long, serpentine worms, or that הולך על ארבע means the scorpion, כל beetles, and מרבה רגלים the centipedes (נדל, see p. 161; *Talm.* Chull. 67[b]; *Siphra* fol. 57[a]). Rashi defines the שרץ as "a diminutive creature with short legs, which is only perceived when it creeps and moves": however, the שרץ is not characterised by smallness of size, but by low and crawling locomotion, the number of feet, and by predaceous and lurking habits. — The Masorites have written the ו in גחון prominently large, because, according to their orthography, it forms the middle *letter* of the Pentateuch; as regards the *words*, they marked דָּרֹשׁ (in X. 16) as the middle; and as regards the *verses*, that which begins with והתגלח (XIII. 33), whence they wrote the ג in this word large, and they did so on the authority of an old *beraitha*; however, the Talmudical treatise Soferim (ch. IX § 2) mentions another verse of Leviticus (VIII. 7) as the middle, which difference is not without interest for the history of the Masorah (comp. *Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. III. 91). — The "creeping things" are described (in ver. 42), with reference to their mode of locomotion, in a certain systematic gradation — creatures that have, or seem to have, no feet, creatures that have four feet, and creatures that have many, that is, more than four feet: it is easy to see the climax implied in עד כל מרבה רגלים "up to all that have many feet", culminating in the comprehensive terms "in fact, all (לְכל) creeping things that creep upon the earth" (comp. on ver. 26, p. 167); these words (עד כל וכ׳) are not simply, "or whatever has many feet" (so Luther, Engl. Vers., Michael., Luzzatto, a. o.); the Syr. and Sept. do not express עד (διαπαντὸς ὃ πολυπληθεῖ ποσίν), and a manuscr. of De Rossi omits it; while the Vulgate renders the whole verse with more than usual inaccuracy ("quidquid super pectus quadrupes graditur, et multos habet pedes sive per humum trahitur"), disregarding וְ in וכל altogether, and fancifully translating לְ in לכל with *sive*. On the paraphrase of Targ. Jonath. see *supra* p. 161. The apparent tautology in the concluding words of the 43rd verse may be avoided by referring the words ולא תטמאו בהם to physical, and ונטמתם בם to levitical or civil uncleanness, the latter being the result and consequence of the former. — נִטְמֵתֶם is written defectively for נִטְמֵאתֶם (Grammar § LXVI. 1[b]); it is unnecessary to derive it from טמה, probably *to be obtuse* or *stolid* (Job XVIII. 3); so Gesenius (Lex. s. טמה), Luzzatto

that creeps, nor make yourselves unclean with them, that you should become unclean thereby.

44. For I *am* the Lord your God; you shall therefore hallow yourselves, that you may become holy; for I *am* holy: nor shall you make yourselves unclean with any manner of creeping things that creep upon the earth.

(Gramm. p. 280, ne divereste otturi, abbrutiti), a. o.

**44—47.** After the prohibition of every kind of נְבֵלָה, the Deuteronomist briefly adds, "for thou art a holy people (עַם קָדוֹשׁ) to the Lord thy God." This point of view lay nearest, and was most congenial, to the mind of the levitical author. He extended and applied it to all dietary laws, especially to all unclean animals. Distinctly combining the notions of cleanness and holiness, and regarding the one as the indispensable condition or invariable preliminary of the other, he thus expressed the very centre of the system that is usually understood by the term *levitical*: "Do not make yourselves unclean with any creeping thing that creeps . . . You shall hallow yourselves that you may become holy." But desirous tangibly to strengthen this abstract idea, he urged, that the Hebrews stood under the guidance of Jehovah, the holy One, not merely in the manner of the other nations; for they had by His mercy and power been released from Egyptian thraldom; He was, therefore, "their God" in a peculiar and special sense; He had made them a nation and preserved them amidst dangers "that He might be their God"; and He had "borne them on eagles' wings, and brought them to Himself" (Exod. XIX. 4). Thus there was a close, almost a personal relation between God and Israel (comp. 2 Sam. VII. 23). It originated by an election through God's grace, and was ratified by a mutual covenant. "You shall be holy, for I am holy": this is the pith and kernel of the intellectual labour of many centuries; it is the ripest fruit of a long spiritual education (see p. 106). But is the fruit entirely of Hebrew growth? Is no foreign influence discernible? The idea of Purity is the foundation of the Persian creed, and the contrast between clean and unclean animals forms one of its chief features. In the exile, the Hebrews developed both the one and the other with assiduous care; but they intensified purity into holiness, and they placed the clean and the unclean animals under the dominion of the same Omnipotence. The doctrines of Zoroaster are plainly reflected in the rigorous distinction of a pure and impure creation; but Hebraism asserted in this point also its independence and superiority (see p. 64).

Here ended the commands attributed to Divine utterance; nothing, therefore, was left to the author or revisor but to mark the dietary code as concluded, and as complete in itself; and this he did in a recapitulation embracing all the various classes of animated creatures, the tenants of land, air, and water; moreover, he significantly represented the distinction between lawful and unlawful animals as coinciding with the distinction between "clean and unclean", and he thus raised the dietary laws with unfaltering hand into the sphere of religious purity.

Philological Remarks. — The Talmud expresses the connection be-

**45. For I *am* the Lord that brought you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: you shall therefore be holy; for I *am* holy.**

tween ceremonial and ethical purity clearly, though somewhat playfully, in the following gradation: "Watchfulness (זריזות or זהירות) leads to cleanness (נקיות), cleanness to purity (טהרה), purity to holiness (קדושה), holiness to humility (ענוה), humility to fear of sin (יראת חטא), fear of sin to piety (חסידות), piety to the holy spirit (רוח הקדש), the holy spirit to the resurrection of the dead (*Talm. Jerus.* Schekal. c. III. fol. 47^b; comp. *Talm. Bab.* Avod. Zar. 20^b; Sot. 49^b; etc.; see also *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 33, τὴν δὲ ἁγνείαν εἶναι διὰ καθαρμῶν κτλ. Pythagor.). The "creeping things (שֶׁרֶץ) that creep upon the earth" (ver. 44), relate to all unclean species in general, since the term שרץ gradually took universal meaning; whereas Rabbinical interpretation restricts them to the species "born in dunghills" by a supposed generatio originaria (*Maimon.* De Cib. Vet. II. 13). — וְהִתְקַדִּשְׁתֶּם (ver. 44), with chirek in the penultimate (comp. XX. 7; XXII. 22); see Gramm. § XLVI. 1^a. — The participle המעלה (ver. 45) has the meaning of the preterite (Gramm. § 100. 8) "who have brought you up" (so also Deut. XX. 1; Josh. XXIV. 17; 2 Ki. XVII. 7; Jer. II. 6; Ps. LXXXI. 11; etc.), for אשר העליתי (comp. Ex. XXXII. 1, 23; 2 Ki. XVII. 36; Jer. XVI. 14, 15; etc.); and thus המוציא (XXII. 33; Deut. VIII. 14; XIII. 6; Judg. II. 12; etc.), although אשר הוצאתי is as frequently used (Exod. XXIX. 46; Lev. XXV. 38, 42; Num. XV. 41; etc.); while in Ex. VI. 7 המוציא occurs in the meaning of the present or future "who brings or shall bring you up." Therefore, all speculations attributing a peculiar significance to the use of the article instead of the relative pronoun (*Talm.* Bab. Mets. 61^b), are gratuitous. — The concluding formula (ver. 46, 47) is probably not intended as a part of God's address to Moses and Aaron (ver. 1), but as the author's addition meant to round and to complete the section. It does not enumerate the various classes of animals in the same order in which they have before been treated in the chapter; but this irregularity, striking mainly by the precedence given to birds before the aquatic animals, is by no means unusual (comp. esp. VII. 7; XIII. 59; XIV. 54—56), and calls for no recondite explanations. — The connection between the last two verses is rather loose: "this is the law of the beasts ... to distinguish (להבדיל) between the unclean and the clean"; where the general notion is given in the infinitive, and not in a distinct tense and person, "that you or the people may distinguish" (see Gramm. § 98. 6); *Vulg.* ut differentias noveritis; *Luth.* dass ihr unterscheiden könnet; *Michael.* dies ist das Gesetz ... nach welchem zu unterscheiden ist; *Luzzatto,* onde sappiasi distinguere; etc. — The Sept. renders החיה (in ver. 47) ζωογονοῦντα, that is, *animals* in general (comp. *Lucian,* Amor. c. 19, πᾶν ἐζωογόνησεν ἔμψυχον), not merely *vivipara,* as St. Augustin contends (Quaest. in Levit. XXXVIII, quae vivos fetus gignunt, id est non ova, sed pullos). The Talmud (Chull. 24) derives from the last verse the rules concerning clean animals disqualified as food through defects or diseases; and it has been supposed that the word ζωογονοῦντα here employed by the Septuagint involves, or points to, the Talmudical decision (Chull. 58), that

46. This *is* the law of the beasts, and of the fowl, and of every living creature that moves in the waters, and of every creature that creeps upon the earth: 47. To distinguish between the unclean and the clean, and between the animals that may be eaten and the animals that may not be eaten.

animals capable of conceiving and bringing forth young, are to be considered as perfectly sound, and in no way falling under the category of טרפה, however they may seem to suffer from defects or diseases (so *Frankel*, Vorstudien zu der Sept. p. 189): but it seems hardly warranted to attribute to the Greek translation a sense so entirely foreign to the tenour of our whole chapter, since ζωογονοῦντα is simply a later, though not very frequent term for animals. — On the notion of permission or lawfulness implied in the participle (הנאכלת) and in the future (תאכל), see Gramm. §§ 94. 10; 100. 5, and the passages there quoted.

# B. ON PURITY OF PERSONS, GARMENTS, AND HOUSES.

## CHAPTERS XII TO XV.

---

## THE LAWS OF PURIFICATION.

Next to sacrifices, purifications were the most important of Hebrew rituals. Whenever both were prescribed together, the latter appeared indeed as merely preparatory to the former, since sacrifices were deemed the main agency of restored peace or holiness; but purifications, like offerings, were frequently ordained as separate and independent acts of worship: closely entwined with the thoughts and habits of the Hebrews, they formed an essential part of their religious system; and the doctrine, echoed in a hundred creeds, that "Purity is, next to life, the highest boon of man [1]", was among them also a truth and a reality.

The Hebrews "purified" or, as they understood the term, "sanctified" themselves, whenever they desired to rise to the Deity, that is, before solemn ceremonies and seasons, as sacrifices and festivals [2] — just as the Mohammedans are enjoined to wash themselves before prayer, and the Hindoos before reading the Vedas or any other holy book [3]—; or whenever they expected the Deity to descend to them by some supernatural manifestation, as the disclosure of heavenly wisdom or a deed of miraculous power and help [4]. Therefore, when in a state of impurity, they were forbidden to enter the Sanctuary, to keep the Passover, and to partake of holy food, whether of sacrificial meat, of sacred offerings and gifts, or of shew-bread, because the clean only were fit to approach the holy God and all that appertains to Him [5]; nay more, as long as they were in such a condition,

---

[1] *Vendid.* V. 66; comp. *Khorda-Avesta* I (*Spiegel*, vol. III. p. 3).

[2] Gen. XXXV. 2—4; 1 Sam. XVI. 5; comp. 2 Chr. XXX. 17; *Jos.* Ant. XIV. xi. 5.

[3] *Koran* V. 8; *Manu* V. 138, 145.

[4] Exod. XIX. 10, 14, 15; Josh. III. 5; VII. 13; see Comm. on Levit. I. p. 167—171.

[5] Lev. VII. 19—21; XXII. 3 *sqq.*; Num. IX. 6 *sqq.*; XVIII. 11, 13; 1 Sam. XXI. 5.

they were commanded to keep aloof from all social intercourse, lest the chosen community be defiled [1].

But long before these principles and regulations were fixed in a legal code, they were current and were acted upon among the Hebrews as traditionary notions and customs. Incidental allusions scattered troughout the historical Books, leave no doubt on the subject.

When Samuel arrived at Bethléhem to anoint David, he said to the alarmed elders, "I am come to sacrifice to the Lord; sanctify yourselves, and come with me to the sacrifice"; and as regards Jesse and his sons, he specially "sanctified them, and called them to the sacrifice" [2]. — Saul readily accounted for and excused David's absence from a banquet at which he was expected, by supposing that "something had befallen him": "he is not clean", he said, "surely he is not clean" [3]. — Ahimelech, the chief priest of Nob, hesitated to deliver up the shew-bread to the fugitive David and his men until he was satisfied that these had, in the previous night, abstained from associating with women [4]. For sexual intercourse was deemed defiling, and required "sanctification", which not even Bath-sheba omitted in the royal palace after her violation of conjugal fidelity [5]. — Azariah, the leprous king of Judah (B. C. 811—759), was, like all lepers, compelled to live in seclusion before the gates of the town [6]. — King Josiah, desiring to pollute most flagrantly the places devoted to pagan worship, cast upon them human bones [7].

These are the main facts recorded with respect to the ante-Babylonian times. Do they justify the inference, that there existed among the Hebrews, from early periods, a complete system of purificatory laws, and more particulary that of the Pentateuch? Other facts of equal authority impose great caution; for they point to a slow and gradual progress.

In the latest time of the Judges, a *custom* may have prevailed as to certain religious acts to be performed by women after childbirth, but there was certainly no *law*. Hannah delayed her first visit to the Sanctuary till she had weaned her son Samuel, that is, till he

---

[1] Comp. 1 Sam. XX. 26.

[2] 1 Sam. XVI. 5.

[3] 1 Sam. XX. 26.

[4] 1 Sam. XXI. 3—7: though according to the levitical law, shew-bread, which was "most holy", should on no account be eaten by any one except clean *priests* (Comm. on Levit. I p. 618).

[5] 2 Sam. XI. 4; see *infra* notes on XV. 18.

[6] 2 Ki. XV. 5; comp. Lev. XIII. 46 and notes in loc.; Num. V. 2, 3.

[7] 2 Ki. XXIII. 14.

was two or three years old [8], and then she offered three bulls with flour and wine: whereas the levitical code distinctly prescribes a lamb and a pigeon, or two pigeons, for a holocaust and a sin-offering, to be presented forty days after the birth of a boy [9]. This one discrepancy alone is decisive; for it proves that indeed a natural feeling of gratitude prompted Hebrew mothers, from an early date, to appear at the common place of worship with sacrifices and free-will gifts, but that with regard to the time and the nature of the offerings considerable or complete liberty was allowed; it certainly proves that no enactment like that of Leviticus was in force; indeed it could not then have been framed, as sin-offerings (חטאת) were unknown till late in the monarchical period [10].

The intelligent and the learned among the Hebrews gradually gathered experience as to the symptoms, the course, and the decisive tests of leprosy; but it is obvious, that long periods were required, before any particular mode of treatment could be fixed, declared unalterable, and raised into a law. Therefore, the Deuteronomist simply admonishes the people, in cases of leprosy, to adhere to the directions of the "priests the Levites" [11], which term itself points to an earlier stage of hierarchical development [12]: whereas the levitical law furnishes rules and ordinances so minute and precise that the "priests", deprived of all freedom and option, but then comprising the Aaronites only, became mere instruments, though they monopolised the execution of every ritual detail [13]. The Old Testament has preserved an instructive instance of a similar development in still later times. The prophet Haggai, probably not long after the final compilation of the levitical code, addressed to the priests some ritual questions on cases not specially or directly provided for in that code. It is ordained in Leviticus (VI. 20), that any object brought into contact with holy flesh shall become holy: now if the skirt of a garment has in this manner become holy, does it communicate its sacredness to food or drink that may be tied up in it? Again the Law enjoins, that contact with a dead body renders unclean [14]: now, if a man so defiled touches

---

[8] See Comm. on Gen. p. 433.

[9] Comp. 1 Sam. I. 21—24 and Lev. XII. 3—6.

[10] See Comm. on Lev. I pp. 272 *sqq.*

[11] Deut. XXIV. 8; the addition "as I have commanded them" (כאשר צויתים), does not necessarily point to earlier injunctions of the Pentateuch (comp. *Riehm* in Stud. und Krit. 1868, pp. 360, 361); all knowledge with reference to holy matters was ascribed to Divine suggestion.

[12] Comp. Comm. on Lev. I pp. 598 *sqq.*

[13] Comp. Lev. X. 10, 11; XIII. 1 *sqq.*

[14] Num. XIX. 11 *sqq.*

victuals of the kind just referred to, do they become unclean? The priests answered the first question in the negative, the second in the affirmative[1]. Such were the first stages of that ritual casuistry, of which there are indeed traces even in the Pentateuch (*supra* p. 167), and which was by the Mishnah, the Talmud, and the Rabbins carried to an amazing excess; and of this any one may convince himself by glancing at the sixth division of the Mishnah (טהרות), which consists of no less than twelve elaborate treatises — the first, Kelim, containing alone 254 Mishnahs in 30 chapters —, and which discusses most scrupulously every conceivable emergency that can possibly arise in practical life with reference to the precepts of purity.

Again, let the following two laws be impartially compared. Deuteronomy (XXIII. 11, 12) commands: "If there be among you any man that is not clean on account of an accident by night, then he shall go out of the camp, he shall not come within the camp; and towards the evening he shall wash himself with water, and when the sun goes down, he may come again into the camp." On the same subject Leviticus (XV. 16, 17) prescribes: "If discharge of semen go out from a man, he shall wash all his flesh in water, and be unclean until the evening; and every garment and every skin whereon is the discharge of seed, shall be washed with water, and be unclean until the evening." The law in Leviticus is obviously at once more comprehensive and more special, more general and more minute, just as might be expected in an advanced phase of priestly legislation. Let the dates of the two ordinances for a moment be reversed; then the almost primitive simplicity of Deuteronomy would be strange indeed and almost unintelligible after the minuteness of Leviticus.

Thus prepared, we may venture briefly to sketch the history of purifications among the Hebrews. It is on the whole analogous to the history of sacrifices and other ceremonials; for it represents an advance from the sphere of nature to that of religion, from religion to symbolism and from symbolism to levitical formality; therefore it exhibits also a transition from simplicity to intricacy, and from spontaneous impulse to artificial control. This advance is noticeable both with respect to the causes of defilement, its effects, and the lustrations employed.

At first, cleanness was almost identical with cleanliness. For scrupulous regard of cleanliness was, in the hot and dusty eastern climate, soon found to be imperative for the prevention of fevers,

---

[1] See Hagg. II. 11—13.

skin diseases, and leprous disorders. Hence bathing and washing are very frequently mentioned as ordinary customs; and from the great importance attached to them, it may be explained how, after the exile, ascetic Pharisees and Essenes were induced to carry them to an excess at once rigorous and playful [2], and why especially washing of hands, always performed before meals [3], became a current metaphor and emblem for declaring free from guilt or violence [4]. Thus, whatever is physically unclean, and whatever is, or was deemed, loathsome and contagious, was a pollution. Indeed most of the purificatory laws of the Pentateuch — as those on the normal and abnormal discharges of blood or other fluids, boils and eruptions, leprosy and death — refer to conditions which involve a bodily defilement, and are shunned from a natural instinct of physical dislike.

But the Hebrews could not long rest satisfied with this aspect; eager to spiritualise every external process, and to link the perishable with some higher principle, they soon began to associate with purity the ideas of life and health, and with uncleanness those of death, decay, and corruption; and then they regarded everything as contaminating which, directly or indirectly, or even remotely, might be connected with disease, abnormal decline, and dissolution.

When the notions of purity had reached this phase, another change suggested itself almost spontaneously. The Temple was the abode of life in its highest and noblest form, of the life of the soul and the warmth and freshness of the heart. It was with such life that the "cleanness" of the Israelites was, in the course of time, brought into connection: the common Sanctuary could not achieve its beneficent work of renewing the energy of the soul, if it was approached with a bodily defilement recalling death; nay the Sanctuary itself would thereby be tainted with pollution, which was sure to be fearfully avenged: "Thus shall you keep aloof the children of Israel from their uncleanness; lest they die in their uncleanness, when they defile My abode that is among them" [5]. Hence the unclean were rigorously debarred from the sacred place and all sacred rites.

---

[1] Comp. Gen. XVIII. 4; XIX. 2; 2 Sam. XI. 2; Ruth III. 3; Judith X. 3; Susan. 15; *Jos.* Bell. Jud. II. VIII. 5, 9, 13; V. IV. 3; Vit. 2; *Mishn.* Mikvaoth *pass.*; John XIII. 5—14; 1 Tim. V. 10; etc.

[3] Comp. Matth. XV. 2; Mark VII. 3; Luke XI. 38; see *Yor. Deah* § 158; *Manu* V. 138, 145; *Athen.* IX. 75.

[4] Comp. Deut. XXI. 6, 7; Isai. I. 16; Jerem. II. 22; IV. 14; Ps. XXVI. 6; LI. 4, 9; LXXIII. 13; Matth. XXVII. 24.

[5] Lev. XV. 31.

But the Hebrews did not stop even here. They followed out their views with their usual tenacity and with consistent zeal. They extended the attribute of holiness to the entire country and to all its habitations; for they felt the Divine presence in every portion of that land, and found the sanctity of the Temple reflected in every homestead; and they deemed it therefore necessary to remove all uncleanness from their dwellings no less scrupulously than from their Sanctuary [1]. Moreover, they cherished the idea with increasing confidence that they were the "chosen people", singled out by God among the nations of the earth to bear witness of His power and His truth; and then they regarded their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, the conquest of Canaan, and the establishment of a theocratic monarchy, as so many proofs of God's special care to be gratefully acknowledged by a life of purity. And finally, they invested the entire nation with the character of holiness, because all were destined to devote their worship to the holy God; they became familiar with the maxim, "You shall hallow yourselves that you may become holy, for I am holy"; till at last they described themselves as "a kingdom of priests", however reluctant the levitical legislators were to make this phrase a reality [2].

Thus we find in the laws of purity the same successive stages which mark nearly all religious ordinances of the Hebrews; and we can trace in them the same influences working one by one — the notions of external cleanliness, of vigour and health, of spiritual life, and of the sanctity of the Temple and the land, the homes and the whole people [3]. In correspondence with these stages, uncleanness till the evening seems at first to have been the only effect of defilement; then ablution or bathing was added, and then the washing of the garments; later, the period of uncleanness was, in many cases, significantly extended to *seven* days; then a holocaust was presented, or in some instances a trespass-offering; and lastly, the levitical law prescribed a sin-offering and lustration by the ashes of the "red cow".

From these remarks it is evident that the Hebrew notions of purity cannot be exhausted by one all-embracing definition; for those notions grew slowly and expanded, were refined and spiri-

---

[1] Comp. Num. V. 3; XIX. 13; XXXV. 34; Deut. XXIII. 15; see also Lev. XIII. 46; XIV. 3, 8; Num. V. 2—4; XII. 14, 15; XXXI. 19, 20; Deut. XXIII. 11, 12.

[2] See the observations in Comm. on Lev. I pp. 589 *sqq.*

[3] Comp. *supra* pp. 101 *sqq.*; and Comm. on Lev. I pp. 14 *sqq.*

tualised. To avoid confusion and error, different periods of history must be distinguished. Traditions and customs were, in the lapse of ages, converted into laws; isolated practices were blended into a system, supplemented, or modified, or they were subordinated to moral principles, and employed to serve religious ends: this process, marking the growth of all Eastern institutions and legislations, ought especially to be kept in view in examining the theocratic code of the Israelites.

Again, it must be obvious that, if system be discoverable in the Hebrew laws of purity, it is not to be found in their unity, but in their organic development; for while the one cannot be established without an artificial straining of facts, the other becomes manifest by a calm historical analysis. Those laws were suggested by peculiar instincts or tastes, by varied notions, and long experience; they were the result of many generations and the work of many minds; and though they possess a general resemblance and a certain internal affinity, they were not moulded on a definite and preconceived plan. Yet they were evidently intended to have validity, not only during the times of the Temple, but in all ages; they have, therefore, not ceased to operate after the dispersion of the Jews; for though deprived of their common Sanctuary and of an officiating priesthood, the Israelites, by virtue of an eternal covenant and of irrevocable promises, remain for ever God's *holy* and God's *chosen* people. This is unquestionably the teaching of the Pentateuch. However, Talmudists and Rabbins decided differently; they partly abrogated the laws of purity, and partly substituted for them others of a less stringent nature, especially for those connected with sacrifices. Thus they released men who have had a nocturnal accident from the prescribed bath of lustration; and though they excluded from conjugal intercourse women in their menses and persons afflicted with sexual disorders, they admitted the former to the society of their husbands and friends, and the latter to religious and public worship [4]. Either the spirit of the levitical injunctions was not understood, or these injunctions, rigorous in themselves, were deemed oppressive under the altered conditions of the people. Therefore, the sixth great division or *seder* of the Mishnah, which, in eleven treatises, sets forth the precepts of purification, has, with the only exception of the treatise Niddah, no *gemara* or Talmudic exposition, because those precepts were, in later times, considered of little practical importance. Yet even while the Temple was still in

[4] See notes on XV. 1—15; 16, 17; 19—24; 25—30.

existence, they were disregarded in all countries except Palestine, because they were held to be inseparable from the sacred soil[1]; therefore some teachers, as Jose ben Joëzer and Jose ben Jochanan, declared, that the Jews of all other lands lived in constant, though unavoidable, uncleanness[2]. The Karaites, more consistently weighing the intention of the Law, and disdaining all relief from the burdens it imposes, still consider the contact with "unclean objects" sinful, though they are divided in opinion on many vital questions, and some, as Anan and his followers, closely approached the views of the Rabbanites[3].

The result to which all researches lead, remains unshaken — namely, that the purificatory ordinances of Leviticus represent a much later phase than those of Deuteronomy; and this result is supported by the language of Leviticus, which contains words familiar only in writings composed during and after the Babylonian period[4]. On this principle only both the one and the other can be understood and historically appreciated[5].

This will appear in still clearer light if we briefly review the various other theories that have been proposed.

We may dismiss with a few passing words some opinions the weakness of which is self-evident. Maimonides supposes, that the numerous laws of purity, in consequence of which persons were but seldom levitically clean, were devised to prevent them from visiting the Temple too frequently, and thus slighting it, since "familiarity breeds contempt."[6] This singular view is hardly happier or better founded than the same author's theory of the sacrificial laws[7]; and both alike betray a disregard or misconception of the Biblical spirit:

---

1 Comp. *Ebn Ezra* on Lev. XII. 8, וזה תלוי בארץ.

2 *Talm.* Shabb. 14$^{b}$, גזרו טומאה על ארץ העמים וכ׳.

3 Comp. *Geiger*, Wissensch. Zeitschrift, VI. 52, 55, 71, 72; *Fürst*, Karäerthum, I. 10, 54. The Jewish Falashas in Abyssinia have generally, at some distance from their dwellings, a cottage to which all unclean people retire, as menstruating women or persons who have come into contact with a corpse (comp. *Jos. Halévi*, Bericht über die Mission zu den Falaschas, in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1868 p. 406).

4 As נִדָּה, see on XII. 2; בֶּן־שְׁנָתוֹ and בַּת־שְׁנָתָהּ, see on XII. 6.

5 The remarks of Riehm (Stud. u. Krit. 1868, pp. 360, 361), do not touch the pith of the question, and are inconclusive: if נגע הצרעת was not the ordinary and popular term, it may as well have passed from Deuteronomy into Leviticus as from Leviticus into Deuteronomy.

6 *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 35 (no. 12), 47; and similarly *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. I. xi. 2.

7 See Comm. on Lev. I p. 56.

for was not the holiness of the Sanctuary considered to exercise an awe-inspiring influence upon the worshippers at all times, and the more so, the more regular they were in their attendance?[8] And did not the Hebrews look upon uncleanness as a sad visitation principally for this reason, that it caused their exclusion and estrangement from the Temple[9]? — Some contend, that "the laws of purity were meant to punish the Hebrews for the sins they had committed in the desert"[10]: as if religious rites were penal inflictions. — Or, "their object was to educate a rude and barbarous people"[11]: but they pre-suppose a very high degree of religious training as well as of political and ecclesiastical organisation. — Or, "they were designed to enhance the influence of the hierarchy"[12]: though indeed they conferred upon the priests very considerable powers, and if faithfully carried out, tended to promote their aggrandisement[13], this was certainly not their original or their exclusive object; for they aimed not at the ascendency of one class, but at the sanctification of the whole people.

Again, it has been maintained that they were intended to place a strong and permanent barrier between the Hebrews and the heathen nations[14]: but they concern entirely the inner life of the community, and serve no other but their own important and peculiar purpose; moreover, most of them have very close analogies in the religious rites of other, especially Eastern nations; in fact, the idea of seclusion or separation is as foreign to these laws as to the dietary precepts[15].

Or they have been characterised as sanitary or police precautions, prescribed for the protection of individuals and of society[16]: such considerations, though at first probably the chief motives of some of the ordinances, and never wholly disregarded, gradually gave way to religious and spiritual conceptions, which, in the course of time, gained increasing weight; besides, many, and these the most important provisions, have no reference to health and illness, being as useless for preserving the one as they are inefficacious for warding off the other.

Or they have all been referred to birth and death, the beginning and end of human existence, which, contrasted with Divine

---

8 Comp. Ps. LXXXIV. 10.

9 See *infra*.

10 *Spencer* Legg. Ritt. I. xi. 2.

11 *Spencer* l. c.

12 So *Gramberg*, Relig. Id. I. 64, a. o.

13 Comp. *Siphra* and *Rashi* on XIII. 2.

14 *Spencer* l. c.

15 See *supra* p. 70.

16 *Hess*, Gesch. Mos. I. 374 *sqq.*; *Michaelis*, Mos. Recht, IV. §§ 207 *sqq.*; *Saalschütz*, Mos. Recht, pp. 21 *sqq.*

infinitude, is sinful and impure[1]: but the Hebrews were utter strangers to such notions, and they never looked upon the new-born child as unclean[2]; moreover, that principle does not apply to the dietary laws, which are of the utmost importance; for they regulate the assimilation of external objects with the inner organism, whereas the other purificatory precepts mostly control passive and abnormal conditions of the organism itself; therefore, the defiling effects are greater with respect to the former, though the defilement is more conspicuous with reference to the latter; and hence the Pentateuch often threatens severe penalties for trespasses in diet, while for "uncleanness" it merely ordains lustrations or sacrifices[3].

Or the laws under discussion have been deduced from the ideas of death and corruption: but though these ideas prevailed in cases like contact with corpses and lepers[4], and though they probably exercised an influence in a few other instances, such as irregular discharges and the prohibition of carnivorous animals; they can, as general principles, not be upheld without strained applications: for how is it possible to associate decay and dissolution with conjugal intercourse, menstruation, or childbirth? And this questionable view has been coupled with the typical or allegorical acceptation, which is even more objectionable: the laws of purity, it is asserted, were meant to remind man of death "as the monument of sin"[5], and, by imbuing him with a deep disgust for physical corruption, to implant in his mind a strong abhorrence of unrighteousness[6]; but all typical interpretations of moral and ritual laws have been proved to be as unfounded, as they generally are playful and arbitrary[7]; moreover, the doctrine that death is the hereditary consequence of original sin, is not fundamental in the Old Testament; it is indeed implied in the narrative of the "Fall of man" in Genesis, but in every other part of the Hebrew Canon, death is represented either as coming in the ordinary course of nature, or as the consequence of individual and personal transgression.

---

[1] So *Bähr*, Symb. II. 459—464.

[2] See notes on XII. 1—8.

[3] See *supra* p. 123; *Sommer*, Abhandlungen, 239—241.

[4] Num. XII. 12.

[5] Comp. Gen. III. 14—19 with reference to Gal. III. 22; Rom. V. 12; VII. 24; VIII. 20, 22; Hebr. IX. 27; etc.

[6] Comp. *Theodor*. Quaest. XIV ad Levit. (per affectiones corporeas indicat morbos animae etc.); *Sommer*, l. c. pp. 202, 234, 235; *Keil*, Levit. pp. 85, 86; Archaeol. I. 276—280; II. 18, 19; *Hengstenb*. Christol. III. 592 *sqq*., 663 *sqq*.; and on the other hand, *Winer* l. c. II. 319; *Knob*. Levit. p. 435. On the strange opinion of Br. Bauer (Relig. des Alten Bundes, I. 256 *sqq*.), see *Knob*. l. c.

[7] See Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 142 *sqq*.

The usual explanations, therefore, are by no means satisfactory.

If compared with the purificatory laws of other nations, those of the Pentateuch appear in a favourable light. They may possibly evince traces of Zoroastric views, which are discoverable in the dietary laws also[8]; but they exhibit no vestige of a dualism; in every detail they are stamped by the monotheistic creed; God alone, the merciful, wise, and omnipotent Ruler, sends trials and diseases; and no evil genius has the power of causing uncleanness. They are singular in the noble principles on which they are framed — the perfection and holiness of God; and they are thereby raised above frivolity and unmeaning formalism. Moreover, it would be unjust to deny that they were understood as symbols, or as means of sanctification[9]; to defile oneself and to sin, and also to cleanse and to hallow, are frequently used as equivalents[10].

They must be pronounced simple if considered side by side with those of the Parsees, the Hindoos, the Egyptians, or the Talmud. For they are, on the whole, confined to the chief and most striking forms of defilement, and evince a judicious moderation in fixing the detail; they prescribe no rituals for many occasions which are so signalised in other codes; and the rituals they prescribe are neither very burdensome, nor do they materially encroach upon the practical duties of life. They declare no *living* animal as defiling, however strongly it may have been detested, and however scrupulously its carcass may have been shunned[11]; whereas, for instance, among the Egyptians the accidental touch of a passing pig was contaminating[12]. Unlike the laws of the Parsees, they include no such ordinances as those which declare hair and nail-parings as unclean, and as polluting the ground upon which they fall[13]; they do not enjoin washing before and after meals[14], nor after sleep[15], after spitting and sneezing[16], or the like[17]; in most of which cases Rabbinism also prescribed ablutions, generally accompanied by some formula of prayer.

They ordain rituals only for the following occasions: (1) For women after childbirth[18]. — (2) For touching or approaching

---

8 See *supra* pp. 107, 108; comp. *Sommer* l. c. pp. 196 *sqq*.

9 Comp. Gen. XXXV. 2; Lev. XI. 44; XX. 25, 26; etc.

10 Comp. Gen. XXXV. 2; Lev. XVIII. 20, 23—30; XIX. 31; Num. V. 13; 1 Sam. XVI. 5; Isai. I. 16; etc.

11 Comp. Lev. XI. 29 *sqq*., במותם ver. 32.

12 *Herod.* II. 47; see *supra* p. 79.

13 Comp. *Vendid.* XVII. 1—33; *Spiegel* l. c. I. p. 81.

14 Comp. *supra* p. 115 note 9.

15 *Manu* V. 145.

16 *Ibid.*

17 Comp. *Manu* V. 138, 144; etc.

18 Lev. XII. 1 *sqq*.; see notes in loc.

a human corpse or human bones[1], as was the case also among the Greeks and Romans[2], the Hindoos[3], the Parsees[4], and Phoenicians[5].— (3) For touching the carcasses of "unclean" and of such "clean" beasts, as had not been regularly slaughtered, had died of themselves (נבלה), or were torn by wild beasts (טרפה)[6]. — (4) For those diseases which seem to point to an unnatural decay of the body, and in some manner to reflect the process of dissolution, especially for leprosy which was regarded as living death[7]. — (5) For abnormal secretions (זוב) from the sexual organs[8]. — But (6) also for the natural and regular discharges of women in their menses[9], and of men during sleep[10], and even for conjugal intercourse[11].

How striking is the difference if, after considering this limited number of rules, we glance at the Zend-Avesta[12], the laws of Manu or of Yâjnavalkya[13], the scattered accounts respecting the Egyptians preserved by Herodotus, Porphyry, and others[14], or at the sixth section of the Mishnah[15]!

As regards simplicity of detail, we will only introduce one illustration. The Pentateuch merely commands with respect to domestic utensils, that wooden or brazen ones, if defiled, shall be cleansed by water, and metal ones by fire, and that earthen vessels

---

1 Num. XIX. 11—22; 2 Ki. XXIII. 14; Hagg. II. 13; Tob. II. 5, 9; comp. *Jos.* Ant. III. xi. 3; XVIII. ii. 2, 3; *Mishn.* Kelim I. 4, 5, 8; Ohol. I. 1 *sqq.*; II. 1, 5; and both treatises *passim.*

2 *Varro*, Ling. Lat. V. 23; *Cic.* Legg. II. 22; *Eurip.* Alcest. 100; Helen. 1430, 1431; *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 33; *Virg.* Aen. VI. 229; *Gell.* N. A. X. xv. 24; *Tacit.* Annal. I. 62; *Senec.* Ad Marcian. 15; *Festus* sub aqua.

3 *Manu* V. 59, 62, 74—79, 88, 91, 92.

4 *Vendid.* III. 25—27, 39, 40, 44—71, 123—136; V. 1—23, 35—64, 113 *sqq.*; *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. pp. XLII. XLIII.

5 *Lucian*, Dea Syr. cc. 52, 53: whoever had seen a corpse was unclean and excluded from the temple for one day; the relatives of the dead for thirty days; the Galli, after having buried one of their colleagues, for seven days.

6 Lev. XI. 8, 11, 24—28, 31, 36, 39; see notes in locc., and *supra* pp. 16, 21.

7 See notes on XIII. XIV.

8 See notes on XV. 1—15, 25—30.

9 See notes on XV. 19—24.

10 See notes on XV. 16, 17.

11 See notes on XV. 18.

12 Comp. *Vendid.* III. 25—27, 39, 40, 44—48; V. 66—68, 83—178; VI. 1—106; VII. 1—93, 122—196; VIII. 1—72, 107—310; IX. 1—185; X. 1 *sqq.*; XI. 1 *sqq.*; XII. 1—71; XVII. 1—44; XVIII. 134—152; etc.; comp. also *Spiegel*, Av. II. pp. XLIV, XLVI, LXXXIV, LXXXV; and in general to p. XCVI, where the different lustrations and the degrees of their importance or efficacy are described — the *patiab*, the *ghusl* (غسل), and the *barashnom nuh shava* (برشنوم نه شوة).

13 Ed. *Stenzler*, I. 11—13, 15—22, 139, 147, 148, 182—197, 222; II. 303; III. 18—38, 243—258, 277, 278.

14 Comp. *Herod.* II. 37; *Porph.* Abst. II. 44; IV. 7; etc.

15 Comp. *supra* p. 190.

shall be broken, lest they be used again[16]. But the Hindoo laws give so many injunctions that it would be tedious to enumerate them; let it suffice to observe that they distinguish between vessels or objects of metal and wood, horn and bone, cane and ivory, jewels and precious stones, corals, shells, and pearls; and that for the purpose of purification, they call into requisition water and fire, ashes and earth, acids and mustard-seed, cow-urine, cow-dung, and the cow herself, which is made to stay a day and a night on land which is to be cleansed. Moreover, they prescribe purifications for fields and their produce, for wood and straw, for fluids, for silk and woollen stuffs, cloths, and skins, and for an infinite variety of other objects. Yet with that spiritual refinement which distinguishes the Hindoo sages, they rise occasionally to a noble conception of purity: no uncleanness, they declare, can fall upon a king or divine while engaged in the exercise of their duties; a monarch is purified by acts of mercy, a warrior by valour on the battle-field, scholars by pardoning offences, artists by the exercise of their art, the heedless by generosity, secret sinners by pious devotion, the mind by truth and careful study, the soul by holy meditation, all men by sacred learning, self-denial, and religious worship; and "he who acquires wealth with unstained hands, is clean above all others".[17]

Not even blood was, of itself, deemed defiling[18] among the Hebrews, since, as a means of grace and atonement, it was sprinkled upon the most sacred parts and objects of the Sanctuary; only if shed by murder, it polluted the land, the hallowed abode of God;[19] and it was to be expiated whether the perpetrator was known or not, in the one case by the death of the murderer, in the other by significant symbols.[20]

The purificatory laws of the Pentateuch assert their superiority, besides, in another respect. They reflect indeed that hierarchical tendency which is manifest throughout the levitical legislation; for they are more stringent with regard to the priests than the people, since the former, the anointed mediators between God and the com-

---

[16] Lev. VI. 28; XI. 32, 33; XV. 12; Num. XXXI. 22—24. On the purifying force of fire see Comm. on Lev. I pp. 529 *sqq*.

[17] See *Manu* V. 57—145. Similarly, the law of Zoroaster declares him clean who keeps himself pure by good thoughts, words, and actions (*Vendid.* V. 67, 68).

[18] This has frequently been asserted; comp., f. i., *Knobel*, Lev. p. 437; and it was so among the Persians (comp. *Strab.* XV. III. 14, p. 732).

[19] Num. XXXV. 33, 34.

[20] Deut. XXI. 1—9.

munity, are invested with uncommon holiness[1]; and they are also more exacting with respect to the Nazarite, because "the consecration of his God is upon his head[2]". But with these few exceptions, they are identical for the whole people, and admit no distinction of classes. How different, for instance, are the corresponding ordinances of the Hindoos! After defilement by contact with a corpse, a merchant becomes pure in five days, a priest in ten, a warrior in twelve, and a servant in a month[3]; and similar gradations pervade all analogous laws[4]. Among the Egyptians, the idea of purity seems to have been restricted to the priests only[5], and indeed the purificatory laws of the Egyptians have the least resemblance to those of the Hebrews.

Nor is it possible to mistake, in the Pentateuch, a well-considered method and system as to the *degrees* of defilement. In some instances, the uncleanness is communicated to persons and objects by direct or indirect contact[6], in others, it remains confined to the person who contracted it[7]; in some cases it only lasts till the evening[8], in others seven full days[9], at the birth of a boy during forty, at the birth of a girl for eighty days[10], and in cases of leprosy, irregular menstruation, and seminal discharges, as long as the evil continues[11].

The *means* of purification are no less thoughtfully varied. In some cases, the uncleanness ceases without any ceremony[12], in others

---

[1] Lev. XXI. 1 *sqq.*; comp. Comm. on Lev. I. 587 *sqq.*

[2] Num. VI. 6 *sqq.*

[3] *Manu* V. 83; comp. 59, 136, 137, and Book V. *passim.*

[4] Comp. also *Spiegel*, Avesta, I. p. 111.

[5] Comp. *Herod.* II. 37; *Porph.* Abst. II. 44; see, however, *ibid.* IV. 7 αἱ δὲ ἁγνεῖαι πάντων ἐκαθάρευον.

[6] As in reference to a corpse, to leprosy, "running issues", and regular or protracted menstruation (Levit. XIII. 45, 46; XV. 4—12, 20—24, 26, 27; Num. XIX. 21, 22).

[7] As with respect to unclean carcasses, conjugal intercourse, spontaneous emission of semen, and childbirth (Lev. XI. 24, 25, 27, 39, 40; XII. 2 *sqq.*; XV. 16, 18).

[8] Viz. if caused by nocturnal pollution, or by entering a leprous house; or if produced by contact with a carcass, with a person defiled through touching a corpse, and with the "water of purification" (מֵי הַנִּדָּה), a menstruating woman, or an object on which such a woman or a man with a running issue had been sitting or lying (Lev. XI. 24, 27, 31, 39; XIV. 46; XV. 19, 23; Num. XIX. 21, 22; Deut. XXIII. 12).

[9] As after contact with a corpse or a human bone or grave; after entering a house harbouring a corpse; menstruation and connection with a menstruating woman (Lev. XV. 14, 16, 19, 24; Num. XIX. 11, 14, 16; XXXI. 19).

[10] Lev. XII. 2—5.

[11] XIII. 46; XV. 2, 25.

[12] See the passages *supra* note 8.

by bathing the body in water[13]; in some by the washing of garments[14], and in others by both bathing and washing of garments[15]; and lastly, in some remarkable emergencies, sacrifices and symbolical rites are prescribed, usually in addition to the ordinary ceremonies: thus in the important case of defilement by a corpse, the lustration includes sprinkling, on the third and the seventh day, with the "water of purification", a strong and sharp lye, prepared from the ashes of the red cow[16]; a holocaust and a sin-offering are required of women after childbirth, and of men and women after the cessation of certain abnormal discharges; while the leper, whom the Hebrews regarded as the image of death-like dissolution, has to present a holocaust, a trespass- and a sin-offering, and has besides to submit to an elaborate ceremonial of purification[17].

Yet in spite of these laudable features, the purificatory rites of the Pentateuch were, like all ceremonials, liable to perversion. They were too often considered as a self-sufficient end, and

---

[13] As after the emission of semen, whether during sexual intercourse or not; or a priest after coming into contact with an unclean animal, or with a person defiled by touching a corpse or by any other cause (Lev. XV. 16, 18; XXII. 4—7; Deut. XXIII. 11, 12; comp. Lev. VIII. 6; XVI. 4; etc.); similarly *Manu* V. 66, 77, 78, 85, 86, 103, 144; *Vendid.* XVI. 18, 19; comp. also *Manu* V. 76, 99, 108 (purification by touching water); V. 86, 145 (by sprinkling or washing the mouth with water); V. 139 (by drinking water); *Vendid.* V. 157; *Spiegel*, Avest. II. pp. XX, XLVI, XLVII, LXXXIV, LXXXV; *Meiners*, Gesch. der Relig. II. 108.

[14] So after carrying the carcass, or eating of the flesh, of an unclean animal; after recovery from disorders of the skin; after having eaten or slept in a leprous house; and after having sprinkled the "water of purification" (Lev. XI. 25, 28, 40; XIII. 6, 34; XIV. 47; Num. XIX. 21; comp. Exod. XIX. 10, 14); see also *Manu*, V. 77, 78, 103.

[15] As lepers were required to do when passing through the ceremonies of lustration; or persons healed from running issues, and about to be declared clean; or those who touch a bed or any object on which such a person or a woman in her menses or with an irregular flow of blood had been sitting or lying; those who eat of נבלה or טרפה; those who are cleansed from defilement by a corpse; and all persons engaged in burning the red cow and gathering its ashes (Lev. XIV. 8, 9; XV. 5, 6, 10, 13, 21, 22, 27; XVII. 15, 16; Num. XIX. 7-10, 19; comp. Lev. XVI. 24, 26, 28).

[16] Num. XIX. 17—19; comp. XXXI. 19; Hebr. IX. 13; *Jos.* Ant. IV. iv. 6: ashes and lye were employed as a means of purification by the Persians, the Romans, and others (comp. *Virg.* Ecl. VIII. 101; *Ovid.* Fast. IV. 639, 640, 725, 726, 733; *Arnob.* Adv. Nat. VII. 32).

[17] Lev. XII. 6—8; XIV. 1—32; XV. 13—15, 28—30; see notes in locc. An offering of purification (צועת) is repeatedly mentioned in the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles (lines 3, 5, 7, 9, 13).

instead of promoting humility and purity of heart, they engendered pharisaical pride and hypocrisy, and their mechanical performance by the mass of the people was constantly rebuked by prophets and moralists. More advanced generations require no purificatory laws as injunctions of religion; for they conform spontaneously to the requirements of cleanliness; and they can see no "pollution" in those natural processes and conditions of man, which are inseparable from him as a link in the universal chain of life.

# TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY.

## CHAPTER XII.

SUMMARY. — *The ordinances concerning women in childbirth.* For seven days after the birth of a *boy*, the mother is as thoroughly unclean as in the time of her menstruation (ver. 2); while during thirty-three days after the first week, she has merely to keep aloof from holy things and from the Sanctuary (ver. 4): on the eighth day, the boy is to be circumcised (ver. 3). After the birth of a *girl*, both periods of purification are doubled, viz. fourteen and sixty-six days (ver. 5). When the terms are completed, that is, forty days after the birth of a boy, and eighty days after the birth of a girl, the mother, to effect her atonement and purification, has to present a lamb one year old as a burnt-offering, and a young pigeon or a turtle-dove as a sin-offering (vers. 6, 7); but if she be poor, a pigeon or a turtle-dove suffices for the burnt-offering also (ver. 8).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Speak to the children of Israel, saying, If a woman is delivered,

**1—8.** A certain principle and system of arrangement cannot be mistaken in the purificatory laws. No weight can be attached to the Rabbinical suggestion that, as in the cosmogony the creation of animals preceded that of men, so in the section on purity the animals are treated of first, and then the ordinances relating to men (*Midr. Rabb.* Levit. 22 ed. Stett., Rashi, a. o.): but we may acknowledge a natural progress from precepts on food received from without and assimilated within the body, to precepts on accidents arising from conditions of the human body itself and manifesting themselves externally. And of this latter class of laws, those relating to childbirth, or the beginning of human life, are logically introduced first. Their meaning naturally coincides with that of the laws of purity in general. They bear no reference to "the first sin for which woman was cursed with the pains of labour" (*Baumgarten*, Comment. II. 161); nor do they imply that every mother is unclean and worthy of death on account of man's hereditary deflement and guilt (*Michael.* Typ. Gottesg. p. 95); they do not teach that "both sin and its punishment lie principally in the relation of the sexes", or that "the flesh, created by God and originally good, has yet, by the sin of the spirit, become the kindling spark of all sinful desires" (*Gerlach*, Comm. pp. 408, 409; *Bren-*

and gives birth to a male child, she shall be unclean seven days; as in the days of the impurity of her

*tano*, Pent. II. 69; comp. *Origen*. In Levit. Homil. VIII. pp. 316, 317 ed. Lomm.): they point to no ideas so totally foreign to the conceptions and the character of the Old Testament (see p. 196). They are clearly laws of purity, and their spiritual character is manifest from the religious rites prescribed in connection with them.

After a certain number of days, when the mother might well be restored to perfect health and to her normal state, she was ordered to present a burnt- and a sin-offering. By the one she was to acknowledge the sovereignty and power of God, as the Lord of nature and mankind, to whose will and grace she owes her offspring; and by the other she was to express her unworthiness, from her moral frailty and failings, of receiving so precious a blessing, and of overcoming pain, anxiety, and peril. The impurity itself, inseparable from childbirth, required no atonement whatever, because it is ordained by God as natural and inevitable. It was held physically defiling, but pointed to no moral trespass; it imposed, therefore, necessary restrictions in the mother's intercourse with men, and in her relations to holy things and places; but it called forth no mournful thoughts of self-reproach and abasement. The days of purification at the birth of a girl were double of those observed at the birth of a boy, simply because in the former case the physical derangement of the system was supposed to last longer (see *infra*), and not because, "viewed in reference to the origin of things, the woman is and remains the seducing and the seduced sinner, who is affected by greater impurity, till she is hallowed by the birth of the pure seed" (*Baumgarten*, l. c.); nor because the female sex "stands a step lower than the male sex", is "more imperfect, weaker, and in a certain respect even more unclean" (*Bähr*, Symb. II. 490); no such difference is traceable in the Hebrew law; for the sacrifices of lustration were identical in both cases, irrespective of the sex of the child. They were in no manner intended to remind the woman of "the corruption of her whole nature, and to impress upon her the depravity of her desires" (*Baumg.* l. c.; *Keil*, Comm. p. 87): the occasion was far too joyful to be dimmed by reflections so gloomy and so unavailing; it was indeed calculated to call forth the feelings of dependence and humility, but no less those of gratitude and exultation; if the former alone were conveyed by the prescribed offerings, it is because they predominated in the solemn hour when the mother, long secluded from the privileges of the Sanctuary, was restored to her full rights as a Hebrew woman, and to the unrestricted communion with her God; yet the ideas of transgression and guilt were decidedly subordinate to those of awe and submission; for the sin-offering consisted of the smallest animal sacrifice lawfully permitted, namely, a single pigeon or turtle-dove; while the holocaust was ordinarily a lamb. Origen (l. c.) indeed strives to prove that only sinners, like Pharaoh and Herod, rejoice at their birth-day (Gen. XL. 20; Mark VI. 21), while "to pious and holy men it is an object of execration"; but this startling assertion, which might be expected from a Pliny or a Lucretius, rather than a Father of Church, and which Origen supports by the well-known ut-

*monthly* illness shall she be unclean. 3. And on the eighth day, the flesh of his foreskin shall be circum-

terances of Job (III. 3—9) and Jeremiah (XX. 14—18), is absolutely contradicted by the Hebrew and Eastern spirit, nay by the very words of those sufferers (comp. Comm. on Gen. p. 134). Nor was the burnt-offering ordained merely because the mother might, in the agony of her pains, have allowed reproachful thoughts to rise in her mind, and the sin-offering, because she might have given expression to them (*Ebn Ezra*, a. o.): the sacrifices were not meant to apply to individual conditions or to special times, but were founded upon the totality of life and the innermost character of human nature. But it is certain that the expiation was performed, not for the new-born child, but for the mother; for though the Psalmist declares, "I was shaped in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me" (LI. 7); though the Pentateuch pronounces "the imagination of man's heart evil from his youth" (Gen. VIII. 21); and Job exclaims, "How can a clean being come from an unclean one! not one" (XIV. 4): sacrifices of atonement were only offered by and for those who understood and felt their significance, and never for children (comp. *Augustin.* Quaest. XL ad Levit.). The new-born boy had indeed to undergo the rite of circumcision, but not as a means of penitence, but of sanctification; it was not intended to atone for innate depravity, but to serve as the sign of a holy covenant; if indeed, in a certain sense, it was a sacrifice, because it involved the feelings of human dependence and submission, it was a holocaust rather than a sin-offering (see *infra*; comp. Comm. on Gen. p. 390); and no initiatory ceremonial whatever was required for new-born girls.

Analogous laws or customs in connection with childbirth existed and still exist among other nations; but they are far more rigid and more capricious than those of the Hebrews. Among the Hindoos, "all the kindred" of a new-born child are impure; the father, who, according to the Hebrew law, is in no way levitically affected, has to undergo lustration by bathing; the mother is unclean till the tenth day, when the child receives its name, and in cases of miscarriage she remains in a state of impurity as many nights as months have elapsed since conception; the house itself, in which the birth takes place, is unclean, and must be sprinkled with hallowed water (*Manu*, V. 58, 61, 62, 66). — Curious are the ceremonies of the Parsees. While in ancient times the new-born child was simply washed with water (*Vendid.* XVI. 18, 19), in later periods it became customary to pour into the mouth of the child a few drops of the purifying juice *parahaoma*, and to wash the body three times with cow-urine and once with water; three years afterwards the father is bound to present an offering to Mithra; for the child is supposed to be fed, in the mother's womb, by the impurities which ordinarily pass away with her menses, and it is, therefore, at its birth believed to be intensely polluted. The mother herself, as soon as her labours begin, is placed on an iron bed, as no wooden one would finally be capable of purification; immediately after the birth of the child, she washes herself, but remains unclean for forty-one days, during which time she takes the same food as in the period of menstruation. Then she makes thirty ablutions with cow-urine and

cised. 4. And she shall *then* continue in the blood of purification three and thirty days; she shall touch no

water, and having put on a new dress, she is at last considered clean. As in the days after her confinement, both she and her child, and the latter even in a higher degree, are deemed to be exposed to the malice of evil spirits, it is strongly commanded to have during the first three days and nights a light burning in the house, since fire, the emblem of Ormuzd and the enemy of the wicked *kharfesters*, is a powerful protection for the infant (comp. *Vendid.* V. 157; see *Spiegel*, Zend-Avesta, II. XIX, XX, XLIV—XLVII). — Among the Mohammedans, the woman is unclean for forty days after childbirth, during which time she has to abstain from all acts of religion and worship. — The Greeks believed they defiled an altar by approaching it after having been near a woman in childbirth (*Eurip.* Iph. Taur. 381—383); nay by coming near such a woman they held that they defiled themselves, though excessive rigour in this respect was looked upon as superstition (*Theophr.* Char. XVI [XXVII]). During the Peloponnesian war, one of the means they employed for "purifying" the island of Delos (in the 88th Olympiad), was to forbid, that no woman should keep her confinement in the island (*Thucyd.* III. 104). The same prohibition was enforced by the Epidaurians with respect to the holy grove of Aesculapius (*Pausan.* II. XXVII. 1). The mother was not permitted to appear in the temples before the fortieth day, which was generally celebrated as a holiday (the τεσσαρακοστόν), because within that period most women were still supposed to suffer from the effects of their pregnancy, and to be subject to loss of blood, while the infants are feeble, do not smile, and seem subject to constant danger (*Censorin.* Di. Nat. c. XI). On the fifth day, the well-known ceremony of *amphidromia* (ἀμφιδρόμια) took place, when the child was by the nurse or midwife carried rapidly round the domestic hearth; on the same day, sacrifices were offered on behalf of the child, when relatives and friends sent presents; and the name was given either on the seventh or on the tenth day, which was likewise celebrated as a festival (ὀνομάτων ἑορτή; see *Suid.* sub ἀμφιδρόμια and ἑβδομευόμενα; *Plaut.* Trucul. II. IV. 69, 70). — Among the Romans, the mother was required to bathe immediately after her confinement (*Plaut.* Amphitr. II. II. 37; *Ter.* Andr. III. II. 3); the day on which the child was named — the dies lustricus or nominalis — dedicated to the goddess Nundina, was kept with solemnity; it was for boys the ninth, for girls the eighth day after their birth, for which difference playful reasons were assigned, as, for instance, females grow more rapidly and come sooner to maturity; or even numbers partake of the female, uneven ones of the male character (*Macrob.* I. 16 sub *fin.*; comp. *Plut.* Quaest. Rom. 102; *Pers.* Sat. II. 31—36. — *Callim.* Hymn. in Jov. 10 *sqq.*, in Del. 123 *sqq.*, offer no apt parallels). — Some Asiatic nations employ fire for the lustration of women in childbirth. The Siberian women must leap several times over blazing flames. The Siamese keep the mother constantly before a fire for a whole month, turning her, for more efficient purification, frequently from one side to the other, unmindful of her agonies; and the people of Pegu put her for four or five days upon a heated hearth: after these periods they celebrate

**hallowed things, nor come into the Sanctuary, until the days of her purification are fulfilled. 5. But if she gives**

festivals in honour of the fire, to express their gratitude for its great services. Among the Hottentots the lustration is effected by urine and cow-dung. Many northern tribes, as the Samoiedes, Siberians, and Laplanders, compel the women to remain for six weeks or two months in secluded huts; or they prevent them at least, during that time, from preparing any food, touching the garments or any other property of their husbands, coming near a hearth or the path of men and rein-deer, and above all from approaching altars or places of sacrifice. Among some negro-tribes also the women are kept in isolation during the whole time of their impurity; preparing food for their husbands within this period is a sin of death (comp. *Meiners* l. c. pp. 105—108). Similar customs prevail among the Red Indians and the North-American savages, and seem, in fact, to be common to all nations and tribes which consider physical impurity not merely repulsive, but in some mysterious manner morally polluting.

Though the issue of blood that succeeds childbirth (or lochia rubra) generally lasts only three or four days, and the efflux of the white fluid that follows (lochia alba) usually ceases altogether after two or three weeks, the Hebrew legislator, extending both periods so as to cover extreme cases, fixed significant numbers of days — seven for the one and forty for the other period at the birth of a boy, and twice seven and twice forty at the birth of a girl; for he desired to stamp the time of separation with the seal of religion. The significance attributed to those numbers by the Hebrews requires no illustration in this place (comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 480; on Gen. p. 185; see also Henoch XVIII. 6; XXIV. 2; XXXII. 1; LXXVIII. 4—8; XCI. 16; XCIII. 10; *Philo*, De Septenar. cc. 1, 6, 9, 10, 18, 19, 24; *Yalk. Shim.* I. § 276; *Saadiah*, On the Decalogue, ed. Eisenstädter, pp. 12, 13; *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 43; *Ebers*, Aegypten und die Bücher Mose's, pp. 339, 346). But it was particularly striking among the heathens with reference to birth, life, and death. It was believed that "the number seven encompasses the whole existence of man in all its stages to its very termination": conception is decided seven hours after the intercourse; seven days later, the semen is enclosed in a membranous vesicle, as the egg in its shell; from seven to seven days the foetus undergoes marked changes or developments; in the seventh week it is perfectly formed; it is fully matured in seven months; and generally sees the light of day after 273 or after 39 times 7 days; seven hours after the birth of a child, it is possible to decide whether it will live; the seventh day after this period, when the navel drops off, is particularly dangerous to the infant, which previously "resembled a plant rather than an animated being"; after fourteen days, it begins to turn its eyes to the light, and after forty-nine, it notices and distinguishes objects; after seven months, it gets the first teeth, and cuts seven in each jaw; after fourteen months, it sits upright without fear of falling; after twenty-one months, it speaks with distinct articulation; after twenty-eight, it stands firmly and walks with ease; after thirty-five, it shows dislike to the milk of the nurse, and accepts it only from habit; in

**birth to a female child, she shall be unclean two weeks as *in the time of* her *monthly* impurity; and she shall**

the seventh year, it looses its first, and gets its second teeth, and the pronunciation of words becomes perfect; at the end of the fourteenth year, both boys and girls enter the period of puberty, the former becoming capable of generation, the latter beginning to have their menses; at the age of twenty-one, the young man has a fully developed beard, which then ceases to grow in length; at twenty-eight, his body has attained its greatest height, which never exceeds seven feet; at thirty-five, the man is in the plenitude of his vigour, which remains on the whole stationary to the forty-second year, when his faculties are highest, and fit him alike for action and counsel; then his strength diminishes, at first slowly till his forty-ninth year, then more perceptibly; and as a rule he reaches the limit of his life in his seventieth year. — Again, the seventh day marks the crisis for most diseases; man has seven great internal and seven other vital organs; his body consists of seven substances and of three times seven limbs; his head, the seat of Divine intelligence, has seven apertures; he dies after seven hours of suppressed breathing and after as many days of hunger. Moreover, seven stars form the constellations of the Great and the Little Bear and of the Pleiads; there are seven planets and seven heavenly circles; summer-solstice takes place when the sun passes the seventh sign after the winter-solstice, viz. from capricorn to cancer, and conversely; the moon completes her revolution round the earth in four times seven days; and twenty-eight is the sum of the numbers from 1 to 7; the deity or the soul of the world itself originated in this number, which is hence designated "the venerable" (ἑπτάς or σεπτάς), the "sovereign regulator of the human fabric", the "perfect number", or the "key to nearly all things" (rerum omnium fere nodus; comp. *Macrob.* Somn. Scip. I. 5, 6; *Plut.* Quaest. Rom. 102; Placit. Philos. V. 18; *Gell.* III. 10; *Censor.* Di. Nat. cc. VII, XI; *Apulej.* Metam. XI *init.* eum numerum — septem — praecipue religionibus aptissimum divinus ille Pythagoras prodidit).

Nor were the Hebrews singular in the belief that the woman suffers more and longer at the birth of a girl than of a boy. It was supposed that the foetus of the former is developed more slowly than that of the latter; that the mother looks more pale, feels greater discomfort, and is exposed to more irregularities and mischances in the one instance than in the other; that the purifications continue, in the one case never more than thirty, in the other never less than forty days after conception; and generally last as long after childbirth (comp. *Hippocr.* De Nat. Puer. I. 393 ed. Kühn; *Aristot.* Hist. An. VI. xxii. 3; VII. iii. 2; iv. 3; xii. 1). Some Rabbins expressed the opinion that both the male and the female child are indeed formed in the mother's womb within 41 days, but that the body of the female is by nature colder and moister, and cold humours require longer time to be secreted and lustrated (comp. *Nachman.* in loc.; *Holling.* Jus Hebr. p. 231), which questions were eagerly discussed by classical writers also (comp. *Macrob.* Sat. VII. 7; also *Talm.* Nidd. $31^b$).

Now, the text enjoins that the newborn boy should, after the first great period of the mother's purification,

*then* continue in the blood of purification six and sixty days. 6. And when the days of her purification are

or after the lapse of seven days, be circumcised (ver. 3). This express injunction, which might appear superfluous, can in the connection in which it occurs, hardly refer to any other idea than that of purity; but the nature of this purity must be understood in harmony with the entire system of Hebrew theology; it is not of an outward kind; circumcision aims not simply at cleanliness, as it did for long periods among the Arabs and Egyptians (*Herod.* II. 37); it typifies still less "the corruption of the human will manifesting itself in the lust of the flesh", or "the origin and principle of all the impurity of human nature" (*Baumgart.* l. c. p. 162); but being "a sign" (אות) of the holy covenant with the God of Israel, and of the boy's introduction into the chosen community, it marks his transition from the state of nature to that of religion; from pagan uncleanness to the priestly holiness of Israel. In this sense, but in no other, the boy's circumcision is a rite of lustration (see *supra*).

During the second term of recovery, extending over 33 or 66 days, the mother was indeed still under restraints; for the white issue from which she suffers during that time, was also looked upon as "blood of purification" (vers. 4, 5); yet her restrictions applied no longer to the social, but only to the religious sphere; she was not, as in the first seven days, treated with the same rigour as a menstruating woman; her proximity or contact did not defile; she was probably not forbidden to her husband; yet as the *lochia alba* was justly regarded as another, though more lenient, stage of the *lochia rubra*, she was debarred from holy places and holy objects; she was "to touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the Sanctuary" (ver. 4); she was still in her "days of purification", which closed finally when, at the end of 40 or 80 days, she had cleansed herself by the prescribed offerings. So careful is the author in this respect, that he bids the mother bring the sacrificial animals, not within the precincts of the Sanctuary, from which she was excluded before the completion of the sacrifice, but "to the door" of it, where she was to hand over her offerings to the ministering priest (ver. 6). Bathing is not expressly mentioned, as it formed no part of the religious ritual; but it was doubtless performed as a first and natural lustration, and is at present, together with a special visit and prayer in the Synagogue, the only ceremony observed by Jewish women after childbirth (see *Yor. Deah* §§ 194. 1; 197. 1; 201. 1; comp. also *Hottinger*, Jus Hebr. pp. 233, 234; and in general *Mishn.* Nidd. III. 1 *sqq.*). The Christian church still celebrates the annual "festival of the purification of Mary" on the second of February, that is, on the 40th day after the 25th of December, in reference to our law and to an allusion in the New Testament (Luke II. 22—24); and in some countries, Catholic women repair to their places of worship to pray, six weeks after their confinement, just as Hebrew women do everywhere.

But in connection with those sacrifices several questions arise which have not been satisfactorily answered, and which lead to interesting historical inferences. Why did the holocaust precede the sin-offering (vers. 6, 8), whereas in all other instances when both were presented

**fulfilled for a son or for a daughter, she shall bring a lamb one year old for a burnt-offering, and a young pi-**

together, the sin-offering preceded the holocaust? And why is the formula, "This is the law for her that gives birth to a male or female child" (ver. 7), which in all similar cases concludes the ordinances, followed by other regulations on the same subject? (ver. 8). It has been contended, that the holocaust, being the larger offering and probably designed for the child as well as for the mother, is indeed first mentioned, but was not first presented (comp. *Talm.* Zevach. 89 *sqq.*; Rashi; a. o.); or that logical sequence must not be expected, the text employing the concluding formula after having stated the "ordinary rule", and caring less about "exceptional cases", which are treated of in supplementary precepts. It is unnecessary to point out the weakness of these explanations; the sacrifices were not intended for the child, but for the mother only (see *supra*); not the value of the victim, but the character of the offering decided the priority; the last verse (the eighth) forms a necessary and integral part of the law, nay the smaller offering of two birds was doubtless in reality the more frequent one, as it was, for instance, presented by the parents of Jesus, an incidental proof of the humbleness of their station and circumstances (Luke II. 24; comp. *Origen.* In Lev. Hom. VIII. referring to 2 Cor. VIII. 9; *Augustin.* Quaest. XL. in Levit.).

We have proved before, that holocausts were the oldest, expiatory offerings the latest class of sacrifices (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 3, 4). Now it is very probable, that offerings of pious acknowledgment or holocausts were, from comparatively early times, presented by Hebrew women after childbirth, though we have pointed out that this custom was not yet raised into a law at the end of the period of the Judges (see p. 188). The levitical legislator found the practice in existence; and he not only fixed it permanently, but he enjoined besides another sacrifice of that class which had, in his time, risen more and more in importance, and which he deemed the holiest and most essential of all — a sin-offering. A lamb had probably been customary as the holocaust after childbirth; he could not venture to demand another great victim for the sin-offering; and he, therefore, contented himself with prescribing a young pigeon or turtle-dove. Now the ordinances were completed, and the formula, "This is the law" etc. was added to mark the conclusion. But the presentation of a lamb must very soon have become extremely burdensome, when it was no longer left to custom or option, but was required as compulsory by a religious command; it was impossible to enforce it with any degree of rigour or consistency, especially if the prolificness of Hebrew women be considered; it was, therefore, deemed wise to alter the law in so far, as to permit to poorer families the sacrifice of a pigeon or a turtle-dove for the holocaust also; this was the more feasible, as the offering of birds, for long periods unusual among the Hebrews, had become frequent, probably as an unavoidable concession, and had even been adopted with respect to the sin-offering (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 474, 475); and then the ordinance permitting two young pigeons or turtle-doves for both sacrifices was appended by a later reviser, satisfied that the addition was

geon or a turtle-dove for a sin-offering, to the door of the Tent of Meeting, to the priest: 7. And he shall offer

demanded by necessity, and convinced that the intention and the frame of mind are more essential than the offering itself (see l. c. p. 51), but unconcerned at the logical offence of adding an appendix to a final conclusion.

But why did he not, in extreme cases of poverty, permit a cereal offering, as he did in several other instances? Without desiring to speak with decision where the Bible affords no hint whatever, we may suggest, that he possibly deemed the sacrifice of a living creature appropriate on occasions connected with life and birth, and therefore eminently requiring the embodiment of the idea of "life for life", or of a vicarious sacrifice (see l. c. pp. 291 *sqq.*).

Philological Remarks. — The word תזריע (ver. 2) no doubt means "she brings forth seed" i. e. is delivered of a child (comp. מזריע זרע and זורע זרע Gen. I. 11, 12, 29), since זֶרַע is commonly used for progeny, offspring; so also Ebn Ezra and Abarban. (תתן זרע), Gerlach, Johlson, Herxh., Keil, Luzzatto, Bunsen, a. o.; it does not mean "she has conceived seed", so Targ. Onk. and Jon. (תְּעַדֵּי and תְּעַדֵּי, see *Nachman.* in loc.), Sept. (ἐὰν σπερματισθῇ, comp. σπερματίζειν τι *to sow something*, *Stob.* Ecl. I. p. 131, ed. Meinecke), and Vulg., Luther, and Engl. Vers., Rosenm. a. o. Origen, believing the word תזריע superfluous in reference to women in general, since they cannot bring forth children without conceiving, considers it to point to the virgin Mary "quae sine semine concepit et peperit" (In Lev. Hom. VIII. p. 314). The phrase חַיּוֹת זֶרַע (Gen. VII. 3; XIX. 32) has a different sense, viz. "to keep alive seed" or "to secure descendants" (comp. also *Talm.* Nidd. 27[b]). The readings תְּזָרֵעַ and תִּזָּרַע are uncalled for; the former is against the usage. — דָּוָה *to be ill* (דְּוֹתָהּ infin. Kal with suff.) is used especially with respect to menstruation, as the feminine of the adjective דָּוָה (XV. 33; XX. 18) *a menstruating woman*, and the noun דָּוֶה (Isai. XXX. 22) a menstruous garment (comp. *Talm.* Nidd. 9[a]; Rashi, Ebn Ezra, a. o., לשון מדוה וחולי; hence כִּימֵי נִדַּת דְּוֹתָהּ תִּטְמָא is literally, "she shall be unclean as in the days of the uncleanness of her being unwell", that is, she shall be as unclean and subjected to the same rigorous rules and restraints as in the time of her menses (comp. Lev. XV. 19, Rashi, כסדר כל טומאה האמורה בנדה); for כִּימֵי stands instead of כְּבִימֵי, the time being expressed by the simple accusative (Gram. § 86. 4). The same sense is conveyed more briefly in ver. 5 by וְטָמְאָה כְּנִדָּתָהּ, where נדתה signifies also *the period* of her impurity, and is therefore likewise employed in the simple accusative. Indistinct is the rendering of the Septuagint κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ χωρισμοῦ τῆς ἀφέδρου αὐτῆς, and of the English Version, "according to the days of the separation for her infirmity shall she be unclean"; inexact that of Onk. and Jon. כיומי ריחוק סאובתה, and of the Vulgate juxta dies separationis menstruae; and quite incorrect, both as regards the words and the context, that of Luther and Michaelis "so lange sie ihre Krankheit leidet", and "so lange ihr Wochenbett währt" (by which the time of *lochia rubra* is meant). The noun נִדָּה is indeed derived from נדד *to flee*, *to remove*, and signifies, therefore, in the first instance, *separation* or *removal* (so Rashb. a. o. avoidance of, and separation from, her husband;

**it before the Lord, and make atonement for her, that she may be cleansed from the issue of her blood. — This**

Rashi on XV. 19, מנודה ממגע כל אדם); but then it means that which is to be shunned and avoided, that is, *impurity*, used paralleland coupled with טֻמְאָה (XVIII. 19; Ezek. XXXVI. 17; Ezra IX. 11), whether the impurity is physical, as the menstruation of women (XV. 19 *sqq.*; Ezek. XVIII. 6; XXII. 10), or moral, that is, *iniquity* (Zech. XIII. 1) and *abomination*, as incest (Lev. XX. 21) and idolatry (2 Chr. XXIX. 5; comp. תועבה and שקוץ), or *loathing* and *disgust* in general (Ezek. VII. 19, 20; Lam. I. 8, 17), while מֵי נִדָּה (Num. XIX. 9 *sqq.*; XXXI. 23) is *water of* or *for impurity*, i. e. for the removal of impurity. It will be seen that the word נִדָּה occurs only in works written during and after the Babylonian exile; it became current in late periods only, when the laws of levitical cleanness were fully developed' (see p. 194). The derivations from נדד, so that נִדָּה would be formed like אִפִּי (Fürst), or from the Arabic root נדא to ripple, to flow (Wogue), are doubtful. — תֵּשֵׁב (in vers. 4, 5) is hardly "she shall remain at home" (so Luther, Michael., Dathe, Knob., Bunsen, a. o.), much less, as Nachmanides fancifully interprets, "she shall sit, and not walk", since "by her steps she defiles the earth and taints the air" (Gen. XXXI. 35 affords no proof); but simply "she shall continue" in the blood of her purification (so Vulg. manebit in sanguine, Engl. Vers., Herxh., Cahen, Johlson, a. o.); an active Hebrew woman, so useful in field and vineyard, could not be expected to stay at home for full 40 or 80 days from her confinement, and long after she had recovered her full vigour and power for work; the construction חשב עַל (in ver. 5) also favours the latter interpretation; although some codices read both times בִּדְמֵי (see *De Rossi*, Var. Lectt. I. 96), and the Sept., Vulg., Chald., and Ar. render so (ἐν, in, etc.): passages like Gen. XIII. 18 and Deut. I. 46, in which the place is mentioned after ישב, or like Hos. III. 3 (תשבי לי), are not parallel with ours. It is, therefore, impossible to entertain the view of Theodoret (Quaest. in Lev. XIV) and others (as *Trusen*, Sitten etc. p. 112), that 40 or 80 days of impurity were fixed merely with the object of securing to the woman complete rest after her exhausting pains; they were not fixed as a matter of expediency but of religion, and "the rest", especially with regard to conjugal intercourse, ceased after the first short terms of 7 and 14 days. — דְּמֵי טָהֳרָה (vers. 4, 5) is the impure *blood*, the removal of which effects *purification*, whence the Sept. renders the words indifferently αἷμα καθαρισμοῦ (ver. 4) and αἷμα ἀκάθαρτον (ver. 5). Rabbinical interpretation too decidedly explains them to mean "pure blood" which is not defiling, in contradistinction to דם נדה (Ebn Ezra, Rashb., Nachman. fol. 92[a]; see *infra*; comp. *Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. II. 27, 28; comp. I. 51, 52; Michaelis also has "reiner Blutabgang"); and Rashi renders by way of hypallage "purification of blood." — מְלֹאת (vers. 4, 6) is the constr. inf. Kal of מָלֵא, formed in the manner of verbs ל״ה, like חֲטָאת (Ezek. XXXIII. 12), שְׂנֹאת (Prov. VIII. 13), etc.; see Gramm. II. § LXVI. 13. — כִּנִּדַּת דְּוֹתָהּ (ver. 5) for כִּימֵי נִדָּתָהּ, "as in the time of her menses" (see *supra*); Sept. κατὰ τὴν ἄφεδρον αὐτῆς, and more distinctly still Vulg. juxta ritum fluxus menstrui; Onk. and Jon. inaccurately בריחוקה; Dathe incorrectly pro duratione puerperii sui. —

*is* the law for her that gives birth to a male or female *child*. — 8. And if her fortune does not suffice for a lamb,

The sense לבן או לבת (ver. 6) is "with reference to — or at the birth of — a son or a daughter", for the mother and not the child required purification; Sept. correctly ἐφ' υἱῷ ἢ ἐπὶ θυγατρί; Clericus ob filium vel filiam, i. e. prout marem aut foeminam peperit. — The term בֶּן־שְׁנָתוֹ (ver. 6), an animal one year old (Sept. ἐνιαύσιος, Vulg. anniculus, etc.), instead of the more usual בן־שנה, is found exclusively in later writings, viz. in Ezekiel (XLVI. 13), and the middle Books of the Pentateuch (Lev. XXIII. 12; Num. VI. 12, 14; VII. 15—81; and בַּת שְׁנָתָהּ Lev. XIV. 10; Num. VI. 14; XV. 27), and is, therefore, like נִדָּה an incidental proof of the late origin of this section (see p. 194). — The verb תביא (ver. 6) has three different complements; hence the Vulgate, to render the construction easier, inserts before the third a new verb — "et tradet sacerdoti." — The subject of וְהִקְרִיבוֹ and וְכִפֶּר (ver. 7) is of course הכהן (comp. ver. 8), to be supplied from the preceding verse; it is added in a codex of Kennic., and expressed by the Samar., Sept., Syr., and Jonath. — The suffix in והקריבו, though in the singular, refers, collectively, to *both* sacrifices (Ebn Ezra וזה רחה הכבש והתור), and not, as Rabbinical interpreters maintain, to the sin-offering only, on which the purification and atonement of the mother are supposed to depend (*Siphra* in loc. fol. 59ª ed. Schlossb.): the holocaust being the older, and for a long time perhaps the only sacrifice presented, it is in the prescribed ritual at least of equal importance with the sin-offering. — On כִּפֶּר על see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 476; the Vulg. paraphrases (in vers. 7 and 8) "et orabit pro ea"; and the Sept. renders the following וְטָהֲרָה καὶ καθαριεῖ αὐτήν, as if reading וְטִהֲרָהּ. — The sense of מְקֹר דמיה (lit. "the spring of her blood") cannot be doubtful (comp. XX. 18); Sept. πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος, Vulg. profluvium sanguinis, Luther a. o. Blutgang; inaccurately Onkel. מסואבת דמהא, Michael. Wochenbett, a. o. — Several manuscripts, the Samarit. Text and Vers., and the Arab., have ולנקבה (ver. 7) instead of או ל׳, which is indeed an unessential deviation, since ו also has occasionally disjunctive force (Gr. § 107. 1ᵉ); but as this is very strongly expressed in the double ל (in לזכר and לנקבה, *whether — or*), או is preferable (as in ver. 6): the Masorites seem designedly to have provided הילדת with a strongly distinctive accent (Luzz. tanto per la nascita di un maschio quanto etc.). — On the phrase תמצא ידה די שה (ver. 8) see Comm. on Lev. I. 515 (on V. 7). — The Samar. and Syr. Vers., and a codex of Kennicot, give (in ver. 8) to להבאת precedence before לעלה, evidently in order to obviate difficulties which have been discussed above. The Rabbinical, and no doubt the correct interpretation of this chapter, as embodied in the Targum of Jonathan, is this: the mother is unclean only during the first seven or fourteen days after childbirth; on the eighth or fifteenth day, after having bathed, she is clean (ver. 3, תיטהר), and fit for conjugal intercourse; and her discharges in the following 33 or 66 days are also clean (ver. 4, כל דמהא דכיין); yet she is during this time to keep aloof from the Sanctuary and all sacred things (as tithes, תרומה, and the flesh of thank-offerings): thus a double "flow of blood", a clean and an unclean one, is distinguished (מבוע תרין דמהא, ver. 7; *Talm*. Nidd. 35ᵇ, 42ᵃ; Shabb. 64ᵇ;

she shall bring two turtles or two young pigeons, the one for a burnt-offering, and the other for a sin-offering; and the priest shall make atonement for her, that she may be clean.

*Yor. Deah* ll. cc.; *Mitzv. Hashem* p. 27[b]). The Sadducees, on the other hand, and with them the Samaritans and Karaites, though admitting a difference of degree between the two periods, declared the woman even during the second term too unclean for matrimonial connection; they are, therefore, in this instance, more strict than the Rabbanites, who have certainly the tenour and the wording of the Law on their side. — The Mishnah (Kerith. I. 3—7) ordains sin-offerings also in certain cases of abortion.

## CHAPTER XIII.

SUMMARY. — ON LEPROSY OF PERSONS AND GARMENTS AND ITS TREATMENT. — 1. *Leprosy developed from plague-spots in the skin* (vers. 1—8). A rising (שְׂאֵת), or scab (סַפַּחַת), or bright spot (בַּהֶרֶת) on the skin, with the hair on that part turning white, and the part itself appearing to be deeper than the rest of the skin, constitutes a leprous disease (נֶגַע צָרַעַת) and causes uncleanness (vers. 1—3). But a white spot which does not appear to be deeper than the other skin, and the hair of which does not turn white, is a doubtful symptom requiring to be carefully tested: if after a week's seclusion of the person so affected, the disorder does not spread, but remains unchanged in appearance, he is to be subjected to another term of confinement of the same duration; if then the diseased part is found to be paler and has not extended farther, it is merely affected with a scab (מִסְפַּחַת), and washing of garments suffices to restore cleanness (vers. 4—6). But if at the end of the first or second week, the disorder has spread, and, on renewed inspection by the priest, is discovered to have made another advance, it is polluting leprosy (vers. 7, 8). — 2. *Leprosy breaking out direct on the body, and not from plague-spots* (vers. 9—17). The presence of raw flesh, and whiteness of the hair on a white rising, characterise confirmed and defiling leprosy (vers. 9—11). White leprosy extending equally over the skin of the whole body, is not considered a tainting disease (vers. 12, 13); yet it becomes one by the appearance of red raw flesh on any part (vers. 14, 15); when such flesh disappears and the original white colour returns, the sufferer is restored to a state of cleanness (vers. 17, 18). — 3. *Leprosy arising in consequence of a healed boil* (vers. 18—23). A white rising or a reddish white spot appearing in the place of a healed boil (שְׁחִין), is real leprosy, if it seems lower than the skin, and if the hair on it turns white; but it is merely a scabby scar left by the boil if it does not show these two symptoms, is pale in colour, and does not spread within seven days of seclusion after the first inspection by the priest. — 4. Precisely the same regulations apply to the bright spot which may arise *in the place of a burning* (מִכְוַת אֵשׁ, vers. 24—28). — 5. *Leprosy on hairy parts of the head and face* (vers. 29—37). If an eruption on the head or at

the beard appears deeper than the other skin, and is covered with yellow thin hair, it is a scall (נֶתֶק), or leprosy of the head or beard (vers. 29, 30). Now, if indeed the diseased part seems not deeper than the other skin, but has yellow hair upon it, it is examined again after seven days of isolation: if then the disorder has not spread, and the yellow hair has vanished, the sufferer is to shave his body with the exception of the afflicted parts; and if, after other seven days of separation, the scall has preserved the same limited extent, he is to be declared clean by the priest, and has merely to wash his garments; yet if after that time the evil spreads, he is unclean, whether yellow hair shows itself or not; and he becomes only clean when the irregularity ceases, and black hair grows on the affected place (vers. 31—37). — 6. *Harmless leprosy* (vers. 38, 39). A palish white eruption on the skin (בֶּהָרֹת לְבָנוֹת or בֹּהַק) is harmless, and does not render unclean. — 7. The same applies to *baldness at the back of the head or at the forehead* (vers. 40, 41); but a reddish white rising on the bald places, resembling in appearance leprosy of the skin, is looked upon as that disease, and causes uncleanness (vers. 42—44). — 8. *Social status of the leper* (vers. 45, 46). — He shall rend his clothes, bare his head, cover his beard, and at the approach of strangers exclaim, "Unclean, unclean!"; during the whole time of his illness he is to stay in an isolated place without the camp. — 9. *Leprosy of garments* (vers. 47—58). If garments, or linen and woollen stuffs, or objects made of skin, show greenish or reddish spots, they may possibly be affected with leprosy; hence they are to be shut up by the priest for a week; if on the seventh day the spots have spread, it is a case of malignant leprosy, and the garments and stuffs must be burnt; but if the spots have not extended, the things are to be washed, and removed for other seven days; if after the washing, the spots do not change their colour, whether they spread farther or not, the garments are unclean, and must be burnt; if the spots become pale after the washing, the part is to be torn out, and if they yet appear in the stuffs, these are to be burnt; for it is a spreading leprosy; but if the spots vanish altogether after the washing, the objects are washed a second time, and thus become clean. — Then follows 10. *the concluding formula* (ver. 59).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses and Aaron, saying, 2. If a man has in the skin of his flesh a rising, or a scab, or a bright spot, and it becomes in the skin of his flesh a plague of leprosy; he shall be brought to Aaron the priest, or to one of his sons the priests. 3. And

**1—8.** Of the various diseases endemic among the ancient Hebrews, none was more inveterate, and none more disastrous, than leprosy. It clung to them from the earliest to the latest times; it was by all but general tradition attributed to them during their stay in Egypt, especially in the age of Moses, and was together with other contagious disorders, not unfrequently represented as having caused their expulsion from that country (comp. *Manetho*, *Chaeremon*, and *Lysimachus* ap. *Joseph.* C. Ap. I. 26, 32, 34; *Tacit.* Hist. V. 3; *Justin.* XXXVI. 2; *Diod. Sic.* XXXIV. 1;

the priest shall look on the plague in the skin of the flesh: and *if* the hair on *the part affected with* the plague is turned white, and the appearance of *the part affected with* the plague *is* deeper than the *other* skin of his flesh,

XL init.; see *supra* p. 111). Nay it prevailed, even in the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian periods, to such an extent, that the most elaborate laws of precaution were deemed imperative. Its occurrence, in striking instances, is mentioned during all intermediate and even in much later epochs — at the time of the Hebrew wanderings in the desert and of the Judges, of the earlier and of the later kings of Judah, of Christ and his apostles; for it is connected with the names of Miriam and Joab; of Gehazi and the "four lepers" who, driven by the despair of starvation, ventured into the hostile camp of the Syrians; of the kings Azariah and Uzziah, and of Job; of Simon the leper of Bethany, and the many lepers healed by Christ at various times (comp. Num. V. 2—4; XII. 10—15; 2 Sam. III. 29; 2 Ki. V. 27; VII. 3; XV. 5; 2 Chr. XXVI. 19—23; Job II. 7, 8; VII. 5; XIX. 17, 20; XXX. 17, 30; Matth. VIII. 2, 3; X. 8; XI. 5; XXVI. 6; Mark I. 40—42; XIV. 3; Luke IV. 27; V. 12, 13; VII. 22; XVII. 12; see also *Talm.* Sanh. 107[a], 110[a]). Nor was the disease less frequent in the neighbouring countries, as Syria, Phoenicia, and eastern Asia in general; it was above all so common in Egypt that this country was considered the chief, if not the sole, centre of at least a principal form of the disorder (comp. 2 Ki. V. 1 *sqq.*; Exod. IV. 6, 7; Deut. XXVIII. 27; *Lucret.* VI. 1112, 1113, Est elephas morbus qui propter flumina Nili Gignitur Aegypto in media, neque praeterea usquam; *Plin.* XXVI. 1 or 5, Aegypti peculiare hoc malum est); it appeared sporadically at the beginning of the Christian period in Germany; imported by the returning crusaders, it spread, in the twelfth century, to a fearful extent, over Greece and other European countries; and though mostly found in warm and damp coast-lands, as in Arabia and at the Persian gulf (*Herod.* I. 138), on all the shores of Africa and along the Mediterranean, in Sumatra and Java, in Ceylon and the islands of the Southern Ocean, the West Indies, Surinam, and Brazil; it invaded, though often with modified features, colder climates also, as Iceland, Norway, and the Faroë islands, the Crimea and Astrakhan; it rendered necessary an incredible number of leper houses and hospitals — France alone had in the thirteenth century above 2000 —; till it gradually yielded to rigid precautions in diet, cleanliness, and habits; throughout central Europe it was considered extinct in the seventeenth century; yet it lingers still in some parts of Portugal and Spain, especially Asturia; even in Germany several cases, though with comparatively mild symptoms, have recently been noticed; it rages occasionally in Egypt, where in 1845 a French hospital was erected at Constantine, and among the Falashas in Abyssinia; it is not rare in the districts of the Lebanon and the Jordan, in Bosra, Bagdad, and Damascus, and in Jerusalem, where before the Zion gate a colony of lepers is still found, inhabiting about a hundred wretched huts; these unfortunate sufferers intermarry with each other, producing a progeny as miserable

it *is* a plague of leprosy: and *when* the priest sees *it*, he shall pronounce him unclean. 4. But if the bright spot *is* white in the skin of his flesh, and its appearance *is* not deeper than the *other* skin, and the hair

as themselves; and though loathed and shunned, they are allowed to enter the town to buy provisions, or to beg for alms.

Although the Bible often mentions leprosy, and even discusses it in some portions, it affords no information as to the origin and causes of the dire disease. This will not be surprising to those who bear in mind the principle of Divine retribution, upon which all laws and narratives of the Bible are framed, and which, disdaining to trace effects to natural agencies, represents diseases mainly as heavenly inflictions and providential visitations. With respect to leprosy, the Bible adheres most strictly to that principle. For leprosy appears in all instances as the result of God's immediate interference — as a trial in the case of Job, as a fearful punishment in all the others: Miriam uttered disrespectful words against God's chosen servant Moses; Joab, together with his family and descendants, were cursed by David for having treacherously murdered his great rival Abner; Gehazi provoked the anger of Elisha for his mean covetousness, calculated to bring the name of Israel into disrepute among the heathen; king Azariah clung to the reproachful worship on high places; and Uzziah was, according to the Chronist's characteristic account, smitten with incurable leprosy for his alleged usurpation of priestly privileges in burning incense on the golden altar of the Temple. Jewish tradition clung consistently to the same views; the Talmud declared, that leprosy should be looked upon by the sufferer as "an altar of atonement", since it is only sent for great transgressions, such as idolatry and incest, calumny and perjury (comp. *Talm.* Berach. 5; Sanh. 107[a], 110[a]; Erach. 16; Bab. Bathr. 164[b]; *Av. Rabb. Nath.* c. 9; *Midr. Rabb.* Lev. c. 16); and Kabbalists maintained, that the Messiah, though having long since appeared on earth, delays the work of redemption, because he must first expiate the iniquities of mankind; and that he does this by taking upon himself the plague of leprosy (comp. *De Wette,* De Morte Jes. Chr. expiat. pp. 67, 68).

Influence of climate can scarcely be set down as the chief cause of a disorder which has raged in all parts of the old and the new world, both in dry highlands and in humid valleys, both in the torrid and the frigid zones. Diet, next to damp dwellings, a marshy atmosphere, ill-aired clothes, and uncleanliness, may be of greater moment, though indeed no station or mode of life secures immunity. Salt fish and salted cheese, fat and oil, indigestible or insufficient food, putrid water, pork, camel's or buffalo's flesh eaten abundantly, and milk drunk after fish, have in ancient and modern times been asserted to engender the disease. Woollen garments are considered to promote it, linen ones to ward it off. Inflammation, boils, or wounds may hasten its development in constitutions predisposed to it by the unhealthy action of the blood. Violent emotions, such as fright, anger, fear, or excitement, have been observed to produce or to favour it. But all this hardly passes

**thereof is not turned white; the priest shall shut up *him that has* the plague for seven days: 5. And the**

beyond the sphere of vague conjecture or probability. Nor is there any foundation for the theory (brought forward by Calmet), that leprosy is caused by small animalcules, which, settling between the skin and the flesh, gnaw away the epidermis and cuticle, and then the extremities of the nerves and the flesh; or for the Rabbinical supposition, that it arises from a disturbance of the assumed equilibrium in the human frame between water and blood, the latter unduly preponderating (see *Yalk. Shim.* on Job XXVIII. 25, II. no 916, fol. 151[b]). In fact, its exact origin has up to our time baffled both observation and science.

Leprosy is generally classed among the diseases of the skin; but its germ lies deeper in the constitution, in an excessive hardening and thickening of the blood-vessels, and in a consequent derangement in the circulation and production of the blood; it testifies to a complete degeneracy of the body, of the liver, the spleen, and the lymphatic system, and to the corruption of the cellular tissue, which fills itself with a peculiar milky fluid congealing and drying up, and thus producing pale and chalk-like spots (comp. *Plut.* Symp. IV. v. 3). It appears in two essentially different forms, either as "white leprosy" (*leuke*, *lepra alba*, برص *barras*), or as *elephantiasis* and *lepra leonina*. The former kind only — the white leprosy — concerns us in this place; for it is that which is treated of in our section of Leviticus, and is hence also called *lepra Mosaica* or *Hebraeorum*; while elephantiasis, first and mainly attacking the feet, is probably meant and described in the Book of Job (comp. Job II. 8; VII. 4, 5, 13, 14; XVI. 8, 16; XIX. 17, 20; XXX. 30; etc.).

Men are liable to white leprosy at all ages, though seldom before the time of puberty, and not very often after the fortieth year; women generally at the end of their first menses, when it proceeds slowly till their second childbirth, after which it makes fearful and rapid advances. In the beginning, it is deceitfully insignificant and almost imperceptible; it then differs but little from ordinary and harmless affections, such as moles or freckles. It seems for some time entirely confined to the skin, without having the least connection with the inner organism. First appear small tumors of a glossy white, sometimes of a livid-red or violet colour, and often there is not more than one hardly larger than a needle's point; they commonly rise on hairy parts of the body, principally the face, the arm-pits, or the genitals, yet also on the forehead, the nose, or finger, and often in the place of healed boils or burnings of the skin. They are so scattered and diminutive that they are easily overlooked; so utterly painless and insensible that they may, without the least effect, be pierced with red-hot pins; so free from all inconvenience that they are usually disregarded; yet so obstinate and obnoxious that they are absolutely irremovable. Owing to their indistinct colour, they seem to lie deeper than the surrounding skin, in the manner of scars, though they are in reality flat elevations. If cut with a pointed instrument, they do not emit blood, but a whitish humor. For a long time, often for ten or twenty years, if careful diet be observed, they

priest shall look on him the seventh day; and, behold, *if* the disease has remained the same in its appearance,

are the only symptoms of the approaching disease. The patient suffers no pain, eats and drinks with keen appetite, and is not incapacitated for sexual intercourse. But gradually, though by almost inappreciable stages, important changes take place. The hair on the swellings turns white, becomes woolly, and then falls out. The patient feels a slight rigidity in the hands and feet, is languid and depressed, subject to a feverish alternation of heat and cold, and to a strange tickling in all limbs as if ants were crawling over his body. The tumors get larger, and spread over the face, the ears, and the fingers, and then indiscriminately over the whole skin, which appears "white like snow." They penetrate through the cellular tissue to the muscles and bones. When they have attained about the size of a bean, the malignant nature of the malady is decided, which now hastens on in its baneful course. Sometimes they soften into distressing pustules, which burst, become boils, or heal, leaving slightly deepened and whitish scars, and rendering the skin excruciatingly sensitive: this is the "smooth" leprosy. But more frequently they remain and spread, join and become inflamed and extremely offensive in smell: this is the "tuberous" leprosy (l. squamosa). But both forms take essentially the same development. The skin is hardened, rough, and chapped, and exudes a lymph producing large concretions which break from time to time, and under which often foul and spongy tubercules are formed. That lymph is so powerfully corrosive that it indelibly taints woollen stuffs and linen textures, defies removal by water or chemicals, and may by contagion propagate the disease. The pulse is feeble, the urin copious and earth-like. The blood loses the power of coagulation, and is filled with little sandy globules. The wounds heal of themselves without cure or medicine, to reappear deepened and enlarged. But some tumors contain neither that white and viscous pus nor water, but are covered with a thick white skin, under which appears raw flesh, soft and dingily red, often protruding in all directions and growing to a considerable size. The whole body is tormented by a violent itching, for which scratching, even to bleeding, affords no relief. The hair is covered with a dirty and offensively smelling crust, or it falls out, especially just above the forehead. The eyebrows bulge out, the eyelids upturn, and the hair of both drops off; the eyes are dimmed, become painfully sensitive, and blear. The tears are hard and pungent, ulcerate the eyelids, and often even the cheeks. The face, repulsively disfigured, is generally covered with knotty, dirty, deep-red tumors, which congregate in grape-like clusters, or form large knobs separated by deep furrows. The nose is transmuted into a shapeless lump, for the upper part becomes bloated, the nostrils expand, the ridge softens, and the passage is partially stopped. The lips swell to such a size that it is impossible to close the mouth, which secretes abundant saliva, and emits a nauseous breath. The jaw-bones, the tongue, and the roof of the mouth, are frequently covered with excrescences, and then the breathing is thick, heavy, and asthmatic, and the speech

*and* the disease has not spread in the skin; the priest shall shut him up seven days again. 6. And the priest

laborious, hoarse, and unequal. The ears are puffed, and the hearing is impaired. The joints of the hands and feet become vitiated by glandular nodules, distend, and lose their vital power; the palms and soles are dotted with dry and deep pimples by turns rising and disappearing; the extreme points of the fingers and the toes swell; the nails thicken, get scaly, bend, and fall off. The genitals, monstrously enlarged, are infested by cancerous knots. The lung, liver, spleen, and the viscera harden and shrivel. The mucous membranes and the skinny coverings of the nerves grow abnormally, and thicken to such extent that large parts of the body become insensible. The bones are emptied of their marrow, while in some parts of the cellular texture, where the sinews and the cartilage of the joints separate, fat and tallow are formed. An unconquerable torpor seizes all senses. Then the itching decreases, though it does not cease. The frame is emaciated, and occasionally a limb drops off withered or decayed. Debility or consumption, constantly advancing through fever, diarrhoea, and dropsy, makes life a burden. The miserable sufferer is tortured by harrowing dreams, gloomy dejection, and thoughts of suicide, which often prove irresistible. Though, as a rule, experiencing great discomfort rather than violent pain, he now presents a hideous spectacle. He is loathsome to the eye and insufferable to the smell, in which respect he often resembles a corpse in an advanced state of decomposition. His dissolution is progressing limb by limb. It is literally living death. Indeed his condition is so wretched that, as an ancient writer observes, "any death is preferable"; and his trials are by the Rabbins compared with the loss of children, since both cannot easily be borne with resignation (*Talm.* Berach. 5^b^). Yet his sexual desires not only remain, but are morbidly intensified; they assume a repulsive vehemence, and sometimes continue to the very day of his death, whence Galenus designated leprosy as *satyriasmus*. Thus the leper lives on to the age of fifty and upwards. At last, a very slight fever, or sometimes suffocation caused by the swelling and closing of the windpipe, releases him from a pitiful existence, not seldom suddenly and unexpectedly.

In many cases, the disorder is hereditary. Infants born of leprous mothers die, unless they are at once separated from their mothers. Yet the evil is not transmitted regularly or in continuous succession, and rarely beyond the third or fourth generation, when it still manifests itself by decayed teeth, foul breath, and sallow complexion, but by no more serious symptom. This may be one of the reasons, besides uncontrollable desire, why neither among the Hebrews nor among other nations lepers were forbidden to marry. — Again, leprosy is often contagious, if not directly, at least through dangerous concomitant disorders, such as obstinate scab and syphilis; it was supposed to be communicated both by inhalation of the infected air and by actual contact, both through sexual and through longer social intercourse. It would be very precarious to deny, on the strength of recent observations, the infectious character of leprosy, because this disease was,

shall look on him again the seventh day; and, behold, *if the part affected with* the plague *is* pale, and the plague has

in ancient times, infinitely more malignant. Therefore lepers were, in most countries, expelled from society, and forced to live apart beyond the gates of towns, in hospitals, or in "houses of separation" (בית החפשית or בית סגירותא, at present *chush el kaatti*). Jewish lepers were, under penalty of eighty stripes, forbidden to approach the mountain of the Temple; yet they were not rigidly confined to isolation, but were allowed to move about freely, and, in towns without walls, even to enter Synagogues (comp. Lev. XIII. 46; Num. V. 2—4; XII. 14, 15; 2 Ki. VII. 3, 4; XV. 5; 2 Chr. XXVI. 21; also Job XIX. 13—17; *Joseph*. Ap. I. 31; Ant. III. xi. 3; Bell. Jud. V. v. 6; Matth. VIII. 2; Mark I. 40; Luke V. 12; XVII. 12; *Mishn*. Kel. I. 7; Neg. XIII. 12; *Phot*. Bibl. p. $41^{b}$ ed. Becker, παρὰ Πέρσαις ὁ λεπρός . . . πᾶσιν ἀπρόσιτος). It was of the utmost importance that they should, on the remotest suspicion, present themselves for inspection to competent authorities, such as the appointed priests, and should be pronounced clean only after repeated and most scrupulous examination. They had no right to complain of a personal restriction which was imposed in the interest of society as well as in their own; for society was freed from apprehension and danger, and they themselves from a distrust which, even when unfounded, was sure to injure their social position. If declared to be infested with the evil, they were required to make themselves strikingly known at first glance; like mourners, they were to appear in public with rent garments, bare head, and covered beard; thus signalised, they would surely be shunned; but if yet any one should inadvertently come near them, they were to warn him off by the loud wail, "Unclean, unclean!" (Lev. XIII. 45). They were even interred in a separate burial ground (2 Chron. XXVI. 23). In the middle ages, lepers, when walking abroad, were, in some countries, obliged to make a constant noise with a rattle, to wear two artificial hands of white wool, one tied on the breast, the other on the head, and to make themselves otherwise conspicuous. However, leprosy is not invariably contagious, and in no case so powerfully or so virulently, as pestilence or pox; therefore, in Egypt and elsewhere no precautions are taken to prevent infection; and the patients mix, and even eat at the same table, with their families and friends.

But leprosy was, from early times, considered to be an incurable disease. Celsus declared that no person once afflicted with white leprosy is easily freed from it; and even if the malady should be mitigated, of which there is hope if in cutting or pricking the skin, blood and not white matter issues, a healthy complexion is never completely restored (*Cels*. De Medic. V. xxviii. 19). Nor has medical science hitherto made any advance in the treatment of leprosy; all the remedies that have been tried, tend only to increase the sufferer's agonies, to complicate the malady, and to accelerate the crisis. The symptoms are often deceptive; for white spots on the skin are by no means an unfailing sign or guide; if they grow paler and do not extend, they indicate merely a scab (vers. 2—6); if they cover the entire body as with shining scales, they

not spread in the skin, the priest shall pronounce him clean: it *is* scab; and he shall wash his clothes and be

force the unwholesome matter from the constitution to the surface, fall off within ten or twelve days, and then leave the skin clear and white "like the flesh of a little child" (vers. 12, 13; 2 Ki. V. 14); if they are of a peculiar dull and palish white, and of unequal size, and appear chiefly on the neck and in the face, they usually result in a harmless cutaneous eruption, still known among the Arabs by the old Hebrew name *bohak* (בֹּהַק, vers. 38, 39, Gr. ἀλφός), which is "neither infectious nor dangerous", and still less hereditary; it hardly occasions any inconvenience, and causes no change in the colour of the hair; it spreads and remains from two months to two years, and then gradually vanishes of itself (comp. vers. 18—28). That which was presumed to be leprosy, frequently turns out to be some very different disorder, and suspected persons were consequently often pronounced clean. Yet this does not imply that leprosy was considered curable; the recovery of Job affords no proof; for it is no real fact, but serves a didactic end in a philosophical work, and the Bible distinctly declares the Egyptian leprosy as incurable (Deut. XXVIII. 27). Miriam, smitten with leprosy, is described as "one dead, of whom the flesh is half-consumed when he comes out of his mother's womb" (Num. XII. 12); the "uncleanness" of the leper is, according to the Law, but little inferior to that caused by death itself; Josephus affirms that he "differs in nothing from the dead" (Ant. III. xi. 3); and it is a current Talmudical adage, "the leper is counted a dead man", like the poor, the blind, and the childless. Similar to the great Greek physicians, the Bible prescribes no treatment, alludes to no remedy, but confines itself to a description of symptoms and the injunction of sanitary precautions. Popular or traditional cures were probably applied; thus the Syrian captain Naaman was healed by bathing in the Jordan, the water of which was, on account of the sulphuretted hydrogen it contains, like the baths in Tiberias, much valued for its remedial properties (comp. 2 Ki. V. 10, 14; *Talm.* Shabb. $38^b$; Megill. $6^a$); just as the Greeks deemed bathing in the river Anigrus in Elis an efficient restorative (*Strab.* VIII. iii. 19, p. 547); and very often good results were expected from bathing in, or rubbing the body with, blood (comp. *Plin.* XXVI. 1 or 5; *Midr.* on Exod. II. 23; etc.; *Friedreich*, Zur Bibel, I. 225, 226). But it would have been extremely unwise to embody definite directions in a code meant to be unalterable for all times, and thus to annul beforehand the possible progress of medical science in reference to a disease which takes many different forms, and, in the course of centuries, materially changes its character. Those only who assume a direct and Divine inspiration of the legislator might, with some justice, expect an infallible method of perpetual validity, were they not, by another principle of Biblical orthodoxy, compelled to conclude that God, having reserved for Himself the infliction of leprosy as one of His means of retribution and chastisement, could not fitly, by revealing an effectual cure, defeat the force of His own judgments. That "Moses", in addition to the instructions of this chapter,

clean. 7. But if the scab spreads in the skin, after he has been seen by the priest for his cleansing, it shall be

orally imparted to the priests more precise hints regarding the treatment of the disorder, is a gratuitous assumption resting on artificial inferences (see f. i. *Michaelis* Mos. R. IV. 181; Orient. Bibl. XVII. 20—22).

As might be expected, leprosy has not been left untouched by typical interpretation; it has been understood as the most striking symbol of sin, which is likewise almost imperceptible in its beginning, and is often unfelt by the sinner, till it ends in the total obduration of his mind — which may suffice as a fair specimen (comp. *Origen*. In Levit. Hom. VIII. 5—10; Selecta in Lev. pp. 167—169 ed. Lomm. vol. ix; *Michael.* Typ. Gottesgel. pp. 102—106).

It would be needless to point out the very late character of the ordinances of this section. The author indeed studiously and successfully portrays the time of the Hebrew wanderings. He makes God enjoin the commands upon Moses and Aaron; he entrusts the medical supervision of the people to Aaron and his sons; he bids the diseased repair to places "without the camp"; he speaks of the conquest of Canaan as still impending; and he retains, in general, an archaic colouring. But the spirit of these laws is entirely hierarchical. The priests are solely invested with the power of examining the symptoms of the disorder, of deciding on its character, watching its development, and pronouncing it healed or incurable. They superintend, guide, and almost control the community. They make their directing influence felt in every relation of life, both personal, social, and religious. Such supreme authority they enjoyed only at very advanced periods, certainly not before the Babylonian exile; they could venture to claim it only after the return and the re-organisation of the colonists; although they had acquired the leisure for gathering medical knowledge, and the opportunity for applying it, from the time when the tribe of Levi, by its own misdeeds and offences, forfeited political power (see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 649; comp. *De Wette*, Beiträge, II. 278—281; *Gramb.* Rel. Id. I. 194 *sqq.*). The later Mishnah and the Talmudical writings extend indeed to all Israelites the permission of inspecting and treating the leper, and merely reserve to the Aaronites the formal or official declaration of the decision (*Mish.* Neg. III. 1; *Siphra* Neg. c. 1); but whether that permission was considered to be implied in the spirit of the law, or whether it was a designed democratic opposition to the hierarchical tendencies of the ordinance, cannot be discussed in this place (comp. *Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. II. p. 49). Nor does the detail in the description and treatment of the disease bespeak a less advanced age; it is far too complicated and minute for the earlier stages of national existence; it was no doubt gradually accumulated by close and systematic scrutiny; and it is so obviously borrowed from actual experience, that Jewish interpreters, declining to explain these laws in their literal sense, or from their own observations, adhered exclusively to ancestral traditions and suggestions (comp. *Rashb.* on ver. 2). Rabbinical exegesis discovered in the words of our text 4, nay 16, 36, or 72 kinds of leprosy, of simple and

**seen by the priest again. 8. And *if* the priest sees *it*, and, behold, the scab has spread in the skin, the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it *is* leprosy.**

complex forms, which are fully described and amply discussed in the Talmudical treatise Negaim (comp. *Mishn.* Neg. I. 1, 2).

The two decisive symptoms pointed out in the text are—the hair, generally jet-black among the Hebrews, turning white on the affected spot, and the spot itself appearing to lie deeper than the rest of the skin; which two criteria have, by common experience been confirmed as constituting or foreboding real leprosy (comp. *Arist.* Hist. An. III. xi. 5). But one statement is not without difficulty. The suspected person is to be shut up twice for seven days; and if, after the lapse of this time, the spot has not spread, he is to be released as clean. Yet the progress and final crisis of leprous diseases are often so remarkably slow that years hardly produce a perceptible change; therefore, it has been conjectured, that the legislator meant to enjoin inspection and isolation of the patient for an indefinite succession of weeks, until a decided judgment can be formed on the nature of the evil: but this view is both against the tenour and the wording of the text, which prescribes no more than two examinations. We must, therefore, suppose that the sufferer was only brought to the priest when his illness had assumed a serious character, indeed not before it "had become in the skin of his flesh a plague of leprosy" (ver. 2): a public supervision spreading over a very protracted period would have been equally troublesome and superfluous; for as the superintendence mainly aimed at preventing contagion, it could, in the earlier and harmless stages of the complaint, well be left to private control. Whether and in what degree contact with a person in those incipient stages engenders uncleanness, we are not informed, which is a surprising omission in so elaborate a code. Jewish tradition fixed the extent of the plague-spot at a square *gris hakalki* (כגריס הקלקי מרובע), that is, half a Cilician bean, which kind was remarkable for its size, a *gris* covering the space of nine lentils, each supposed to hold four hairs; while it limited the raw flesh growing out of a leprous part (vers. 10, 14) to a lentil; it declared two white hairs sufficient to corroborate the suspicion, and illustrated the apparent depression of the shining spot by the analogy of sunny places which seem to be deeper than shady parts. — Comp. *Mishn.* Neg. VI. 1 *sqq.*; *Talm.* Shevu. 6[b]; Chull. 63[a]; and see in general *Mishn.* Tract. Negaim; Kelim I. 4; Midd. II. 5; *Maimon.* Tumath zaraath V. 16; on *Mishn.* Neg. XII. 5; and Mor. Nev. III. 47; *Arist.* Probl. X. 4, 5; *Celsus*, Medic. III. 25; V. 28 § 19; *Plin.* XXVI. 1; *Galen.* De Tumorib. praet. Nat. c. 14; *Prosp. Alpin.* l. I. cap. 14; *Lightfoot*, Opp. I. 511—514, 754, 755 (comp. p. 415), 678; *Otho*, Lex. Rabb. pp. 365—368; *Mead*, Medica sacra, pp. 11—24; *W. Hillary*, Observations on the.... epidemical diseases in the island of Barbados, pp. 322-351; *Hasse*, Magaz. für Phil. Fasc. I. p. 50; *Schilling*, De Lepra, p. 135; *Michaelis*, Mos. R. IV. §§ 208—210; Orient. Bibl. XVII. 1—37; *Reinhards*, Bibelkrankheiten, I. 79—96; *Niebuhr*, Beschr. v. Arab. pp. 135—138; *Larrey* in Déscript. de l'Egypt. état mod. I. 492 *sqq.*; *Sonnini*, Voyage, II. 26, 75, 76; III.

117—126; *Seetzen*, Reisen, I. 125; II. 315; *Burckhardt*, Beduinen, p. 76; *Ersch* und *Gruber*, Encycl. I. vi. 451—453; *Winer*, Bibl. Realwörterb. I. 114—117; *Sommer*, Bibl. Abhandl. I. 214—218; *Hensler*, Abendländischer Aussatz im Mittelalter; *Friedreich*, Zur Bibel, I. 207—226; *Trusen*, Sitten der alten Hebräer, pp. 167—170; *Robinson*, Palest. I. 243; *D. Essinger*, Ueber den Zaraath des Moses (1843); *Hirsch*, Histor. Geogr. Pathologie (1860), I. 303 *sqq.*; *Haeser*, Geschichte der epidem. Krankheiten (1865), pp. 92 *sqq.*; *Danilssen* und *Boeck*, Traité de la Spedalskhed; *Virchow*, Oncologie, II. 509 *sqq.*; *F. Steudener*, Beitr. zur Pathol. der Lepra mutilans (1867).

Philological Remarks. — The commands apply probably to the Hebrews only, and not, as Ebn Ezra infers from the general term אדם (ver. 2), and from the contagious nature of leprosy, to the strangers also, who can hardly be included in the rites of purification, and still less in the sacrifices connected with them (XIV. 1 *sqq.*). As the affected part was to be estimated in reference to the general appearance of the body, especially the skin, it was called "the skin (עור) of the flesh", in which phrase the etymological sense of עור "naked or hairless spot" (from עור, comp. Exod. XXII. 26) is not to be urged, since the text speaks of the hair growing in that part, and also of "the skin of the head and beard" (vers. 29 *sqq.*). — It is not easy precisely to define the terms describing the first symptoms of leprous diseases (שְׂאֵת, סַפַּחַת, and בַּהֶרֶת, ver. 2). Jewish interpreters explain them simply as "names of disorders differing in their degree of whiteness" (Rashi; comp. *Talm.* Shevuoth 5[b]). The original meaning of שְׂאֵת (from נשא) *rising*, *swelling*, or *eminence* (Rashb. גבוה) is too general to lead to identification, especially as it was abandoned in the living language, and the word was used to denote any kind of affected spots, even such as are, or appear at least, deeper than the skin (vers. 3, 4). Onkelos translates the word in this sense by עַמִּיקָא or עֲמִיק (ver. 43) or עֲמִיקְתָּא (ver. 10) *that which lies deep*; other ancient versions render vaguely *mark* (*Targ. Jer.* שומא, Syr. שומתא, Saad. شامة), while Targ. Jonath. has more accurately שׁוּמָא זְקִיפָא *prominent mark* or *tumor* (from זְקַף to rise, to lift up), which seems to be the most exact explanation it is at present possible to give (*Michael.* Finnen, *Knob.* Grind); while other equivalents are unfounded hazards, as *Sept.* οὐλή (scarred wound), *Vulg.* cicatrix (in XIV. 56, though it uses the word for other Hebrew terms also, see *infra*), or diversus color or color (ver. 10); *Mishn.* Neg. I. 1 "like an egg-shell" or "as white wool"; *Ebn Ezra* "like a burning" (as מַשָּׂאָה and מַשְׂאֵת in Isai. XXX. 27; Judg. XX. 38, 40). — The word סַפַּחַת or מִסְפַּחַת (from ספח to pour out, to fall off) appears to be the *scurf* or *scab* that "peels off"; so Targ. Jon. קְלוּפֵי (from קְלַף to peel off), Syr. קלפיתא, Targ. Jerus. קַלְפָא or קְלוּפֵי מִדַבְּקָא (i. e. scurf that clings or adheres to the body), while Onkelos, on the contrary, renders עַדְיָא or עַדִּיתָא ("something that is added" to the skin, ulcer or blister, perhaps from ספח to take up, to gather; comp. עִדּוּי); and Ebn Ezra explains "an evil that settles in one place"; the Sept. has inaccurately σημασίας (sc. οὐλή) or σημασία; Vulg. pustula, or scabies, or erumpentes papulae (XIV. 56); Rashb., adopting older Talmudical explanations, takes it vaguely as "something connected with שאת or בהרת", or merely a modified form of these symptoms (טפילה לשאת; comp. 1 Sam. II. 36; *Talm.* Shevu. 6[b]; Neg. 71[a], מראות נגעים שנים שהן ארבע); Rashi as "the name of some clean disorder";

and others "the falling off of hairs" (comp. שְׂפָחָה; Michael., Gesen.). — Lastly, בַּהֶרֶת, expressing no more than the notion of *brightness* implied in the Shemitic root בהר, seems to be a *bright spot*; so Targ. Onkel. בַּהַרְתָּא or בַּהֲקָא; Jon. and Jer. בַּהֲקֵי or בַּהֲקֵי (comp. בֹּהַק ver. 39); Syr. בהקיתא, similarly Ebn Ezra, Rashb., a. o.; Sept. τηλαυγής sc. οὐλή far-shining scar, or τηλαύγημα (ver. 23; comp. *Suid.* s. v. ἀρχὴ λέπρας ἐν τῇ τοῦ σώματος ἐπιφανεί(ᾳ)), or τὸ αὐγάζον (ver. 28), or αὔγασμα (vers. 39, 56); Vulg. lucens quippiam, or candor (vers. 28, 38), or albor (ver. 39). The "brightness" was qualified by Hebrew tradition to mean "a shining spot white as chalk" (Jon. בַּהֲקֵי חִיוּרְתָּא סִידָא), esp. "the chalk of the Temple" (כסיד ההיכל), or "as dazzling snow" (עזה כשלג; *Mishn.* Neg. I. 1; *Talm.* Shevu. 5, 6): the rendering *spots* (Rashi חברבורות and טי"א or טיי"ש tâches) omits the chief attribute; and that of λεύκη (*Jahn*, Archaeol. I. § 215) assumes in the word the name of a disease, whereas it denotes merely a symptom. This shining white spot (בהרת עזה) is, according to the Mishnah (Neg. II. 1), in a perfectly white man (גרמיני, a German) darker than his skin, whereas even a darker spot on the skin of a negro appears of shining white; but as the Jews are neither like the one nor the other, but stand in the midst between them, their complexion resembling "box-wood" (כאשכרוע), a middle colour of the affected spot is generally to be taken as a test. — These three unusual appearances *grow*, or are developed, *into* the plague of leprosy, והיה ··· לְנגע, so that the particle ל has its proper force. — The etymology of צָרַעַת, only used for white leprosy in men (Arab. برص), the black leprosy or elephantiasis being שְׁחִין, is uncertain; it may be traceable to צרע cognate with גרע to scrape — a *scabby disease* (Gesen.) —; or to the Arab. صريع *scourge*, sc. of God, from صرع to strike down (*Michael.* Orient. Bibl. XVII. 13; Typ. Gottesg. p. 101; *Virchow*, Specielle Pathol. III. 410 *sqq.*; see also *Fürst*, Handwörterb. II. 290); or, as is hardly probable, to זרח or זרח *to break out*, an *eruption* (Knob.). — נֶגַע, though usually signifying plague or *disease*, is by way of metonomy, employed for *diseased part* or *spot* (vers. 3, 30—32, etc.), or for the affected *person* (vers. 4, 12, 13, etc.) or *garment* (vers. 50, 55); in a similar manner, נֶתֶק is both *scab* (vers. 30 *sqq.*) and a *scabby person* (ver. 33); see also *Augustin.* Quaest. XLI in Lev. — The passive form והובא (ver. 2) may imply, as Ebn Ezra supposes, that the person who exhibits the symptoms alluded to, is to be brought to the priest, whether he be willing or not, and that any one who notices the symptoms is bound to take active steps in the matter: it has above been pointed out that it was certainly in the interest of such a person as well as of those who associated with him, to bring the case to an issue. — In ver. 4, the Sept. adds after לא הפך לבן αὐτὴ δέ ἐστιν ἀμαυρά (as in vers. 6, 21 *sqq.* והיא כהה). — The sense of the words הנגע עמד בעיניו (ver. 5) cannot be doubtful — "the plague has stood still in its appearance", that is, has remained the same; בעיניו is, therefore, synonymous with במראהו (comp. vers. 3, 4); so Onk., Jon., Syr. (קָם חֶזְוֵיהּ), Rashi, Ebn Ezra, a. o. (comp. ver. 55; Num. XI. 7 with reference to the manna ועינו כעין הבדלח); the sense is feeble if the suffix in בעיניו be referred to the priest — "the plague stood still before his eyes" (Sept. μένει ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, and in ver. 37 ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ... ἐπὶ χώρας; Keil "in seinen Augen", that is, in his view or opinion). — The plague כֵּהָה (ver. 6) has lost its bright

9. If the plague of leprosy is in a man, he shall
be brought to the priest; 10. And the priest shall see
*him*: and, behold, *if* a white rising *is* in the skin, and
it has turned the hair white, and *there is* quick raw
flesh in the rising; 11. It *is* an old leprosy in the
skin of his flesh, and the priest shall pronounce him
unclean; he shall not shut him up, for he is unclean.
12. But if the leprosy breaks out upon the skin,
and the leprosy covers all the skin of *him that has* the
plague, from his head even to his feet, wheresoever
the priest looks; 13. And if the priest looks, and, be-
hold, the leprosy has covered all his flesh, he shall
pronounce *him* clean *that has* the plague: if all is turned
white, he *is* clean. 14. But from the day that raw

or striking aspect or its resplendent whiteness, i. e. *has become pale* or *dim* (Sept. ἀμαυρά, Rashi on ver. 39). Onk., however, has עַמְיָא and Jon. עֲמָא, it has become *darker*; so Vulg. obscurior (ver. 56) or subobscurus (vers. 21, 26, 39), yet also non satis clarus (ver. 28), and the Engl. Vers. "somewhat dark" or "darkish white" (ver. 39); but entirely unfounded is Ebn Ezra's interpretation who, without any proof, considers כֵּהָה to be identical with לא פשתה and explains —"if the plague has neither spread in the old place, nor has extended to a healthy part." — לְטָהֳרָתוֹ (ver. 7) is "*for* his purification", that is, for the purpose of being declared clean; not *after* his purification, which rendering is indeed admitted by the preposition ל (comp. Num. I. 1; 1 Ki. III. 18; etc.), but is less probable, since the sense of *after* is immediately before expressed by אַחֲרֵי.

**9—17.** In leprous affections showing themselves directly in the skin without premonitory plague-spots, another criterion, in addition to the white colour of the hair, was deemed decisive — the appearance of red raw flesh, which seemed to indicate a complete deterioration of the constitution, and to point to deep-rooted disorders. Its presence made the patient at once unclean, and compelled him to live in seclusion. But a white eruption covering the whole body was looked upon as a favourable contingency; it was considered to bring out all the unhealthy matter that vitiates the system, and to secure renewed vigour. Yet if, at some later period, raw flesh appeared, the distemper was regarded as possessing a malignant character, which ceased only when the flesh became again white.

Philological Remarks. — The verb תִּהְיֶה (fem., ver. 9) accords with the dependent noun צרעת, not with the principal one נגע, because the former contains the chief notion; see Gramm. § 77. 19. — Targ. Jon. adds (in ver. 10) after בציר "like white wool" (כעמר נקי), and then continues "and if it (the rising) has turned the hair into a white colour like the shell of an egg" (comp. *Mishn.* Neg. I. 1; see *supra*). — The term מִחְיַת בָּשָׂר חַי (ver. 10) seems to have caused needless trouble; it is simply "the growth of raw flesh"; for as living and growing may be viewed as correlative notions, מִחְיַת

flesh appears in him, he shall be unclean. 15. And if the priest sees the raw flesh, he shall pronounce him to be unclean: the raw flesh *is* unclean, it *is* leprosy. 16. Yet if the raw flesh changes again and becomes white, he shall go to the priest; 17. And if the priest sees him, and, behold, *the part affected with* the plague has turned to white, the priest shall pronounce *him* clean *that has* the plague; he *is* clean.

18. And if there is on the skin of the body a boil and is healed, 19. And if in the place of the boil there is a white rising or a bright spot of white-reddish colour, it shall be shown to the priest; 20. And if the priest looks *at it*, and, behold, its appearance *is* lower than the *other* skin, and the hair thereof is turned

in reference to flesh is growth, and בשר חי the raw or growing flesh (comp. 1 Sam. II. 15; Rashb. "not like boiled, but like raw meat", since the flesh within the plague-spot gets larger); Engl. Vers. not inaptly quick raw flesh; Luther simply rohes Fleisch. Hence בשר חי is not merely the explanation of מחיה (Ebn Ezra), nor is מחיה only the spot which contains בשר חי (*Simon*, Lex. s. v.), which redundancies are open to well-founded objections (comp. Rosenm. in loc.); the Aramaic translators render that word inaccurately by "sign" or "mark" (Onk., Jon. רושם, Syr. רושמא), and so later expositors (as Rosenm., Gesen., a. o.); while Rashi explains it strangely by שינמ״נט (sainement) recovery (analogous to Gen. XLV. 5; 2 Chr. XIV. 12), and the Sept. translates as if מחיה were contracted from מן and חיה, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑγιοῦς τῆς σαρκός. — After וטמאו (in ver. 11) Jon. inserts ויחלטיניה "he shall declare him affected" with leprosy (חלט to belong to a class or order, hence ver. 51 צרעא מחלטא leprosy to be held utterly unclean); and he adds after עיני הכהן (in ver. 12) "and they (the eyes of the priest) are ready to declare clean or unclean." — The words לכל מראה עיני הכהן (ver. 12), which mean simply "wheresoever the priest looks", have by Jewish tradition been declared to imply that the examination of the suspected leper by the priest is not to be attempted at such hours of the day nor in such places which do not afford a proper light, neither early in the morning nor at dusk, neither in-doors, nor on a cloudy day, nor in the glare of noon, but in the 4th or 5th, the 8th or 9th hour; nor by a one-eyed or weak-sighted priest (see *Mishn.* Neg. II. 2, 3). On the mode of inspection, the chief object of which was to obtain a good view of all the hairy parts, see the rules given *ibid.* 4. — The two verbs יָשׁוּב . . . וְנֶהְפַּךְ (ver. 16) form one notion "if it is changed again" (comp. Hos. II. 11, אשוב ולקחתי; see Gramm. § 103. 2), לְלָבָן being added by way of qualification — namely into white; Vulg. quod si rursum versa fuerit in alborem: there is no necessity for supposing that ישוב and ונהפך have two different subjects, the former the flesh, and the latter the patient.

**18—28.** Leprous disorders originating, as they often do, in the

white, the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it *is* a plague of leprosy; it has broken out of the boil. 21. But if the priest looks at it, and, behold, *there are* no white hairs therein, and *if* it *is* not lower than the *other* skin, and *is* pale, the priest shall shut him up seven days: 22. And if it spreads on the skin, the priest shall pronounce him unclean; it *is* a plague *of leprosy*. 23. But if the bright spot stays in its place, *and* spreads not, it *is* a scar of the boil, and the priest shall pronounce him clean.

24. Or if there is on the skin of the body a hot burning, and the quick *flesh* of the burning becomes a white-bright spot *of a* reddish or white *colour*; 25. The priest shall look at it, and, behold, *if* the hair on the bright spot is turned white, and its appearance *is* deeper

place of healed boils or of a burning caused by hot coals or ashes, and manifesting themselves in white or reddish-white elevations, were treated more leniently than the preceding cases, in so far that if the hair had not turned white, and the spot had assumed no deeper appearance than the rest of the skin — which were the two critical symptoms —, they were looked upon with suspicion for one week only, and not for two: if after the first seclusion, the anomaly had not spread, the patient was at once pronounced clean, the eruption being considered merely as a scar-like remnant of the boil. — "The mixture of red and white", observes the Mishnah (Neg. I. 2), "has the appearance of red wine poured into water, and is either of a palish white or somewhat darker" (comp. *ibid.* III. 4; IX. 1).

Philological Remarks. — On the construction ובשר... בו בעורו (ver. 18), the principal notion standing first in an absolute sense, to be, in the proper place, referred to by the personal pronoun (בו), which is again qualified by בעורו ("and the flesh — if there is on it, namely its skin", a boil), see Gramm. § 75. 5; comp. also ver. 24. — שְׁחִין arises, according to the Mishnah (Neg. IX. 1), from a blow with wood or a stone, or from scalding, as with the hot water of Tiberias, in contradistinction to מכוה, which is caused by actual burning whether with fire or hot ashes; the word (derived from שחן to be hot or inflamed) implies the meaning of heat or inflammation, and is, therefore, no doubt *boil* or *ulcer* (Sept. ἕλκος, Vulg. ulcus). The symptomatic spots are occasionally "white reddish" (לבנה אדמדמת, ver. 19), though more usually white (so observes *Schilling*, De Lepra, p. 7, "coloris mutatio duplex est, nam vel rubrae nascuntur maculae in pallidum vergentes, vel albae ad colorem flavum, lividum aut rubrum tendentes"); and the same difference happens in the change of the hair on those spots ("in priori casu pili qui in parte adfecta sunt, subflavi aut subrubri apparent, in posteriori casu albi conspiciuntur"; comp. vers. 30, 32, 36): the words לבנה אדמדמת are, therefore, not to be translated "white *or* reddish." — The Sept. adds at the end of ver. 22, ἐν τῷ ἕλκει ἐξήνθησεν (בשחין פרחה) from ver. 21; similarly

than the *other* skin; it *is* leprosy, it has broken out of the burning; and the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it *is* the plague of leprosy. 26. But if the priest looks at it, and behold, the hair on the bright spot is not white, and it *is* not lower than the *other* skin, and it *is* pale, the priest shall shut him up seven days. 27. And the priest shall look at him on the seventh day: if it spreads in the skin, the priest shall pronounce him unclean; it *is* the plague of leprosy. 28. And if the bright spot stays in its place, *and* spreads not in the skin, and *is* pale, it *is* a rising of the burning, and the priest shall pronounce him clean: for it *is* a scar of the burning.

29. If a man or woman has a plague upon the head or the beard, 30. The priest shall see the plague; and, behold, *if* its appearance *is* deeper than the skin, *and there is* in it yellow thin hair, the priest shall pronounce him unclean; it *is* a dry scall, it *is* leprosy upon the head or

in ver. 27 (comp. ver. 25). — תַּחְתֶּיהָ (ver. 23) "in its place", on the same spot (comp. Ex. X. 23). — צָרֶבֶת, applied to שחין and to מכוה (vers. 23, 28), both of which are expressive of burning, has no doubt a similar meaning; צָרַב, kindred to שָׂרַף, is *to be scorched* or *burnt* (Ezek. XXI. 3), and the adjective צָרָב is *burning* or *consuming* (Prov. XVI. 27); צרבת השחין is, therefore, the *burning of the boil*, the effect of the healed wound, which subsequently shows itself in a white swelling or spot apt to produce inflammation; Ebn Ezra explains מיקד וחום להבת, and Rashi "contraction of the skin through heat"; Gesenius derives the word from צרב as equivalent to גרב to scratch, to be scabby, and renders *scab*, but that meaning of צרב is doubtful; others understand *scar* or *mark* left by the boil on the skin, Sept. οὐλή or χαρακτήρ; Vulg. cicatrix, Onk. רִשֶּׁם, Syr. צומחא, Jon. צולקת (scar; comp. *Mishn*. Neg. IX. 2, and *Levy*, Chald. Wörterb. II. 329); Rashi also רייטרי״שמנט rétrécissement (scar); but this sense, apparently suggested by probability, is not supported by etymology; and the same applies to the explanation of the Mishnah (l. c.), that the wound is called צרבת, if it is covered with a crust of the thickness of a garlick shell (קרום כקליפת השום). — The meaning of והיתה מחית המכוה וכ׳ (ver. 24) is clear from the remarks above made on מחית (ver. 10) — lit. "if the growth of the burning becomes a white bright spot reddish or white", that is, if the raw flesh that springs up and grows in the place of the burning appears brightly reddish or white; Sept. incorrectly, καὶ γένηται . . . τὸ ὑγιασθὲν τοῦ κατακαύματος αὐγάζον κτλ.

**29—37.** Leprosy not unusually attacks first hairy parts, as the head and beard, and in such cases changes both the quality and the colour of the hair, which becomes thin and yellowish. This symptom, like the gradual extension of the plague-spots, was, under all circumstances, deemed fatal, not only if it showed itself after

the beard. 31. And if the priest looks at the plague of
the scall, and, behold, its appearance *is* not deeper than
the *other* skin, but *there is* no black hair in it; the
priest shall shut up *him that has* the plague of the scall
seven days; 32. And on the seventh day, the priest
shall look at the plague, and, behold, *if* the scall has
not spread, and there is no yellow hair on it, and the
appearance of the scall is not deeper than the skin;
33. He shall be shaven, but the scall shall not be shaven;
and the priest shall shut up *him that has* the scall seven
days again; 34. And on the seventh day, the priest shall
look at the scall: and, behold, *if* the scall has not spread
in the skin, nor *is* in appearance deeper than the skin,
the priest shall pronounce him clean; and he shall wash
his clothes and be clean. 35. But if the scall spreads
in the skin after his having been pronounced clean,
36. The priest shall look at it; and behold, *if* the scall

the first and second week of isolation, but if it re-appeared at a later period, and even after cleanness had been pronounced by the priest; however, spreading of the spot was considered decisive, even irrespective of the change of hair (comp. *Mishn.* Neg. III. 5; IX. 1 *sqq.*). If after the conclusion of the second week, the disease had not advanced and was declared harmless, washing of garments sufficed to restore levitical purity: if bathing had been required, as some suppose, the text would not have failed to enjoin it (see p. 165).

Philological Remarks. — צָהֹב (ver. 30) prop. *shining*, then yellow, prob. the colour of gold (זהב, comp. צהר, זהר, צחח, טהר etc.), Rashi (on ver. 37) אד״מ צלא *or pale*, Kimchi גוון קרוב לגוון הזהב, the colour being like that of the new plumage of young pigeons after they have lost their first feathers (comp. *Talm.* Chull. 22[b]; *Mishn.* Midd. II. 3). — נֶתֶק, from נתק, probably in the sense of *breaking* (Isai. V. 27; Eccl. IV. 12; etc.), is a disorder of sores or wounds that *break* (comp. *supra* p. 219; Job VII. 5), a *scall*, Sept. θραῦσμα (breaking), Saad. كلف pustules; Syr. vaguely מחותא (plague); Vulg. macula or percussura (in XIV. 54); others suppose נתק to refer to the "falling out" of the hair in consequence of the disease (like מצחת, p. 225; so Rashb., Gesen., a. o.), or attribute to it the sense of tearing and scratching (so Knobel, who compares κνήφη and κνάω, ψώρα and ψάω or ψόω, scabies and scabere, etc.). — It is true that the reading ושער שחור (in ver. 31) is rather strange, and that we almost expect ושער צהוב (comp. ver. 32), which is indeed expressed by the Sept. (θρὶξ ξανθίζουσα); yet it would be unsafe to declare שחור "a mistake either of the author or of the copyist"; the writer possibly alludes to an intermediate and undecided stage of the disease, in which the hair turns temporarily yellow, to resume its usual colour at the return of health: therefore the presence of yellow hair at the first inspection

has spread in the skin, the priest shall not seek for yellow hair; he *is* unclean. 37. But if the appearance of the scall has remained the same, and *if* black hair has grown up therein, the scall is healed; he *is* clean, and the priest shall pronounce him clean.

38. And if a man or a woman has in the skin of their flesh bright spots — white bright spots, 39. The priest shall look; and, behold, *if* the bright spots in the skin of their flesh *are* palish white, it *is* a white eruption *that* has broken out in the skin; he *is* clean.

40. And if a man loses the hair of his head, he *is* bald-headed; *yet* he *is* clean. 41. And if he loses the hair of his head towards his face, he *is* forehead-

does not necessarily involve its presence at the second, though it is a questionable symptom demanding the priest's continued attention. — On the large ג in והתגלח (ver. 33) see *supra* on XI. 42, p. 183. — Onk. and Jon. limit the shaving to "the parts surrounding the scall" (סְחָרֵי נִתְקָא or חֲזָרַת נ׳), which is evidently against the author's meaning; while the *Mishnah* (Neg. X. 5) explains, not less questionably, "the hair is shaved off all around the scall, yet two hairs are left on each side, to enable the priest to judge whether the spot is spreading or not." The Sept. adds after בעור (in ver. 34) μετὰ τὸ ξυρηθῆναι αὐτόν (comp. vers. 7, 36, 55, 56).

**38, 39.** Modern testimonies confirm the harmless nature of that palish white eruption or tetter which in the East is still termed *bohak* (בֹּהַק, بهق). The spots are very little higher than the skin; they appear usually on the neck and face, but rarely on the hands or on the hairy parts of the head; they spread for some time, and then vanish of themselves, without having caused much inconvenience or apprehension. Orientals believe that this slight affection is often occasioned by sudden and excessive joy, never by care or depression; and they apply sulphur as a remedy (comp. *Niebuhr*, Beschr. von Arab. pp. 135, 137, 138).

Philological Remarks. — The term בֹּהַק is in the text sufficiently explained (comp. Syr. אבהק to be white, Chald. בהק to shine); the Sept. renders ἀλφός (akin to *albus*), and Rashi interprets "like the white that shines in the flesh of a red man (רו״ש, rosso)". There exists, therefore, no uncertainty on the subject.

**40—44.** Baldness was doubtless looked upon by the Hebrews, as by other eastern nations proud of a luxuriant growth of hair, as a disgrace, and often as a Divine punishment (comp. 2 Ki. II. 23; Isai. III. 17; Jerem. XLVIII. 37); but it is in no part of the Bible distinctly connected with leprosy; in our text it is even in itself, and if unattended by other symptoms, declared to exercise no influence upon levitical purity, whether it be baldness on the crown of the head, or at the temples and the forehead. Yet it may either be the herald or the companion of that disease. The leper's hair, both of the head and beard, gradually becomes thinner, splits at the

bald; *yet is* he clean. 42. But if there is on the bald crown or bald forehead, a white reddish sore, it *is* leprosy springing up on his bald pate or on his bald forehead. 43. Then the priest shall look at it; and, behold, *if there is* a white reddish rising of the sore on his bald crown or on his bald forehead, in appearance like the leprosy on the skin of the flesh; 44. He *is* a leprous man, he *is* unclean; unclean shall the priest pronounce him; his plague *is* on his head.

45. And the leper in whom the plague *is*, his clothes shall be rent, and his head shall be bare, and he shall

points, and shows at the roots small pustules; often the bare parts of the head are covered with a reddish-white eruption resembling that which arises in the place of healed boils (ver. 19); and these were proofs of the presence of leprosy on the head, which was socially and levitically treated like any other form of the same disorder. According to Jewish tradition, it was judged by two usual symptoms—the growth of raw flesh, and extension of the eruption, within two weeks; or extension beyond this time if, after the declaration of cleanness, either of the symptoms re-appears (comp. *Mish.* Neg. III. 6).

Philological Remarks. — מרט is properly to make smooth or bare (comp. Syr. מרט), hence in Niph. to be made or to become bald; Sept. ψαδᾶν (comp. *Aristoph.* Plut. 266). — A person losing his hair from the crown of his head downward towards the neck is קֵרֵחַ, a person losing it "towards his face" (מפאת פניו), that is, in the front part, at the temples or the forehead, is גִּבֵּחַ; hence קָרַחַת (like קָרְחָה) is baldness on the crown of the head, גַּבַּחַת baldness on the front part; and metaphorically, the former is a threadbare spot on the nether side of any stuff or texture, the latter a threadbare spot on the outer side (ver. 55, see notes in loc.); the Sept. renders the two adjectives φαλακρός and ἀναφάλαντος, the Vulg. calvus and recalvaster; Onk. expresses the latter by גְּלוֹשׁ (Syr. גלש to deprive of hair), Jon. גְּלוּשְׁלְשָׁן, and Saad. جلح. According to the Mishnah (Neg. X. 10), קרחת is baldness from the crown downwards to the first vertebra of the neck (עד פיקה של צואר), and גבחת from the crown forward to the extreme hair in front; and in both cases it was supposed to arise from eating, or putting on the head, anything that prevents the growth of hair, or from a wound which has the same effect. Arabic poets also distinguish between "noble baldness" (גבחת) and "servile baldness" (קרחת), the former being frequently occasioned by the wearing of the helmet. The meaning attributed to קֵרֵחַ "one that has boils, therefore originally a leper" (*Michael.* Mos. R. IV. 180), is more than doubtful, the etymological sense of קרח being *to be smooth.* — The two words לבנה אדמדמת (ver. 43) form a compound notion "white-reddish"; the Sept. inserts between them, unnecessarily, ἤ, and the Syr. או.

**45, 46.** The leper, looked upon as stricken by the hand of God, was in every respect to appear as the mourner did in the time of his bereave-

**cover his beard, and shall cry, Unclean, unclean. 46. All the time that the plague *is* on him, he shall be unclean, he *is* unclean; he shall dwell apart, without the camp *shall* his habitation *be*.**

ment—with his garments rent, his head uncovered, and his beard, the pride of the Oriental, veiled (comp. Mich. III. 7; Ezek. XXIV. 17, 22), though Jewish tradition decorously released women from rending their garments and uncovering their heads (*Mishn.* Sot. III. 8). But both disgust and fear prompted the Asiatics to exclude the abhorred leper from their society. For instance, among the Persians, at least in later times, he "was inaccessible to all"; at his sight a solemn prayer was recited; he was forbidden to enter a city or to have intercourse with his countrymen; if a foreigner, he was expelled from the land as one who had grievously sinned against the sun (*Avesta*, Yesht Sade 49; *Herod.* I. 139; *Ael.* N. A. X. 16; *Plut.* Symp. IV. v. 3; *Ctes.* Pers. 41; comp. *Rhode*, Heil. Sage pp. 501—504). But the laws and customs prevailing in Christian countries during the twelfth century were awful. The priest, wearing his stole and holding up the crucifix, conducted the leper into the church. Here he ordered him to exchange his clothes for a peculiar black garment, read to him the mass, and performed the full service for the dead. Then the leper was brought into a sequestered house, where the priest, after repeated exhortations, threw a shovel of earth upon his feet, warned him never to appear otherwise than in his black garment and barefooted, and enjoined upon him on no account to enter a church, or any place where corn was ground or bread was baked, nor ever to approach a well or a fountain. The unhappy outcast forfeited both the right of inheritance and the right of disposing of his own property; for before the law he was considered a dead man (comp. *Ersch* und *Gruber*, Encycl. I. vi. 452).

Philological Remarks. — The leper's head shall be פָּרוּעַ *bare*, *uncovered* (Sept. ἀκατακάλυπτος, Vulg. nudum), prop. *loosened* (comp. Ex. V. 4; XXXII. 25), without the head-covering which holds the hair together (see Comm. on Lev. I. 285 note 13); not "with freely growing hair" (מגדל שער, *Siphra*, *Rashi*). — שָׂפָם is undoubtedly beard (comp. 2 Sam. XIX. 25, עשה שפם to trim or to arrange the beard), probably derived from שָׂפַם in the sense of growing; עטה על שפם is, therefore, to cover the beard, which is repeatedly mentioned as a mark of mourning (see *supra*; Onk. על שפם כאבילא יתעטף, similarly Jonathan); but as beard and chin may, by way of metonomy, be substituted for each other, שפם has probably also the meaning of *chin*, which it must have if applied to women (comp. זָקָן bearded chin, Syr. דקנא beard and chin, Rashi "hair on the lips", גרנו״ן *grenon* moustaches). The connection of שפם with שָׂפָה *lip*, or with סָפַן *to cover* is doubtful (Sept. στόμα, Vulg. os). Ebn Ezra who adopts this interpretation (למעלה מהשפה), explains that the leper had to cover his mouth lest he injured others; which is incompatible with the parallel passages in which עטה על שפם is mentioned not in reference to disease but to misfortune in general; moreover, the patient could not proclaim his uncleanness, if his mouth were covered up. Onk. and Jon. render the last words of ver. 45 freely; the

47. And if a garment has the plague of leprosy, *whether it be* a woollen garment or a linen garment; 48. Whether *it be* cloth or stuff of linen or of wool; whether in a skin or in anything made of skin; 49. And if the plague is greenish or reddish in the garment, or in the skin, or in the cloth, or in the stuff, or in any utensil of skin; it *is* a plague of leprosy, and shall be shown to the priest. 50. And the priest shall look at the plague, and shut up *that which has* the plague seven days. 51. And he shall look at the plague on

former "do not defile yourselves (ולא תסתאבון), do not defile yourselves, shall be the cry;" the latter, "a herald shall call out, 'Keep aloof, aloof from the unclean!'"; and after בדד ישב Jon. adds "nor shall he approach the side of his wife".

**47—59.** "Leprosy of garments," a term peculiar to the Bible, like "leprosy of houses", must imply a disorder analogous to leprosy of persons, since it is expressed by the identical words (נֶגַע צָרַעַת). The simplest and most obvious explanation seems to be the safest, namely, that it denotes an infectious condition of clothes and stuffs, caused by contact with leprous matter, and therefore subject to changes and effects similar to those of leprosy itself. The leprous substance of wounds and boils is so strong, that it corrodes and injures all kinds of textures and clothes; the marks it produces not only resist repeated washing, but spread by the process (comp. *Mead*, Med. sacr. pp. 14 *sqq.*). Wool and linen are here, as elsewhere, named as the sole materials of garments (comp. Deut. XXII. 11; Hos. II. 7, 11; Prov. XXXI. 13); for cotton seems to have been long unknown to the Hebrews, as it was to the Greeks (*Voss*, Mythol. Briefe, III. 264, 265). Now, any manufacture made of wool or linen, or of skins, is liable to be impregnated with the obnoxious matter. Greenish or reddish spots appear, which often extend and prove so malignant that the manufacture cannot be saved. Therefore, the treatment of leprous garments and leprous persons was strikingly similar (see Summary).

It seems hardly necessary to seek for another interpretation; certainly none that has been proposed is more acceptable. It has been conjectured, that the diseases of men were, by a figure of speech, applied to bad conditions of things; as in Egypt and Palestine certain disorders of trees, occasioned by the hurtful activity of insects, are still called leprosy, and the Swiss speak of a "cancer" in buildings (comp. *Maim.* De Lepra XII. 13; XVI. 9). But the Biblical parallels are, in both cases, so distinct and so specific, that the supposition of a vague metaphor appears to be out of the question; and if similar terms are used in modern languages, they have commonly been borrowed from our passage. Or it has been contended (by Michaelis, who is followed by others), that the law refers to garments made of "dead wool" and to objects made of "dead skins", that is, to wool and skins of sheep that have not been slaughtered, but have died of some lingering disease; such wool and skins are coarse and useless, and easily infected by

the seventh day: if the plague has spread in the garment, or in the cloth, or in the stuff, or in the skin, whatever object is made of skin; the plague *is* malignant leprosy; it *is* unclean. 52. And they shall burn the garment, or the cloth, or the stuff of wool or linen, or any utensil of skin wherein the plague is; for it *is* malignant leprosy; it shall be burnt in fire. 53. But if the priest looks, and, behold, the plague has not spread in the garment, whether in the cloth, or in the stuff, or in any utensil of skin; 54. The priest shall command that

vermin; and the garments and objects manufactured from them are dangerous to health, and soon become threadbare, and full of cavities and holes (comp. *Mich.* Mos. R. IV. § 211; *Rosenm.* Schol. ad ver. 47). But it is difficult to see how such "dead wool" could at all be treated as analogous to leprosy, to which it has not the remotest resemblance; it has never been proved that such wool takes a greenish or reddish colour; and supposing even that the explanation were plausible with respect to woollen stuffs, it does not account for leprosy in those of linen. Others understand "mouldy stains" which, produced by dampness and want of air, assume various colours, extend, and gradually destroy the texture, which at last crumbles away like tinder; they are particularly marked in paper, linen, and leather, in which they form considerable depressions, and take whitish, greenish, or reddish shades, like the minute cryptogamic plants which spring up in the affected spots (*Sommer*, Abhandl. I. 224; *Keil*, Lev. p. 93). Or the evil has been traced to certain atmospheric vapours which, settling in the clothes, produce stains that look and smell like leprosy (*Schnurrer*, Chron. der Seuchen, I. 191); or to microscopic insects which consume the wool, and leave suspicious marks (Calmet, Jahn); or it has been declared to be no natural, but a miraculous affliction, sent by God in ancient times to punish or to warn the Israelites (comp. f. i. *Pfeiffer*, Dub. Vex. pp. 295—297): all which hazards prove the perplexity which the subject has, we believe unnecessarily, created.

Philological Remarks. — The generic notion (in vers. 47, 48), of which the remainder are specifications, is בֶּגֶד *garment*, that is, any material suitable and ready for wear; hence the much disputed words שְׁתִי and עֵרֶב (vers. 48, 51, etc.), which are co-ordinate with בגד צמר and בגד פשתים, can only denote two kinds of *stuffs* or *textures*, which signification is fully compatible with their etymology (Syr. אשתי to weave, Ar. سدّى IV to fix the warp in the loon; and ערב in Chald. and Syr. to weave, properly to mix, to plait, to braid), and may have reference to the colours — שתי *striped* in the direction of the warp, ערב with *mixed* colours or *many-coloured* (Houbig. vestis texturae diversae; i. e. quae constat filis spissioribus et tenuioribus; De Wette simply am Tuche oder am Zeuge). It seems impossible to take these terms here in their more usual sense of *warp* and *woof* (Sept. ἐν στήμονι ἢ ἐν κρόκῃ, Vulg. in stamine atque subtegmine, Luth., Engl. Vers., Michael., Gesen., a. o.); it is difficult

they wash that wherein the plague *is*, and he shall shut it up seven days again; 55. And if the priest looks at the plague after it has been washed, and, behold, the plague has not changed its appearance, though the plague has not spread; it *is* unclean; thou shalt burn it in fire; it has eaten downward in the bare place of its inner or its outer side. 56. And if the priest looks, and, behold, the plague *is* pale after it has been washed, he shall tear it out of the garment, or out of the skin, or out of the cloth, or out of the stuff: 57. And if it appears

to preceive how in the same piece the threads forming the warp should be affected, yet not those forming the woof, and *vice versa* (for the assumption of Michaelis—Mos. R. IV. 185 — that the one are made of sound, the others of the bad wool of diseased animals, is entirely gratuitous); and it is even more difficult to show, how it is possible to remove the one without disturbing the others; this objection is surely not met by the assertion, that not the stuffs but the threads of which they are to be manufactured, are meant, so that the threads destined for the warp may be kept distinct from those destined for the woof, and the former may be diseased and removed without the latter (Gasset, Rosenm., Keil); for our passage proves that the manufactured textures, and not the materials, are meant; that assertion, moreover, necessitates the translation of לפשתים (ver. 48) by "*or* of linen" (Sept. ἢ ἐν τοῖς λινοῖς), whereas the particle ל simply expresses the genitive (comp. Gramm. § 86. 9. *g*; Rashi של פשתים; in ver. 52 stands בפשתים instead of לפשתים).— The sense of צרעת מַמְאֶרֶת (vers. 51 *sqq.*) is as unmistakable as its *literal* meaning is doubtful; it evidently signifies leprosy deeply seated and abiding (Sept. ἔμμονος; Vulg. perseverans), dangerous and malignant (Jon. מחלמא); but it can hardly be ascertained whether ממארת is traceable to מאר in the sense of מרר, causing *bitter* pain (Rashi פויי"נט *pointe* stinging; Syr. מרירא; comp. Ezek. XXVIII. 24, סִלּוֹן מַמְאִיר a thorn causing pain), or to מְאֵרָה curse, execration (Mal. II. 2; Prov. III. 33), *curse-laden* leprosy (Rashb., Nachman.), or to the Arabic root صار to become raw again like a wound (comp. *Boch.* Hieroz. I. II. 45, p. 493, *lepra exasperata*, id est, *aspera et acerba*), or to صعر to make bare, "a consuming leprosy" (Knob., Onkel. מְחַזְּרָא "causing to fall off" or "wasting away"); however, the first named derivation has the greatest probability (comp. in Ezek. l. c. the parallelism of סלון ממאיר and קוץ מַכְאִיב). — On the Hothpael הֻכַּבֵּס (ver. 55), instead of הִתְכַּבֵּס, see Gramm. § XLVIII. 18; and on the construction of this passive form with את *ibid.* § 76. 2. — פְּחֶתֶת is no doubt *depression*, *cavity* (comp. פַּחַת pit), Targ. Jon. צִיְרָא שַׁקִיעָא (deep-lying leprosy), Syr. גומא, Rashi לשון גומא or שפלה היא, Menah. ben Saruk ענין עומק; the root is in Syr. *to dig* or *to excavate*, in the Talm. to *diminish*, whence Ebn Ezra explains the noun by חסרון, and Rashbam by מפחת ומחסר; Onk. renders inaccurately תַּבְרָא *wounding*, prop. breaking or rupture, while he translates שקערורת (in XIV. 37) by פַּחֲתָן or פְּחָתִין *depressions* (see notes in loc.).—The meaning which the words קרחת and

still in the garment, or in the cloth, or in the stuff, or in any utensil of skin, it *is* a spreading *plague*: thou shalt burn that wherein the plague *is* with fire. 58. And the garment, or the cloth, or the stuff, or any utensil of skin, which thou washest, if the plague departs from them, it shall be washed a second time, and shall *then* be clean.

59. This *is* the law of the plague of leprosy in a garment of wool or linen, or in cloth, or stuff, or any utensil of skin, to pronounce it clean, or to pronounce it unclean.

גבחת have in this place (ver. 55), viz. threadbare spots on the wrong and the right side of textures, has been explained above (on vers. 40—44, p. 233; those terms have been similarly understood by Targ. Jon. בְּחִדְּרֵיהּ אִי בִּלְבַּהֵיהּ i. e. on the smooth right side or on the rough and feltlike wrong side; comp. *Fleischer* in Levy's Chald. Wörterb. I. 429; comp. also *Talm.* Nidd. 19ª, Saad., Ebn Ezr., etc.). But others translate and interpret freely and conjecturally; thus Onk. בשחיקותיה אי בחדתותיה i. e. in its threadbare or in its new part, and so Rashi, but this acceptation severs all connection with the original meaning of the words; the Sept. ἐν τῷ ἱματίῳ ἢ ἐν τῷ στήμονι ἢ ἐν τῇ κρόκῃ; that is, just like בשתי או בערב (see *supra* on ver. 48); and the Vulg. eo quod infusa sit in superficie vestimenti vel per totum lepra; but in the Vulgate this entire portion is epitomised rather than translated.

## CHAPTER XIV.

Summary. — 1. *Ceremony of purification for a leper after recovery* (vers. 1—32). The priest, going to the leper's seclusion without the camp, orders two clean live birds to be taken, and one of them to be killed over an earthen vessel containing spring water; in the mixed blood and water he dips the second bird together with cedar-wood, hyssop, and a crimson thread or band, sprinkles the fluid upon the convalescent seven times, and lets the living bird fly away over the fields (vers. 1—7). The convalescent then washes his garments, shaves off all his hair, bathes in water, and returns, a clean man, into the camp; for seven days, however, he is not permitted to enter his tent; on the seventh day, he again shaves off all his hair, and bathes in water (vers. 8, 9), and on the eighth, he brings to the Sanctuary two male lambs and one ewe-lamb, together with three tenth of an ephah of flour and a log of oil: one of the he-lambs is presented for him as a trespass-offering, and a part of its blood is sprinkled by the priest upon the tip of his right ear, upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot; then some of the oil is sprinkled seven times towards the Holy of the Sanctuary, some of it is put on the same parts of the convalescent's body as the blood, and some upon his head. Next, the ewe-lamb is presented as a sin-offering, and the second he-lamb as a holocaust, accompanied by the usual bloodless oblation of the flour (vers. 10—20). — In cases of poverty, one he-lamb must be brought as before as a trespass-offering,

together with a log of oil and a tenth part of an ephah of fine flour; but for the sin-offering and the holocaust two turtle-doves or two young pigeons are accepted; and the rituals are in every respect identical with those prescribed for the larger offerings (vers. 21—32).

2. *Leprosy of houses* (vers. 33—53). If a house shows on the walls greenish or reddish spots, sinking, or appearing to sink, below the surface, it is to be shut up for seven days; if then the evil has spread, the affected stones are removed, and the mortar within the house is scraped off, taken to an unconsecrated spot without the camp, and replaced by other stones and other mortar (vers. 33—42). If, after a time, the evil is found to have made progress, the whole house is broken down, and all its materials are brought to an unclean place without the city (vers. 43—45). Those who enter such a house are unclean till the evening, while those who sleep or eat in it have, besides, to wash their garments (vers. 46, 47). But if the evil does not advance, the house is declared clean, and is purified by ceremonies closely analogous to those enjoined for the purification of a leprous person (vers. 48—53; comp. vers. 2—7). — 3. *A comprehensive formula of conclusion* (vers. 54—57).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. This
shall be the law of the leper on the day of his being
pronounced clean: He shall be brought to the priest;
3. And the priest shall go forth out of the camp; and
the priest shall look, and, behold, *if* the plague of leprosy
is healed in the leper, 4. The priest shall command to
take for him that is to be cleansed two live clean birds,
and cedar wood, and crimson *thread*, and hyssop:
5. And the priest shall command that one of the birds
be killed into an earthen vessel over running water.
6. As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar
wood, and the crimson *thread*, and the hyssop, and shall
dip them together with the living bird in the blood of the

**1—32.** The recovery from leprous disorders, which was comparatively rare, was signalised by a significant and impressive ritual, in accordance with the symbolism of the East and the distinctive doctrines of the Hebrews. There could be little difficulty in fixing the prominent features of the ceremony, which were readily suggested by the striking characteristics of the disease, and by the peculiar light in which it was viewed from early times. Leprosy was almost looked upon as living death; therefore the rites must forcibly represent the ideas of life and regeneration. It manifests itself in the most loathsome uncleanness; therefore it required striking acts of purification. And it was regarded as a Divine punishment for grave offences; therefore it demanded expiatory sacrifices. From these three points of view the ceremonial is devised, and it is from them that its apparently complicated details must be surveyed. Its object was to express that the sufferer had been restored to life and health; to bodily cleanness or social intercourse; and

bird *that was* killed over the running water; 7. And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall cleanse him, and shall let the living bird loose into the open field. 8. And he that is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes, and shave off all his hair and bathe in water; then he is clean; and after *that* he may come into the camp; but he shall remain out of his tent seven days. 9. And it shall be on the seventh day *that* he shall shave off all his hair —*that* of his head and his beard and his eyebrows, and all his *other* hair he shall

to moral purity or to communion with God. It was, therefore, naturally divided into three distinct parts.

The first acts of course took place beyond the precincts of the camp or town, away from the congregation of Israel and the Sanctuary of God. They were thoughtfully and consistently framed with the view of impressing the notion of life. The priest, who throughout conducted the ritual, ordered two clean live birds (צפרים) to be brought, together with cedar wood, a crimson thread or a strip of crimson cloth (שני תולעת), and twigs of hyssop, evidently the cedar wood and the hyssop to be tied up by the crimson thread or band. Cedar wood, remarkable for durability and hardness, and long resisting decay and putrefaction, was employed for buildings designed to convey the ideas of power and spiritual life, as the Temple, and for structures meant to defy the effects of time, as the royal palace (comp. *Plin.* XIII. 5 or 11); and cedar oil, supposed to ward off decomposition, was extensively used for embalming (comp. *Plin.* XVI. 11 or 21; 40 or 76—79; XXIV. 5 or 11), it was called "the life of the dead" (νεκροῦ ζωή), and believed to possess many important remedial properties (*Dioscor.* I. 106). Nor were life and health less intelligibly typified by crimson, the colour of blood, which was regarded as the cause and principle of existence in men and animals. But hyssop was chosen merely because it is most convenient for sprinkling, since its delicate and resinous leaves readily absorb fluids, and as readily give them forth by shaking; it was prescribed for the practical requirements of the ceremonial, and was for similar purposes used on other occasions also (Ex. XII. 22; Num. XIX. 6, 18), just as the Greeks took twigs of laurel (comp. *Aristoph.* Pax 959; *Athen.* IX. 76; etc.); it has, therefore, here no symbolical significance; yet having been constantly employed in rites of purification, it may, in the course of time, have been associated with cleansing from moral or physical uncleanness (comp. Ps. LI. 9); and it was, together with cedar wood and crimson stuff, thrown into the burning body of the "red cow", by the ashes of which deflement through contact with a corpse was removed (Num. XIX. 6, 18; see *infra* vers. 49 *sqq.*; comp. *Knobel* on Lev. p. 477).

In the next place, "living water", that is, water taken from a running stream or a perennial spring, bubbling forth with the semblance of action and life, was to be poured into an earthen vessel: an earthen utensil, and not a more durable and more expensive metal one was chosen, probably be-

shave off; and he shall wash his clothes, and he shall bathe himself in water, and he shall be clean. 10. And on the eighth day, he shall take two he-lambs without blemish, and one ewe-lamb one year old without blemish, and three tenths *of an ephah* of fine flour *for* a bloodless offering, mingled with oil, and one log of oil. 11. And the priest that performs the cleansing shall present the man that is to be cleansed, and those things, before the Lord, at the door of the Tent of Meeting. 12. And the priest shall take the one he-lamb, and offer it for a trespass-offering, and

cause, after having served the purposes decribed, it was no more to be used, but to be broken in pieces. Over that earthen vessel one of the clean birds was to be killed so as to let the blood flow into the water: though the bird was no sacrifice, and its slaughter was attended with no sacrificial rites, it seems yet to have been meant as a symbol of that death which had threatened the patient, and from which he had been so providentially saved. Into the mixture of blood and water, both of which were symbols of life, the priest was to dip not only the bundle of hyssop and cedar wood, held together by the crimson thread, but also the second, that is, the living bird. He was then to "let the bird loose into the open field" — not only sparing its life, but restoring it to perfect liberty, and thus intimating to the convalescent that, having been rescued at the threshold of death, he was thenceforth allowed to choose again his abode at pleasure, and to move among his fellow-men in unrestrained freedom. Could this idea have been so aptly expressed by a quadruped, however swift-footed, as by a bird, since wings are the natural emblems of free and rapid movement? (Comp. Ps. CXXXIX. 9.)

Yet the restored leper could not associate with his fellow-men in a state of impurity; therefore, with acts symbolizing return to life were entwined acts conveying complete lustration. The priest was to sprinkle him seven times with the hyssop twigs dipped into the mingled blood and water, the number seven recalling the holy aspiration of man towards Divine purity; then, taking a personal part in the proceedings, he was to wash his garments, which might have absorbed diseased matter; to shave his entire body, because the hair is most seriously affected by leprosy (comp. Num. VIII. 7; *Herod.* II. 37; *Theodor.* Quaest. XII in Num.); and lastly to undergo careful ablutions. Being now considered clean, and released from his dreary seclusion, he was allowed to return to the camp. Yet his admission to society was only gradual; for seven days he was tolerated in the community, rather than received into it; during that time he was forbidden to hold close intercourse with his brethren, and least of all with his family, and he was not permitted to enter his own dwelling. That week was evidently meant as an intermediate stage between his complete isolation and his complete liberty; it was to fill up the immense chasm between religious death and the renewal of that inner life which he was soon to manifest by worshipping at the national Sanctuary; it was to prepare him for the

the log of oil, and wave them *for* a wave-offering before
the Lord. 13. And the lamb shall be killed in the place
where the sin-offering and the burnt-offering are killed in
the holy place; for as the sin-offering *is* the priest's, *so is*
the trespass-offering; it *is* most holy. 14. And the priest
shall take *some* of the blood of the trespass-offering, and
the priest shall put *it* upon the tip of the right ear of him
that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right
hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot. 15. And the
priest shall take *some* of the log of oil, and pour *it* into the

ceremonies designed to reinstate him as a member of the Hebrew theocracy, and to confer upon him his ordinary religious privileges, and with them his full social rights.

Having, on the seventh day, once more scrupulously shaved his whole body, washed his garments, and bathed himself, he was, on the eighth day, to accomplish the final acts of lustration. Among these a trespass-offering, which had probably been presented on similar occasions from early times, occupied a prominent place. It involved those significant rites which most strongly impressed upon the mind the ideas suggested by the event. It consisted of a male sheep which, together with a log of oil typifying Divine wisdom, was first to be "waved" by the priest before God; and by this ritual, which is in no other case connected with expiatory sacrifices,[2] it was specially consecrated to Him as the Ruler of heaven and earth and the Dispenser of human destinies; the sheep was then to be killed at the brazen Altar, on the spot where the holiest sacrifices, the burnt- and sin-offerings, were usually slaughtered, that is, on its northern side; next the priest was to put some of the blood on the right ear of the convalescent, on his right hand, and his right foot, that is, on those parts of the body which most strikingly symbolise a godlike life of ready obedience, unwearied activity and pious devotion, and which were also marked on the High-priests and the priests at their solemn initiation: thus his re-admission as a member of the "kingdom of priests" was conveyed to the Hebrew mind with irresistible force; and it was ratified by a corresponding ceremonial with the oil, which was put on the same parts of the body just over the blood, and, besides, on the head, the organ of reason and intelligence: moral purification was the basis on which spiritual enlightenment was reared up; the negative was supplemented by a positive element prompting to holy thoughts, and resulting in righteous deeds; and this positive element received still greater weight by the priest sprinkling the oil seven times "before the Lord", that is, towards or upon the vail before the Sanctuary, the source of light, knowledge, and peace.

Following the text attentively, we find this order of proceeding prescribed with respect to the oil: first, some of it was put upon the convalescent's right ear, hand, and foot; next, a part was sprinkled seven times before the Lord; and lastly, "the remainder" was put upon the convalescent's head. The fact that the head is treated separately from the other members of the body, is not

palm of his own left hand; 16. And the priest shall dip his right finger in the oil that *is* in his left hand, and shall sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord; 17. And of the rest of the oil that *is* in his hand shall the priest put upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot, upon the blood of the trespass-offering; 18. And the remnant of the oil that *is* in the priest's hand he shall pour upon the head of him that is to be cleansed: and the priest shall make

without significance; it appears to intimate, that the Hebrew was pre-eminently to excel in obedience, activity, and devotion, and that he should regard intellectual superiority as a precious gift indeed, but only in connection with, and subordinate to, the exercise of those practical virtues.

Now the expiation seems completed (ver. 18); for it is difficult to discover any rite or emblem that could have been devised in addition to those just reviewed, comprising, as they did, regeneration of body and mind, of heart and soul. And yet the Law prescribed, besides, not only a holocaust with an exceptionably ample cereal oblation of three omers of fine flour instead of the usual one omer (comp. Num. XV. 4), but also a sin-offering. We can readily understand, why the former was added, since it was deemed desirable to convey a general expression of Divine sovereignty after recovery from a heaven-inflicted disorder. But why the latter? Or rather, why not the latter instead of the previous trespass-offering? Was not the sin-offering the holiest and most imposing form of expiatory sacrifices? and did not, on this occasion, the author intend to prescribe the most solemn rituals which lay within the range of Hebrew symbolism? Why both a trespass- and a sin-offering? and if both, why were the most striking and most significant ceremonies connected with the less important victim? The only satisfactory explanation is afforded by a reference to the history of sacrifices among the Israelites. The earlier, and for a long time the only, class of expiatory sacrifices were the trespass-offerings; though at first mainly confined to the atonement of offences relating to property, they were, in course of time, extended to other and more spiritual spheres; in this manner, they came to be employed at the restoration of the leper, though, for long periods, they were probably offered in a very simple form; and having once taken root, they were retained even after the introduction of the more sacred and more impressive class of expiatory sacrifices, especially as they had then probably been associated with those remarkable rites which exhausted the emblems of moral renovation and intellectual light so completely, that the superadded sin-offering was allowed to consist of a *female* victim (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 262 *sqq.*). Indeed the trespass-offering was deemed so indispensable, that in all cases, whether the convalescent was rich or poor, it was required to be a lamb, the blood of which was disposed of in the manner described;

an atonement for him before the Lord. 19. And the priest shall offer the sin-offering, and make an atonement for him that is to be cleansed from his uncleanness; and afterwards he shall kill the burnt-offering; 20. And the priest shall present the burnt-offering and the bloodless offering upon the altar: and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and he shall be clean.

21. But if he *is* poor, and his fortune does not suffice, he shall take one lamb *for* a trespass-offering to be waved, to make an atonement for himself, and one tenth *of an ephah*

but the sin- and the burnt-offerings were in cases of poverty permitted to be pigeons or turtle-doves, and were thus clearly marked as less essential in the ceremonial of purification.

In this manner, the healed leper, released from bodily and spiritual death, was restored to unreserved communion with his family, his people, and his God; he had passed through a threefold gradation of rites, *without* the camp, *in* the camp, and "before the Lord"; and he had thereby won the threefold boon of political, social, and religious regeneration; he was again a member of the holy theocracy, pledged to all its duties, and entrusted with all its privileges.

Philological Remarks. — As in other passages, טָהֳרָתוֹ is here (ver. 2) "his purification", i. e. his being pronounced clean (comp. XIII. 35; XV. 13; Num. VI. 9); whereas טִהַר (ver. 48) is *to purify* or *to expiate* (comp. Num. VIII. 6, 7, 15, 21), and הִטַּהֵר (Hithp.) *to purify oneself* (Num. VIII. 7), like התחטא (Num. VIII. 21; XIX. 12 *sqq.*; XXXI. 19). — נִרְפָּא מִן is a *constructio praegnans*, the disease "is healed *and has disappeared* from" the leper. — We need not labour to fix the exact species of birds here intended by צִפֳּרִים (ver. 4); for the text prescribes "two *clean* צפרים", which words point logically, not to particular kinds, but to a class of birds; and versions like "two clean pigeons" or "clean sparrows" (Vulg., Pagninus, Arias, a. o. passeres), "clean swallows" (צפור דרור, Maim. a. o.), or "clean hens" (gallinae, *Origen.* in Lev. Hom. VIII. 10), imply a tautology. Ebn Ezra observes, therefore, correctly, "Every bird is called צפור, therefore any clean birds that happen to be at hand, may be taken" (and so Bochart, Lund., a. o.; and Sept. ὀρνίθια, which term, however, was in later times used for *hens* — *Athen.* IX. 7 —, and may, therefore, have given rise to Origen's rendering; comp. *Bochart*, Hieroz. II. I. 16, p. 111). Jewish tradition has decided in favour of sparrows, and adduces the playful reason, that as leprosy was sent as a punishment for calumny which is perpetually whispering, it was proper to choose birds proverbial for their constant twitter (*Talm.* Erach. 16[b], הוא עשה מעשה פטיט לפיכך אמרה תורה יביא קרבן פטיט; and so Rashi, *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 47; comp. also *Lightfoot*, Op. II. 532; *Lund.* Heiligth. p. 761; *Boch.* Hieroz. II. I. 21, pp. 145, 146). And the wood of the lofty cedar-tree (comp. Isai. II. 13; XXXVII. 24; Am. II. 9) was to recall the haughtiness of mind which deserved the affliction of leprosy; while the diminutive hyssop (comp. 1 Ki. V.

of fine flour mingled with oil for a bloodless offering, and a log of oil; 22. And two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, for which his fortune suffices; and the one shall be a sin-offering, and the other a burnt-offering. 23. And he shall bring them on the eighth day for his cleansing to the priest to the door of the Tent of Meeting, before the Lord. 24. And the priest shall take the lamb of the trespass-offering, and the log of oil, and the priest shall wave them *for* a wave-offering before the Lord. 25. And he shall kill the lamb of the trespass-offering, and the priest shall

13) was to enforce humility and obedience as the conditions of Divine forgiveness (*Rashi* after *Yalkut Shim.* I. no. 559, fol. 157; *Midr. Rabb.* Vay. sect. 16; *Hotting.* Jus Hebr. p. 249): Maimonides (Mor. Nev. III. 47) rejects these views, but confesses his inability to account for the selection of cedar, hyssop, and crimson, and to explain their meaning. — It is true, that turtle-doves and young pigeons only are usually ordained as sacrificial birds, and they are so prescribed in this very section (ver. 30); however, the צפרים are not required for a *sacrifice*; they are employed for symbolical ceremonies, not performed at the altar, but without the camp (vers. 3, 8), and not accompanied by the sprinkling of blood on any part of the Sanctuary, which was an indispensable feature in every sacrifice. According to the Mishnah (Neg. XIV. 1), the birds must be such as live both in open fields and in houses (צפרים דרור); this is probably not quite in harmony with the spirit of the injunction, which demands birds loving liberty and accustomed to fly about freely — which is perhaps another reason why pigeons and turtle-doves were not commanded. Jewish tradition, moreover, declared that the hyssop must neither be Greek, nor Roman, neither that coming from the region of "Cochli" (כוחלי), nor such as grows wild in the desert, and, in general, none that is distinguished by a qualifying epithet! (*Talm.* Chull. 62b; *Mishn.* Par. XI. 7 *sqq.*; comp. on this portion in general *Mishn.* Neg. XIV). — The birds are expressly required to be *living* birds, because the notion of life forms the very centre of the ceremonial; hence חַיּוֹת is by no means superfluous; but this word hardly denotes "strong and faultless" birds, or "such as are conspicuous for vivacity and alertness" (Rosenm., Bähr; comp. ver. 7 where הצפור החיה is simply used in contradistinction to הצפור השחוטה (ver. 6). — אֶרֶז (Arab. أرز, Aram. ארזא), prop. the "strong, hard, and compact tree", is undoubtedly the *cedar*, certainly not the pine (*Cels.* Hierob. I. 106—134). — On the colour תּוֹלַעַת see Comm. on Exod. p. 487, and on אֵזוֹב *hyssop* ibid. pp. 204, 205; *Dioscor.* III. 30; *Plin.* XXVI. 4 or 11 *sqq.*; *Cels.* Hierob. I. 407—448. The red or crimson colour here denotes life, which meaning it has in reference to fire also (see Comm. on Lev. I. 529); it does not symbolise purification, but on the contrary sin, white representing innocence (comp. Is. I. 18; Comm. on Lev. I. p. 101). — It has been strangely assumed, that the priest was to procure the birds and the other objects from his own means (Ebn Ezra); but it was a general

**take *some* of the blood of the trespass-offering, and put *it* upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot; 26. And the priest shall pour of the oil into the palm of his own left hand; 27. And the priest shall sprinkle with his right finger *some* of the oil that *is* in his left hand seven times before the Lord; 28. And the priest shall put of the oil that is in his hand upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the**

principle, that the sacrifices and gifts should be the property of the person who offered them (Comm. on Lev. p. 101). — The one bird (ver. 5), which might be killed by any clean person (Jon. ויכוס כהנא לְצִפְּרָא, and so in vers. 13, 50), was to be killed "into (אֶל) an earthen vessel over (על) running water" (מים חיים), that is, it was during the act of killing to be held "over" a vessel with water taken from a running stream or from a well, so that the blood flowed "into" the vessel, and mingled with the water (comp. ver. 51; Sept. σφάξουσι... εἰς ἀγγεῖον... ἐφ' ὕδατι; see *Bähr*, Symb. II. 512). The "living water" (מים חיים; comp. Gen. XXVI. 19) is contradistinguished from stagnant or rain-water, gathered in cisterns or reservoirs; comp. Jer. II. 13; Gen. XXXVII. 24; see also Lev. XV. 13; Num. XIX. 17; Sept. ἐφ' ὕδατι ζῶντι, Vulg. super aquas viventes; Onk. and Jon. מֵי מַבּוּעַ flowing, running water; Ebn Ezra water taken ממקום נובע; Rosenm. aqua perennis; *Liv.* I. 45, vivo perfunderis flumine; *Virg.* Aen. II. 719, 720, donec me flumine vivo abluero; *Ovid*, Fast. IV. 778, et vivo perlue rore manus; etc. — According to the Mishnah (Neg. XIV. 1), the vessel was to be a *new* one (כלי של חרש חדשה), which probably accords with the legislator's intention; and the sprinkling was to be performed on the back of the convalescent's hand, or upon his forehead. — Targ. Jonath., following older authorites, concludes the 7th verse with this addition, "And if that man is destined (איטימוס ἕτοιμος) to be again stricken with leprosy, it shall happen, that the live bird will return to his house, and that it is fit to be eaten: and the killed bird is to be buried by the priest in the presence of the leper." It is possible, that the convalescent's exclusion from his tent or house for seven days was intended to debar him from "approaching the side of his wife", as Jewish tradition maintains (comp. Jon., Siphra, Rashi, a. o.; see also *Bähr*, Symb. II. 520, 521; *Friedreich*, Zur Bibel, p. 224; *Sommer*, Bibl. Abhandl. p. 216); for connubial intercourse, which caused uncleanness during the day (XV. 18), would have interrupted the period of holy preparation; but the injunction is general, and applies to married and unmarried men alike; its chief object was probably that pointed out above; yet it may, besides, have been intended to serve as an additional guarantee of the leper's perfect recovery (see also *Kurtz*, Opferc. p. 382). — According to the Mishnah (Midd. II. 5), restored lepers bathed in a chamber at the north-western corner of the Court of women (comp. Neg. XIV. 8). — The animal killed for the trespass-offering (אשם) was

great toe of his right foot, upon the place of the blood
of the trespass-offering; 29. And the rest of the oil
that *is* in the priest's hand he shall put upon the head
of him that is to be cleansed, to make an atonement for
him before the Lord. 30. And he shall offer the one of
the turtle-doves or of the young pigeons of those for
which his fortune suffices, 31. Even such for which
his fortune suffices, the one *for* a sin-offering, and
the other *for* a burnt-offering together with the blood-
less offering: and the priest shall make an atonement

one of the two *male* sheep, and not, as has been asserted (by *Bähr*, l. c. pp. 512, 522, a. o.), the female one (כבשה), which was reserved for the sin-offering (ver. 19); the victims of trespass-offerings were males in all cases (Comm. on Lev. I. p. 278); hence here והקריב אתו (ver. 12; comp. also *Ebn Ezra* on ver. 10). The trespass-offering has, in this instance also, been considered as a fine or *mulcta* of the convalescent, which he had to pay, because, during his illness, he had been unable to present any offerings, and had thus curtailed the rights of God: this view is so strained and paradoxical, that it is in itself sufficient to refute that theory of the meaning of trespass-offerings (see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 268 note 6; comp. also *Kurtz*, Opferc. § 101). — The Sept. adds after תמימים (ver. 10) ἐναυσίους (בני שנה). — On בַּת שְׁנָתָהּ see p. 213; and on סלת בלולה בשמן Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 85, 103—105. — עִשָּׂרוֹן is undoubtedly the tenth part of an *ephah* (Sept. Num. XV. 4 δέκατον τοῦ οἰφί), that is, an *omer* (comp. Exod. XVI. 36), not the tenth part of a *seah* (סְאָה); on this and on לֹג see Comm. on Exod. pp. 297, 304. — *Three* omers, instead of one, were prescribed for the cereal offering, not as a substitute for the drink-offerings which should have accompanied the two expiatory sacrifices (*Talm.* Menach. 91[a]), and much less "in consideration of the many and troublesome offices the priests had to perform in connection with the leper" (Knob.). — וְאֹתָם (ver. 11) refers to the animals and materials mentioned in the preceding verse. — According to Jewish practice or tradition, the person was not taken "before the Lord" into the Court of the Temple itself, but only to the gate of Nicanor, between the Court of the women and that of Israel, because his purification was still incomplete (מחוסר כפורים); on the other hand, the blood of expiatory offerings could not be brought beyond the limits of the Court of Israel. In this dilemma, a ceremony was adopted which is thus described — "The restored leper puts his head through the gate of Nicanor, and the priest puts some of the blood on the cartilage of his right ear; then he stretches forth his right hand, and the priest puts blood upon his thumb; and lastly his right foot, and some blood is put on the great toe". Yet one authority, Rabbi Jehudah, deemed it desirable, that the person should put through all the three members at once. In a similar manner, the convalescent was required to impose his hand upon the victim; and from the same place the purifications were performed in other cases of deflement; for instance, when

**for him that is to be cleansed before the Lord. — 32 This *is* the law *of him* in whom *there was* the disease of leprosy, whose fortune does not suffice at his cleansing.**
**33. And the Lord spoke to Moses and Aaron, saying, 34. When you come into the land of Canaan,**

a man had recovered from a running issue, or when a woman brought her offerings after childbirth (see *Mishn.* Neg. XIV. 8, 9; Kel. I. 8; *Talm.* Sot. 8; comp. also *Lightf.* Op. I. 754; *Maimon.* De Indigent. piacul. cc. 4, 5, pp. 196—201 ed. De Veil). Origen (in Lev. Hom. VIII. 10) and many later writers assumed an analogy between the two birds here ordained, and the two goats prescribed for the Day of Atonement, the live bird being supposed to symbolise the removal of the leper's uncleanness; but this view, which is devoid of even an appearance of probability, leads to false and distorted explanations of our ritual (comp. *Bähr* l. c. pp. 519, 520; *Winer*, Real-Wört. II. 660; *Keil*, Archäolog. I. 289; *Kurtz*, Opfercult. pp. 379—381; see notes on ch. XVI. 20—22). — The ceremonial here described has naturally been made the subject of *typical* explanations; let it suffice to adduce as a specimen a few features of the theory worked out by Bochart (Hieroz. II. I. 22, p. 151). Leprosy signifies sin. The clean bird, by which the leper is cleansed, denotes Christ, who, pure from stain, effaces all sins. The killed bird points to Christ dying on the cross, and the released bird to Christ rising from the grave, and ascending into heaven. Hence two birds are necessary, because one cannot typify Christ in his double nature, the human, which is subject to death, and the Divine, which is immortal. Similarly, the cedar which is the highest, and the hyssop which is the lowest plant, are symbols of Christ, who is both God and man, while the crimson band resembles his blood. Only one bird is killed, because Christ was to die only in the flesh. The blood of the killed bird is mixed with water, as, on the cross, both blood and water flowed from the side of Christ. The live bird is sprinkled with the blood of the dead one, to intimate that Christ, the man, was, by his death, joined to God; for the remission of sins could neither be effected by God without man, nor by man without God. — וְשָׁחַט (ver. 13) Sept. καὶ σφάξουσι, since it was not the priest who performed the killing of the victim (comp. Comm. on Lev. I. 477); therefore הכהן, which the text is careful to repeat in reference to all other parts of the ceremonial (vers. 11, 12, 14—20), is omitted with respect to that one menial function. — On תְּנוּךְ אזן see Comm. on Lev. I. 679; Rashi gives here the explanation טנד׳רון tendron (cartilage). — על דם האשם (ver. 17) is simply "upon the blood", not "besides the blood of the trespass-offering"; comp. ver. 28, "in the place of (על מקום) the blood of the trespass-offering". — Jonathan renders שְׁתֵּי תֹרִים (ver. 22) by תרתין שפנינין רַבְרְבִין, evidently in contradistinction to בְּנֵי יונה.

**33—57.** Though entirely deserted by experience, we can hardly hesitate to understand by "the plague of leprosy in houses" some abnormal and dangerous affection analogous to leprosy of persons both in its nature and effects. It is true, that nothing similar has in recent times been observed in the East

which I give to you for a possession, and I put the
plague of leprosy in a house of the land of your pos-
session; 35. He that owns the house shall come and tell
the priest, saying, *There* seems to me *something* like a
plague in the house. 36. Then the priest shall com-
mand that the house be emptied before the priest goes
*into it* to see the plague, lest all that *is* in the house be
made unclean; and after that the priest shall go in to see
the house. 37. And *if* he looks at the plague, and, behold,
the plague *is* in the walls of the house — hollow streaks,
greenish or reddish, which in appearance *are* lower than
the wall; 38. Then the priest shall go out of the house to

or elsewhere (comp. *Sonnini*, Voyage, III. 125); but it must always be remembered, that leprosy in general has during the last two or three centuries lost much of its former force and malignity, owing mainly, it may be assumed, to more efficient precautions. Not only is leprosy of houses described with exactly the same terms as leprosy of persons (comp. vers. 34, 44, 55, צָרַעַת, נֶגַע צ׳, and even צ׳ מַמְאֶרֶת), but some of the specified symptoms coincide in both cases, as the deeper appearance of the affected spots (ver. 37); in both cases, the period of seven days marks the crisis (ver. 38); the defilement caused by contact or even by proximity is the same (vers. 36, 46, 47); and what is still more important, and seems almost decisive, the rites of purification are all but identical, as far as the matter admits; we have here also the two clean birds, the cedar wood, the hyssop, and the crimson band; the killing of the one bird over an earthen vessel filled with "living" water, and the release of the other into the open field; the immersion of those three objects in the mingled blood and water; and lastly the sevenfold sprinkling (vers. 49—53). These are lustrations for real leprosy and for nothing else. Nor is it difficult to understand, how in very virulent cases of personal leprosy, some of the diseased matter, which is powerful enough to cause the mutilation, the falling off, and mortification of whole limbs, may corrode the paint or the stones, and especially the mortar of the leper's house, change their colour, cling to them, and spread irresistibly. Living in such houses may become as dangerous as contact with lepers themselves, and requires, therefore, the same rigid control. This explanation appears at least more plausible than any other that has yet been suggested (comp. *Schilling*, De Lepra, pp. 189 *sqq.*; *Knobel* in loc.; etc.). Many decide in favour of "the nitrous scab" (Salpeterfrass), an efflorescence, on the walls, of common salpetre or "mural salt", resembling hoarfrost, and formed by a nitrous acid with the admixture of a fixed vegetable alcali. That nitrous incrustation, fostered by uncleanness, and absorbing the moisture of the atmosphere, penetrates through the stones, and marks them with greenish and other spots, though it is seldom seen higher than the ground floor; it loosens the mortar which slowly crumbles away, and weakens even the

**the door of the house, and shut up the house seven days. 39. And the priest shall come again the seventh day, and shall look, and, behold, *if* the plague has spread in the walls of the house, 40. The priest shall command, that the stones in which the plague *is*, be removed, and cast into an unclean place without the city; 41. And he shall cause the house to be scraped within round about, and the mortar that is scraped off shall be thrown without the city into an unclean place. 42. And other stones shall be taken, and put in the place of those stones; and other mortar shall be taken, and the house be plaistered. 43. And if the plague returns, and breaks**

walls, which ultimately collapse, though often after a long resistance; it occurs mostly in houses built on a marshy soil; it renders the objects near it mouldy or putrid, and causes fusty exhalations, which disagreeably settle in clothes; it thickens the atmosphere, impedes the breathing, and is, therefore, most injurious to health, especially to persons sleeping in such a house (comp. *Michael.* Mos. R. IV. 187—197; *Volney*, Reisen I. 55; *Faber*, Archäol. I. 362; *Rosenm.* Morgenl. II. 185, 186; *Friedreich*, Zur Bibel, I. 234, 235; *Winer*, Real-Wörterb. I. 468; a. o.). Some again trace the evil to animalcules working in the stone, like mites in a cheese (*Calmet*, Dict. sub Lèpre); others to vegetable structures appearing on decomposed stones and mouldy walls, especially those which are built of many heterogeneous materials, and bearing a great resemblance to herpetic eruptions of the skin (*Sommer*, Bibl. Abhandl. pp. 219, 220; *Reinhard*, Bibelkrankh. I. 92, 93); and others think that the fungus is meant, which often grows on walls in extraordinary quantity, and by attracting dampness gradually corrupts the houses, and is exceedingly noxious to health (*Wunderbar*, Bibl. Med. II. I. 8). But it is difficult to perceive the slightest affinity between these contingencies and leprosy, whether in name, appearance, or character; the "nitrous scab" is usually whitish, and rarely greenish or reddish (ver. 37); like the other irregularities alluded to, it affects the exterior of houses also and even predominantly, whereas the precautions with respect to "leprosy of houses" are restricted to the interior (ver. 41), and evidently point to a connection with the inmates. If we may suppose that the term "leprosy" (צרעת) includes several kindred diseases which, though different in form and in their degree of virulence, are all dangerous by contagion, the precepts of our law, bearing so close an analogy to those on leprosy of persons, will be even more intelligible. The assumption that, in the imaginative Eastern style, the peculiarities of leprous persons are naturally applied to "house-patients", is inadmissible in sober legislative ordinances. Perplexity has here, as elsewhere, prompted interpreters to take refuge in miracles, and to assert that the disorder was supernaturally inflicted, whenever God deemed it necessary to remind His sinful people, that they owed to

out in the house after the stones have been removed, and after the house has been scraped, and after it has been plaistered; 44. The priest shall come and look, and, behold, *if* the plague has spread in the house, it *is* a malignant leprosy in the house; it *is* unclean. 45. And the house shall be broken down, its stones, and its timber, and all the mortar of the house, and they shall be carried out of the city into an unclean place. 46. And whoever goes into the house during the whole time that it is shut up, shall be unclean until the evening; 47. And whoever lies in the house shall wash his clothes, and whoever eats in the house shall wash his

Him not only their lives, but also their raiments and their houses; and in support of this idea they have even adduced a Biblical text, "If I put (וְנָתַתִּי) the plague of leprosy in a house" (ver. 34): however, the transcendentalism of the Bible attributes all occurrences, even those resulting from the necessary laws of nature, to God as the primary cause. — It is against the spirit of the Old Testament to consider the uncleanness of leprous houses not as "external defilement or infection", but as "ideal and symbolical", teaching that the sin of man "spreads from him to the things he touches or uses, or to the places he inhabits, in a manner which needs not be taken as physical contagion" (*Keil*, Lev. pp. 98, 99), a mystic view, the singularity of which is but little removed from the typical conceit that leprosy of houses is an emblem of the Hebrew cities, especially the Temple, certain to be destroyed by God on account of Israel's perversity (*Michaelis*, Typ. Gottesgel. p. 106).

Philological Remarks. — The place which this section occupies, is certainly irregular; leprosy of houses would most naturally have followed after leprosy of garments (XIII. 47—58); yet the laws on these two kindred subjects are separated by the expiatory ordinances prescribed for leprosy of persons. The conclusion seems almost irresistible, that our section is a supplementary addition to the laws of leprosy, which originally comprised only those regarding persons and garments; while leprosy of houses, no doubt of rare occurrence, was at first not considered to require legislative control, but was later subjoined with a distinct heading (ver. 33), and with evident reference to the preceding injunctions, since the ceremonies of purification are manifest repetitions (see *supra*). The houses were probably destroyed in extreme cases only, and the loss was seldom very great, as Eastern dwellings are, as a rule, small, frail, and poor. — It has been supposed, that the commands here given were meant to apply to the Holy Land only, which contained the Sanctuary, the abode of God's glory (comp. *Ebn Ezra* on ver. 37); but the contingency of the dispersion of the Hebrews is never considered in the special laws of the Pentateuch. — The clearing out of the house, previous to the priest's inspection, was intended as a boon and favour to the inhabitants; for if the

**clothes. 48. But if the priest comes and looks, and, behold, the plague has not spread in the house, after the house was plaistered, the priest shall pronounce the house clean; for the plague is healed. 49. And he shall take to cleanse the house two birds, and cedar wood, and crimson *thread*, and hyssop; 50. And he shall kill the one of the birds over an earthen vessel over running water; 51. And he shall take the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the crimson *thread*, and the living bird, and dip them in the blood of the slain bird and in the running water, and sprinkle the house seven times; 52. And he shall *thus* cleanse the**

examination proved the house to be infected by leprosy, all objects found therein were unclean (comp. *Mich.* Mos.R.IV.194). — For a reason which will be understood from preceding remarks, Targ. Jonath., anxious to transfer the accident from the physical to the moral sphere, inserts after לאחזה (ver. 34), "And if there is a man who has built his house from stolen goods" (בַּחֲטוּפִין). Jewish conceptions may be seen in *Mishn.* Neg. III. 8; XII; XIII. — The utterly untenable theory, that this entire cycle of laws is traceable to the old Elohist, renders it necessary to declare the words from בטרם to הנגע (ver. 36) as a later Jehovistic interpolation, since the Elohist never uses the particle טרם (Knob.): that a historical analysis of the composition of Leviticus leads to a much later time, and demands very different principles of interpretation, will be evident from the whole tenour of our observations. — Targ. Jonath., in harmony with Jewish tradition, fixes the size of leprous spots which suffice to make a house unclean, at "two beans" (כתרין גריסין; comp. *Mishn.* Neg. XII. 3; Kel. XVII. 12; *Sifra* fol. $62^b$, $63^a$ ed. Schlossb.). — The word שְׁקַעֲרוּרֹת (ver. 37) is rendered by the ancient versions with singular unanimity *cavities* or *hollow places* (Sept. κοιλάδες, Vulg. valliculae, Onk. פחתין, etc.), and it has been so explained by later interpreters; but it is of uncertain etymology; it seems hardly a compound of two roots, as of שקע *to sink down* and قعر *to be deep* (Michaelis, Gesenius), or of שקע and ריר *to be damp* (Cleric., comp. Ebn Ezra), or a *forma shaphelica* of קער *to be deep* (Knob.); but rather a quadrilitera formed from שקע by the addition of the liquid ר, which is repeated to express the notion more emphatically (comp. Gramm. II. §. XVIII. 1, 2). — The Talmud (Sanh. $71^a$) calls the places to which the stones of leprous houses were removed חורבתא סגירתא. The period during which the new stones and mortar were watched for the appearance of suspicious spots (ver. 43), was by Jewish tradition fixed at one week; the term after the expiration of which their soundness may be presumed (ver. 48) at two weeks (*Siphra*). — Rashi, availing himself of the Talmudical principle, that the Law observes no systematic order in the arrangement of details, places the 44th after the 47th verse, thereby producing an illogical sequence. — חִלֵּץ (ver. 43) is an anomalous infin. like נִאֵץ (2 Sam. XII. 14, see Gramm. II. § XLIV. 1. 2): that it is the infin. and not the preterite is evident from the parallel forms הַקְצוֹת and הִטּוֹחַ.

house with the blood of the bird and with the running water, and with the living bird, and with the cedar wood, and with the hyssop, and with the crimson *thread*. 53. And then he shall let the living bird fly out of the city into the open field, and make an atonement for the house, that it may be clean.

54. This *is* the law for all manner of plague of leprosy, and scall, 55. And for the leprosy of a garment and of a house, 56. And for a rising, and for a scab, and for a bright spot; 57. To teach when *it is* unclean, and when *it is* clean: this *is* the law of leprosy.

though the latter, standing for הַקְצוֹת, has also chirek instead of pathach in the first syllable (see Gramm. II. § XLV. I. 2. a). — The words יְמֵי הַסְגִּיר (ver. 46), used elliptically for יְמֵי אֲשֶׁר הִסְגִּיר, form one notion "the days of closing", and therefore the construct state יְמֵי is employed, as is not unusual before relative sentences, whether they have the particle אשר or not (see Gramm. § 87. 8. f, g.). — חִטֵּא (vers. 49, 52) is "to free from sin, to expiate", the Piel involving privative meaning (Gramm. II. § XXXVII. 3. b), and it is synonymous with כִּפֶּר (ver. 53; see Comm. on Lev. I. 477), which the Vulgate here also renders by *orare*. — לְהוֹרֹת (ver. 57) refers back to זֹאת הַתּוֹרָה (ver. 54) — literally "this is the instruction for every plague of leprosy . . . to afford instruction in the time of uncleanness and in the time of cleanness", that is, when a decision is to be given with respect to cleanness or uncleanness of a person, a house, or a garment. Targ. Jon. has the Midrashic rendering, "that the priest may teach the people concerning the dark day when no leprosy is to be examined, and concerning the bright day, etc." (comp. *Siphra* fol. 74[b]; see *supra* p. 228).

## CHAPTER XV.

SUMMARY. — 1. *On running issue in a man* (זוֹב, vers. 1—15). Mucus discharged from or stopping a man's member, constitutes a disease rendering unclean not only the patient himself, but every couch, seat, or object, on which he lies or sits, and all persons he spits upon, or touches with his body or with unwashed hands. Such persons as well as all those who carry any object on which he has been sitting or lying, are unclean till the evening, when they must bathe, and wash their garments; those who merely touch any such object, are also unclean till the evening, but require no lustration; earthen vessels touched by the patient must be broken, wooden ones rinsed with water (vers. 1—12). On the seventh day after the discharge has ceased, he must wash his garments, and bathe in running water; and on the eighth, he has to present two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, one for a sin-offering, and the other for a holocaust (vers. 13—15). — 2. *Nocturnal accidents of a man* render him

unclean till the evening, when he must bathe, while all stained garments require washing (vers. 16, 17). — 3. *Sexual intercourse* makes both parties unclean till the evening, when bathing restores them to cleanness (ver. 18). — 4. *A woman in her courses* (נִדָּה) is unclean for seven days; all things whereon she sits or lies become unclean, and, on their part, defile any object that happens to be upon them; touching such object causes uncleanness till the evening, and so does any personal contact with the woman; but whosoever touches her bed or any object whereon she has been sitting, has, besides, to wash his garments and to bathe. If menstruation ensues before or during the intercourse, without the man being aware of it, he is unclean for seven days, and renders everything unclean whereon he lies (vers. 19—24). — 5. *Prolonged or irregular issue of blood* (זוֹב דָּם) *on the part of women* is levitically treated like menstruation (vers. 25—27; comp. vers. 19—24), and is cleansed by sacrifices identical with those ordained for the running issue of men (vers. 28—30; comp. vers. 13—15). — 6. *General Rule* (ver. 31) and *concluding formula* (vers. 32, 33).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses and to Aaron, saying, 2. Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them, If any man has a running issue out of his flesh, his issue *is* unclean. 3. And this shall be his uncleanness in his issue: *whether* his flesh run with his issue, or his flesh be stopped on account of his issue, it *is* his uncleanness. 4. Every bed, whereon a person lies that has the issue, shall be unclean; and every object, whereon he sits, shall be unclean. 5. And whosoever touches his bed, shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the evening. 6. And he that sits on

**1—15.** The ritual effects of the disorder here treated of are indeed copiously described, but we are almost completely left in doubt as regards its symptoms. We have, in fact, only this to guide us, that the malady is a running issue (זוֹב) from "the flesh" of a man, that is, from his genitals; that this issue occasionally stops up the member; and that both in the one case and in the other uncleanness is caused. However, even these few criteria, in conjunction with some incidental allusions, enable us at least to contract the circle of probabilities. The disorder cannot be hemorrhoids, whether open or blind (Beyer, a. o.), as these do not flow from the genitals, and a loss of blood is never mentioned. It cannot be an involuntary discharge of semen from weakness (or gonorrhoea benigna), whether arising from self-abuse or from excessive sexual intercourse (*Mishn.* Zavim II. 2 and *Maim.* in loc.; Nazir IX. 4; *Maim.* De Indig. Piac. cc. II, III. pp. 189—196 ed. De Veil, a. o.); for the semen thus secreted does not stop up the genitals, as it is quite fluid, while when it ceases to flow, the complaint is cured, and the uncleanness ought to be at an end; be-

*any* object whereon a person sat that has the issue, shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and shall be unclean until the evening. 7. And he that touches the flesh of a person that has the issue, shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the evening. 8. And if a person that has the issue spits upon one that is clean, *the latter* shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the evening. 9. And any saddle, on which a person that has the issue rides, shall be unclean. 10. And whosoever touches any thing

sides, the moral stain which such an evil involves, would in some manner have been intimated by the author either in the statement of the evil or in the purificatory rites. It cannot be syphilis (gonorrhoea virulenta, Michaelis, a. o.); for this disease seems to have been unknown before the fifteenth Christian century; and it is described neither by Greek, nor Roman, nor Arabic physicians. Had it been prevalent in Palestine, its striking features and fearful effects, peculiarly malignant in the hot Eastern climate, would doubtless have been dwelt upon by a legislator so accurate even in subordinate details. It is not necessarily a *contagious* disorder; the most careful precautions are indeed prescribed in reference to even the slightest and most indirect contact with the discharged matter (see the Summary); but similar precautions are ordained in connection with other discharges which are unquestionably harmless, as the menstrual fluid (vers. 19—27); their object was not to prevent physical injury, but that levitical uncleanness which was to be shunned by all citizens of the theocratic commonwealth. It is probably no *seminal* disorder in the stricter sense; for though a "discharge" (זוֹב) is repeatedly mentioned, the term seed or semen (זֶרַע) never occurs (comp. vers. 16—18); and elsewhere a person suffering from running issue (זוב) is clearly distinguished from one who emits semen (שכבת זרע, XXII. 4). What then remains? To judge from its varied effects, the discharge must be more copious than is usual in a spontaneous loss of semen, and must be able to stop up the member without ceasing to be internally secreted; and yet it is harmless, and may be touched with impunity. It can, therefore, only be an inordinate secretion of mucus (blenorrhoea urethrae), caused by some catarrhal condition or relaxation of the mucous membrane, and usually originating from intercourse with uncleanly, menstruous, or unhealthy women. Considering all this, and taking into account the physical degeneracy to which the evil points, we cannot be surprised that it was treated with some severity, which was perhaps the more justified as the sufferers themselves are apt to slight and neglect it, and, if carelessly treated or prematurely stopped, it may grow into a much more serious evil. Hence persons afflicted with a "running issue" were included among those who had to remain without the camp (Num. V. 1—4); they were debarred from partaking of the paschal meal, and, at later periods, from appearing on Mount Moriah, and even within

that was under him, shall be unclean until the evening; and he that bears *any of* those things shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the evening. 11. And whomsoever a person that has the issue touches, without having rinsed his hands in water, he shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the evening. 12. And the earthen vessel, that a person who has the issue touches, shall be broken; and every wooden vessel shall be rinsed in water. — 13. And when a person that has an issue is cleansed of his issue, he shall number for himself seven days for his

the precincts of the holy city itself (*Joseph.* Bell. Jud. V. v. 6; VI. ix. 3; *Mishn.* Kelim I. 8).

The ceremonies of purification were, on the whole, very simple. When the cure was considered certain, that is, on the eighth day after the complete cessation of the discharge, bathing in "living" water was required; for as every irregularity in the functions of the organs was looked upon as dissolution akin to death, the idea of restoration to health or perfect life was in some manner to be symbolised. Two birds sufficed as sacrifices of atonement, which were a holocaust and a sin-offering — the one to acknowledge the sovereign power of God who sent the trial, and the other to expiate the offences by which the troubles were supposed to be merited: for the teaching of the Book of Job, that God often afflicts the pious for inscrutable ends, had not even at so late a period as that of our section superseded the old doctrine of retaliation.

Philological Remarks. — It is well known, that בשר is euphemistically employed for the private parts (VI. 3; XVI. 4; Exod. XXVIII. 42), especially of men (Ezek. XVI. 26; XXIII. 20), but also of women (*infra* ver. 19), and in this sense it is here used (vers. 2, 3): the objections that have been raised against this acceptation (f. i. by *Sommer* l. c. p. 233; *Keil*, Levit. p. 99; Archaeol. I. 276), are removed by comparing the analogy of ver. 19 (זָבָה בִּבְשָׂרָהּ). Therefore, while the translation of the Vulgate and others is too specific (qui patitur fluxum seminis), that of the Sept. is too vague (ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ἐὰν γένηται ῥύσις ἐκ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ), though the Sept. subsequently renders זָב by γονοῤῥυής (vers. 4 *sqq.*). In ver. 13, בשרו is of course "his body", as in ver. 16, etc.; in ver. 7, its sense is more doubtful, but is probably there also euphemistic (so *Mich.* Mos. R. IV. 198; Orient. Bibl. XXII. 1—11; *Rosenm.* in loc.; *Bähr*, Symb. II. 456; a. o.); and the touching need not be limited to the physician or surgeon for medical purposes. — The auxiliary verb היה accompanying the participle, gives to the latter the meaning of an adjective or of a permanent attribute; therefore כִּי יִהְיֶה זָב (ver. 2) signifies, "if he ordinarily suffers from a running issue" (comp. Gramm. § 100. 8); and Targ. Jonathan renders the traditional view — "a man, whether young or old, who has seen his running issue three times". — It is hardly possible to take זוֹבוֹ (ver. 2) as an accusative, "he is unclean by, or on account of, his discharge" (comp. Gramm. § 86.

being pronounced clean, and wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in running water, and then he shall be clean. 14. And on the eighth day, he shall take to himself two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, and come before the Lord to the door of the Tent of Meeting and give them to the priest; 15. And the priest shall offer them, the one *for* a sin-offering, and the other *for* a burnt-offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord for his issue.

16. And if discharge of semen go out from a man, he shall wash all his flesh in water, and be unclean until the

4[b]); passages like Gen. III. 15 and XLI. 40, are not analogous. — The Sept., in the translation of בזובו רר וכ׳ (ver. 3) differing from the Masoretic text, renders ῥέων γόνον ἐκ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς ῥύσεως κτλ., which is however, open to grammatical objections; while the Vulg. has it quite freely, cum per singula momenta adhaeserit carni ejus atque concreverit foedus humor. — חָתַם is *to seal* or *to seal up*, hence in Hiph., with intransitive meaning, *to be shut* or *stopped*, and או החתים בשר מזובו is "or if his member is stopped up from its issue", that is, so that the matter cannot run out freely, the preposition מן often involving obstacle or check (Gramm. § 105. 4). — טֻמְאָתוֹ הוא *it is*, or *it causes*, *his uncleanness*. — Jonathan states explicitly, that the man defiled by contact with an unclean person, must bathe himself in 40 seahs of water (ver. 5; XI. 32; Exod. XXIX. 4; Num. XIX. 7, 8; etc.; comp. *Mishn.* Menach. XII. 4). — מֶרְכָּב (ver. 9) is either simply *vehicle*, *carriage* (comp. 1 Ki. V. 6), though in this sense the feminine מֶרְכָּבָה is commonly used, or more especially the *seat* or *saddle* of a carriage or of a beast of burden (so Sept. ἐπίσαγμα, Vulg. sagma; Rashi ארצו״ן arçon and סלו״ש selle): considering the rigour of our laws, the former acceptation seems preferable; and Jonathan combines the one with the other (זונא ומרכבא). — The Sept. repeats, at the end of ver. 9, the words ἕως ἑσπέρας which occur in the preceding and the following verses, and adds at the end of ver. 12 καὶ καθαρὸν ἔσται. Nachmanides and others groundlessly suppose, that the "rinsing of hands" (וידיו לא שטף) implies immersing or bathing in water (טבילה). — On כלי חרש vessels of porous clay, see p. 177. — About לְטָהֳרָתוֹ (ver. 13) see on XIV. 2; it means not merely ad purificationem suam, ut cognoscat, se vere recuperasse pristinam sanitatem (Rosenm. a. o.).

**16, 17.** Involuntary emission of semen during sleep, or by "nocturnal accident" (מקרה לילה Deut. XXIII. 11), comparatively rare in the East on account of polygamy and early marriages, was deemed an abnormal waste of strength; it was, therefore, looked upon as a Divine visitation, and from early times rendered the man unclean till the next evening (comp. 1 Sam. XX. 26). He had to leave "the camp", to avoid all social intercourse during the day, and then to cleanse himself by ablutions, which, in similar cases, the Egyptian priests had also to perform (*Porph.* Abst. IV. 7). But the levitical writer extended the uncleanness to the stained objects, and forbade

**evening; 17. And every garment and every skin whereon is the discharge of seed, shall be washed with water, and**

their use unless previously washed. It may seem surprising, that for the person himself no significant rite of purification, or no expiatory sacrifice, was prescribed; we cannot suppose that the legislator desired to avoid causing still greater inconvenience, as he was rarely guided by such considerations of expediency; he probably found it difficult to connect contingencies so natural as nocturnal accidents with guilt and moral transgression. But he would certainly not have omitted to ordain some expiatory ceremony, if he had here meant to treat, not of the spontaneous discharge referred to, but, as has been unjustly assumed, of that engendered by self-abuse (*Mich.* Mos. R. IV. § 214), a practice so baneful and so criminal that, had he intended to oppose it, he would not have been content with a veiled allusion, nor with so lenient a treatment of the offender and his offence, but he would have conveyed his abhorrence of both by distinct terms of reproof, and by enjoining severe acts of humiliation. In this rigorous spirit the laws of Manu are conceived. For the "involuntary waste of manhood" during sleep they merely prescribe bathing, praying to the sun, and uttering the supplication, "Oh let my strength return to me"; and similar was the rule among the Egyptian priests, the Zabii, and the Parsees, who looked upon the accident as "the impure play of Ahriman" (*Vendid.* XVIII. 101; *Jesht Sade* 51; *Hotting.* Hist. Orient. p. 281). But intentional pollution was declared a detestable crime; the person, if belonging to the three highest classes, was obliged to sacrifice by night, at a place where four roads meet, a black or a one-eyed ass, besides other victims; clad in the skin of that ass, he was ordered to beg his meals daily for a whole year in seven houses, and publicly to confess his misdeed; he had to bathe three times every day; and during the whole of this period the light of the Vedas was considered withdrawn from his mind (*Manu* II. 180, 181; V. 63; XI. 118—123). — Nor can here "the effusion of seed" in sexual intercourse be meant, as this case is provided for in the following law (ver. 18). — The Talmud, declaring the ordinances of purity inoperative since the destruction of the Temple (see p. 193), dispensed with bathing after a nocturnal accident; yet the Jews living among Mohammedans and adopting their customs, later returned to the Biblical injunction (comp. *Koran* IV. 46); and the Kabbalists, fancying that the semen is emitted by the friction of female demons, and that it produces the devils, considered purifications imperative.

Philological Remarks. — The phrase שִׁכְבַת זֶרַע is undoubtedly *effusion of seed* (vers. 16—18, 32; XVIII. 20; XIX. 20; Num. V. 13), like שְׁכָבָה alone without זֶרַע (XVIII. 23; XX. 15; Num. V. 20), from שכב in the meaning *to pour out* (Job XXXVIII. 37; comp. שכבת הטל Exod. XVI. 13, 14, and Arab. سكب); the signification of *concubitus*, שכבה being derived from שכב in its more frequent sense, can, in some passages, only be maintained by a forced hypallage (concubitus seminis for semen concubitus, so Vulg. semen coitus, Engl. Vers. seed of copulation, Glass, Rosenm., a. o.), while in others, where זרע is omitted, it is entirely inapplicable. The Sept. renders literally, but indistinctly, κοίτη σπέρματος, and Onkel. intro-

**be unclean until the evening. — 18. And if a man lies with a woman *with* discharge of semen, they shall *both* bathe *themselves* in water, and be unclean until the evening.**

duces the verse by the addition "if a man commits a fault" (ארום אִישְׁתְּלֵי).

**18.** It is difficult to decide whether sexual intercourse was, in the consciousness of the Hebrews, brought in to connection with the disobedience of the first couple, and was therefore, because involving a debasement from a state of passionless innocence, considered as inherently defiling; the Scriptures contain no allusion to such a view; and the old and widespread legend referred to included also the Divine institution of matrimony. Yet it seems undisputed that, if not sexual intercourse in itself (concubitus), certainly the attendant effusion of semen (coitus), was from early times regarded to cause uncleanness, extending, according to Josephus, both to the body and the soul (C. Ap. II. 24). Keeping aloof from women was deemed a necessary preparation for holy acts, and was in later periods considered by many as an indispensable condition of a holy life, whereas connection always required "sanctification" (Exod. XIX. 15; 1 Sam. XXI. 5, 6; 2 Sam. XI. 4; comp. 1 Cor. VII. 3 *sqq.*; see Comm. on Exod. p. 336; on Levit. I. p. 167). The levitical law declared both the man and the woman unclean till the evening; and the matter was, therefore, of special importance to the priests, and to all those who desired to visit the Temple, whether on ordinary days or on the great national festivals. The Sadducees and the Karaites interdicted connubial intercourse on Sabbath as a profanation of the sacred day; whereas the Pharisees, though prohibiting it on the Day of Atonement, held it on Sabbath peculiarly appropriate (comp. *Mishn.* Yom. VIII. 1; *Talm.* Bab. Kam. 82[a]). Our law may, by the serious restraints it imposed, have tended to promote moderation in conjugal life, and thus to have been conducive to health and a vigorous progeny, though it was hardly framed with these objects in view; but it was certainly not intended to check polygamy, nor had it this effect (so *Michael.* Mos. R. IV. p. 209; *Jahn*, Arch. II. 343; a. o.). It has many parallels among other nations; thus intercourse with women is also declared defiling by the Koran (V. 9), and by the Hindoo ordinances, which, moreover, fix the propitious days and nights; it was so considered by the Egyptians and the Greeks, by the Arabians and Babylonians: among the latter, it was customary for both parties, after the act, to sit down opposite each other with a vessel of burning incense between them, and to bathe at the dawn of day, when they were again permitted to touch their household utensils (comp. *Manu* V. 135, 144; III. 45—47; *Herod.* I. 198; II. 64; *Strabo* XVI. I. 20, p. 745; *Porph.* Abst. IV. 7; *Ovid*, Metam. X. 434, 435).

Philological Remarks. — This verse contains, as most of the ancient and modern interpreters acknowledge, a new precept on conjugal intercourse, whereas the two preceding verses refer to involuntary loss of semen in sleep. The arguments that have been adduced by many to prove, that our verse also treats of nocturnal accidents, are biassed and fallacious (*Sommer*, l. c. pp. 226, 230—238; comp. also Luther, "ein Weib, bei welchem *ein solcher* liegt"); so understood, our verse would be a superfluous appendage; the Masorah

**19. And if a woman has an issue, *and* her issue in her flesh is blood, she shall be in her impurity seven days; and whosoever touches her shall be unclean until the**

has indeed failed to separate both precepts by ב or כ, but it is, in this respect, neither exact nor consistent; the concluding formula (vers. 32, 33) may well be considered to allude to conjugal connection in the words אשר תצא ממנו שכבת זרע. — Jonathan renders, "If a man has intercourse with a woman a second time"; for according to Rabbinical views, the first coitus does not defile, since it never results in pregnancy. — שכב with the accus. (אֹתָהּ) is not simply "to lie at her side", but "to have connection with her"; it expresses this sense more distinctly (comp. ver. 24; XX. 18; Gen. XXVI. 10; XXXIV. 2, וישכב אתה ויענה; XXXV. 2; 1 Sam. II. 22; etc.), and more directly, than שכב and עם (Gen. XXX. 15, 16; XXXIX. 12; 2 Sam. XI. 4; etc.; comp. German beschlafen), which may also be "to sleep near her" (ver. 33), or than veiled expressions such as נגש אל (Exod. XIX. 15; comp. 1 Sam. XXI. 5 נשמר מן). The words שכבת זרע explain the verb ישכב, and form its qualifying complement — to sleep, viz. so that effusion of semen ensues (Num. V. 13; see Gramm. § 86. 4[c]).

**19—24.** Contact, however slight and indirect, with a menstruating woman was rigorously forbidden and guarded against, not only among the Hebrews, but among nearly all the nations of the ancient world. At first, it was no doubt avoided merely on account of the repulsive "uncleanness" of the discharge, and especially its ill-odour, which is particularly offensive in warm climates; but in later times, it was shunned on account of its real or imagined dangers. For it was supposed to produce the most varied and almost marvellous effects. Connection with a woman in her courses was deemed most injurious to health, and to result in diseased and deformed children: it causes indeed occasionally a slight inflammation of the member with blennorrhoea, pustulous eruptions on the foreskin, and obstinate issue of mucus from the urethra; but all serious apprehensions are, as a rule, unfounded (comp. *Niebuhr*, Beschreib. v. Arab. p. 139). This seems at least to have been the view of the Hebrew legislator; for if he had anticipated real harm, he would have prescribed a cure varying in duration, he would perhaps have threatened a severe punishment; moreover, if a man consorts with a woman who, without his being aware of it, becomes unwell either before or during the connection, he is indeed declared unclean for seven days; but he is then restored to all his social rights, and the effects of that connection are considered to have entirely vanished (ver. 24; see, however, Phil. Rem.).

Again, it was supposed that at the approach of a menstruating woman, the edge of steel is blunted, the polish of ivory fades, and copper vessels contract a fetid smell and are covered with verdigris; brass and iron become instantly rusty, and emit an offensive odour; linen boiling in a cauldron turns black; must gets sour; the brightness of mirrors is dimmed; the very hard bitumen of the Dead Sea, which yields to nothing else, can be cut asunder by a thread dipped in the fluid; seeds touched by the woman become sterile; grafts wither away; garden plants, young vines, rue, and ivy are parched up; and the fruit of trees beneath which she sits

evening; 20. And every thing that she lies upon in her impurity, and every thing that she sits upon shall be unclean; 21. And whosoever touches her bed shall wash his clothes,

falls off; bees die or hasten to escape from their hives; caterpillars, worms, beetles, and other vermin, fall from the ears of corn; the ants drop the grains which they may happen to carry, and never return to them; dogs tasting of the blood go mad, and their bite is incurably venomous; pregnant mares, and even women miscarry; children conceived in the period of the menses are subject to leprosy, elephantiasis, or a hideous formation of the limbs. — Yet on the other hand, the menstrual fluid was credited with remedial properties in many cases, such as gout and erysipelas, scrofulous sores and ulcers, defluxions of the eyes and head-ache, tertian or quartan fevers, the bite of a mad dog, and the evil spells of magicians! (comp. *Plin.* VII. 13 or 15; XXVIII. 7 or 23; also *Joseph.* Bell. Jud. IV. VIII. 4; *Tacit.* Hist. V. 6; *Meiners*, Gesch. der Rel. II. 108, 109; *Friedreich*, Zur Bibel, I. 133—138). It is needless to observe, that these influences of the catamenia, which we have selected from a number of others too monstrous to be believed even by the ancients, are utterly fabulous, though they were partially admitted even in the middle ages and still more recent times.

But such views being entertained, is it surprising that religious legislators deemed the subject worthy of their serious attention? According to the Hindoo law, a person touching a woman in her courses, becomes unclean like herself and requires bathing (*Manu* V. 66, 85), and anyone having connection with her at such a time, must fast three days, and then purify himself by eating clarified butter (*Yâjnav.* III 288). Similar rules obtain among the Mohammedans, who look upon menstruation as "a defilement", in consequence of which the women of the sect of the Hanefites are forbidden to say their usual prayers during ten, those of the Shafites during fifteen days (*Koran* II. 217; *Niebuhr*, Beschreib. v. Arab. pp. 39, 40). But no people treated the matter with so much earnestness as the Parsees, who made it a part of their mythology; for they taught that when Jahi, the most dangerous of all the wicked female demons (Pairakas), and the spirit of incest and fornication, saw Ahriman enraged at Ormuzd's growing power and glory, she encouraged him to fight boldly against his adversary; as a reward for this friendly disposition, Ahriman kissed Jahi, who then for the first time felt the uncleanness of menstruation coming upon her; just as the Talmud teaches, that Eve became menstruous after her connection with the serpent Sammael (comp. *Vendid.* XVI. 1—44; XXI. 35; *It.* III. 9, 12, 16; VIII. 59; XVII. 54, 57; *Bundeh.* IX. 8; *Talm.* Yevam. $103^b$; Shabb. $146^a$; Av. Zar. $22^b$; *Yalk. Chad.* init.; etc.; see *supra* p. 76 note 3). In harmony with this fabled origin of menstruation, the enactments of the Parsee codes on the matter are extremely rigorous and almost terrible: a man cohabiting with a woman at such a period, commits one of the twenty-five crimes regarded as the roots of all sins, or of Ahriman's mischievous works; he must provide food for a thousand hares, sacrifice to the fire the pure and holy fat of many animals, and burn with it a thousand bundles of dry wood, the branches

**and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the evening; 22. And whosoever touches any object that she sat upon shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be un-**

of fragrant trees, and choice aromatics; he must carry pure water, slay a thousand serpents moving along on their bellies or coiled up, two thousand other snakes, and a vast number of frogs; unless he comply with all this, besides doing severe personal penance, he can, after death, never enter the abodes of the saints, but he will be hurled into a pit of dense darkness, there to suffer eternal torture (*Vendid.* XVI. 1—44; XVIII. 134—152; *Jesht Sade* 15). Among many nations, the menstruous woman was isolated from society, to prevent injury and pollution. In Persia, she was forbidden to speak to anyone, not even to those who brought her food, which they were obliged to set down at some distance from her. Among the Zabii, she remained secluded in her room; the places on which she had been treading were purified with fire; and a breeze that passed both over her and another person, rendered the latter unclean (*Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 47). Some tribes both in the old and new world, as the negroes in Issing, the Calmucks, and Hottentots, and many others, provide special houses for menstruating women before each town or village. At the river La Plata, they are, besides, sown into hammocks, with only a small aperture for the mouth, and are thus kept until the discharge ceases. In Ceylon, not only the woman herself, but all persons who have been in the same house with her, are forbidden to enter a pagoda. The Red Indians deem all objects touched by her unfit for use. At her first menses, she remains secluded for thirty days, at the expiration of which the fire used by her during this period must be extinguished; in Delaware, her head is closely tied up for twelve days, during which time she has to take frequent emetics, must eat little and do nothing; afterwards she is bathed and newly clad, and is for two months more strictly forbidden to see anyone.

The Hebrew legislator fixed the duration of uncleanness at seven days; for although he was no doubt aware that, as a rule, the discharge ceases much sooner, he was anxious to associate the significant number seven with so remarkable a phenomenon, which is peculiar to the human female (comp., however, *Plin.* H. N. VII. 13 or 15). He prescribes indeed no special acts of lustration for the woman herself; but as he enjoins ablution even after the most indirect contact with her, it is in the spirit of his laws to suppose that, after the lapse of seven days, she is to take a bath of purification. On this point, Jewish tradition is extremely scrupulous, and has very minutely set forth the construction, the size, and the supply of the baths to be used on such occasions (comp. *Mishn.* Tract. Mikvaoth; *Yor. Deah* § 201; see also *Friedreich*, Zur Bibel, I. 142—153; *Trusen*, Sitten, pp. 16—20). Intercourse during menstruation was visited with the death of both parties (XVIII. 19; XX. 18; comp. *Koran* II. 221). In the East, girls begin to have their menses from their ninth and even their seventh year (comp. *Mishn.* Kel. I. 8).

Philological Remarks. — Targ. Jonath. renders the first words of ver. 19, "If a woman has a discharge of red or black blood, or issues blood of the colour of saffron or clay, or

**clean until the evening; 23. And if *anything is* on *her* bed, or on any object whereon she sat, and any one touches it, he shall be unclean until the evening. 24. And if any man**

like the mixture of red wine with two parts of water" etc.; and this is in harmony with the teaching of the Mishnah (Nidd. II. 6, 7; comp. *Talm.* Nidd. 19; *Yor. Deah* § 188; and in general *Mishn.* Nidd. I, II, IV *sqq.*; *Kelim* I. 3; *Yor. Deah* §§ 183—202). — As the words דם יהיה זבה בבשרה (ver. 19) define those immediately preceding ואשה כי תהיה זבה, they are added by way of asyndeton — "if a woman has an issue, *that is*, if the issue in her flesh is blood", which notion is expressed by other euphemisms also, as דרך נשים or ארח כנשים (Gen. XVIII. 11; XXXI. 35). — The construction in ver. 23 ואם על המשכב הוא וכ' is doubly elliptical, הוא implying not only the auxiliary verb, but an indefinite pronoun — "if anything is on her bed"; the apodosis begins with בנגעו, but this word itself involves a conditional sentence — "if anyone touches it" (lit. by anyone's touching it): the athnach is, therefore, required under עליו, not under בו. The ancient and most of the modern translators render the verse inaccurately or unintelligibly, and the Vulgate omits it entirely. The words הוא and בו cannot be referred to דם, which is not mentioned in the preceding verses; and it would, after the other injunctions, certainly have been superfluous to declare that persons become unclean by touching the blood itself. — If harmony between the various levitical precepts were to be assumed, the 24th verse could hardly be understood otherwise than has been explained above (comp. *Ebn Ezra* in loc.; *Bähr*, Symb. II. 455; *Knobel;* a. o.). On the one hand, the phrase ישכב איש אֹתָהּ can only be referred to actual intercourse (see *supra* on ver. 18); but on the other hand, intercourse with a woman in her menses was declared a heinous offence inexorably to be punished with the death both of the man and the woman (XX. 18); whereas in our passage the result of such connection is merely uncleanness of the man during seven days: such contradiction could only be accounted for by supposing that in the latter case the man was not aware of the woman's condition, or that it came on during the act; while in the former case the legislator desired to visit the wanton heedlessness of the offender, which is perhaps even intimated in the text (וְגִלָּה וכ' XX. 18). However, harmony between the various levitical precepts is a mere assumption. There is in the wording of the two laws nothing which *compels* so different an interpretation; the intercourse may in either passage be intentional; and if so, the discrepancy could only be explained historically. Our chapter is apparently a very late composition; it attempts a systematic and almost exhaustive treatment of discharges from the generative organs; it displays a subtle minuteness in the effects of uncleanness; and it prescribes not only purifications but expiatory sacrifices. But the twentieth chapter, desultory in form, and barbarous both with regard to the offences forbidden and the punishments enacted (comp. vers. 2, 5, 6, 9, 13—16, etc.), exhibits traces of a less advanced age. In this earlier period, connection with a woman in her menses was forbidden under penalty of death, not only because primitively punishments were in general more severe and summary, but

lies with her, and her impurity comes upon him, he shall
be unclean seven days, and any bed whereon he lies shall
be unclean.
25. And if a woman has her issue of blood a long
time out of the period of her *monthly* impurity, or if it
runs beyond *the time of* her *monthly* impurity; all the days
of her unclean issue shall be as the days of her *monthly*
impurity; she *shall be* unclean. 26. Every bed whereon
she lies all the time of her issue shall be to her as the bed
of her *monthly* impurity; and any object she sits upon shall
be unclean, as the uncleanness of her *monthly* impurity;
27. And whosoever touches those things shall be unclean,
and shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and
be unclean until the evening. 28. And if she is cleansed
of her issue, she shall number for herself seven days, and
after that she shall be clean. 29. And on the eighth day she

because such connection was deemed both unnatural and dangerous; while later, when experience had proved, that the popular fears were much exaggerated, if not entirely groundless, uncleanness during a week was deemed sufficient inconvenience to induce men to care and caution. — The view that the command in XX. 18 refers to intercourse during the issue of blood after childbirth (on account of מקור דמיה there and in XII. 7), is untenable (*Keil*, Arch. I. 276; Comm. p. 100).

**25—33.** The last case of sexual discharge is a protracted or irregular issue of blood in women; it is a distressing disease often extending over many years (Matth. IX. 20), and indicates a serious derangement of the constitution. The blood so discharged was, in every respect, regarded and treated as the blood of menstruation; and the woman herself was subjected to precisely the same laws and restrictions as a woman in her menses. She was unclean, and defiled every person and object touched by her directly or indirectly. If the flow ceased, she had to undergo appropriate rites of purification; for seven days, she was in an intermediate or preparatory state, at the expiration of which she was considered clean; and then she had to present a sin-offering and a holocaust, which finally restored her to purity, secured her atonement, and re-instated her in all social rights.

Our section is fitly wound up by a double conclusion — one more formal (vers. 32, 33), and one pronouncing a leading principle of great significance: "Thus shall you keep aloof the children of Israel from their uncleanness, lest they die in their uncleanness, when they defile My abode that is among them" (ver. 31). Every uncleanness must be physically removed and religiously expiated; the omission of the one or the other is an offence against the Divine presence, which, symbolised by the Sanctuary, is graciously granted to the Hebrew community, but which severely avenges sin and pollution. The holy God demands a holy people, and the emblem or essence of holiness is purity (comp. on XI. 44, p. 184).

shall take for herself two turtles or two young pigeons,
and bring them to the priest, to the door of the Tent of
Meeting. 30. And the priest shall offer the one *for* a sin-
offering, and the other *for* a burnt-offering; and the priest
shall make an atonement for her before the Lord for her
unclean issue.

31. Thus shall you keep aloof the children of Israel
from their uncleanness, lest they die in their unclean-
ness, when they defile My abode that *is* among them.

32. This *is* the law of the person that has an issue,
and whose seed goes from him, so that he is defiled
therewith, 33. And of the woman that is unwell of her
*monthly* impurity, and of the persons that have an issue,
whether men or women, and of the man that lies with
an unclean *woman*.

Philological Remarks.— וְהִזַּרְתֶּם (ver. 31), probably standing for וְהִזְהַרְתֶּם (see Gramm. II. § xlvii. 3), is derived from זהר, which in Hiphil has the meaning of *admonishing* or *warning* against something (comp. 2 Ki. VI. 10; Ezek. III. 18); Sept. εὐλαβεῖς ποιήσετε, Vulg. docebitis ut caveant; yet the derivation from נזר *to separate* is also admissible both as regards the form and the meaning (comp. נזר in Niph. *to separate oneself* or *to hold aloof*, XXII. 2; Ezek. XIV. 7; Zech. VII. 3; hence in Hiph. the same in a transitive sense); Onk. ותפרשון. — Jonath. adds after מסמאים (ver. 31), "and they shall keep aloof from their wives when near their menstruation" (comp. *Talm.* Nidd. 63b). About הַדָּוָה (ver. 33) see on XII. 2; Sept. τῇ αἱμοῤῥούσῃ (ἐν τῇ ἀφέδρῳ αὐτῆς). — הַזָּב אֶת־זוֹבוֹ lit. "one that is running with regard to his issue", for זָב retains the force of a verb, as is not rarely the case with Hebrew participles; comp. Gramm. § 102. 7.

## III.

# SUPPLEMENTARY LAWS RESPECTING SACRIFICES AND PURITY.

### CHAPTERS XVI AND XVII.

## A. INTRODUCTORY TREATISE ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT[1]:

### ITS ORIGIN AND ITS PLACE IN THE SYSTEM OF HEBREW FESTIVALS.

The ordinances concerning the Day of Atonement are, in the Pentateuch, introduced with these words, "And the Lord said to Moses, Speak to Aaron thy brother." But there is conclusive evidence to prove, that the Day of Atonement was instituted considerably more than a thousand years after the death of Aaron and Moses. If this statement appears startling to many, no one can fail to perceive the important inferences which it would suggest if indisputably established.

In the first place, let us remind the reader, that the Day of Atonement is, except in the three middle Books of the Pentateuch, never mentioned throughout the Old Testament, neither in the historical nor in the prophetic Books; and that it is even omitted by the Chronist in the enumeration of the "Mosaic" festivals which king Solomon honoured with sacrifices[2]. This negative argument, though it will

[1] יום הכפרים or יום כפרים, also called "the Fast" or "the Festival of the Fast" (νηστεία and νηστείας ἑορτή; *Philo*, De Septen. cc. 2, 23; Acts XXVII. 9).

[2] "Solomon offered burnt-offerings .... according to the commandments of Moses, on the Sabbaths, and on the New-moons, and on the solemn feasts, three times in the year, even

not be undervalued by those who consider the nature and extent of the Hebrew Scriptures, is of course in itself not decisive; but it adds weight to historical testimonies at variance with the injunctions of the Pentateuch.

We have incidental proof to show, that the Day of Atonement cannot have been celebrated in the first or Solomon's Temple. In this edifice, the Holy of Holies was separated from the Holy, not by a curtain or "vail" (פָּרֹכֶת), but by folding doors of olive-wood, adorned with carvings of Cherubim, palm-trees, and opening flowers, all overlaid with gold[3]. These doors were not always closed[4]; for in earlier periods, no anxiety was felt to shroud the entire Holy of Holies in mysterious darkness; the Ark of the Covenant was indeed rendered invisible by the figures of the Cherubim and their outspread wings[5]; but the staves by which it was carried, and which always remained in it[6], were so long that their ends could be seen from the Holy through the open doors of the Holy of Holies[7]; yet in order to mark the separation between the two chief divisions of the Sanctuary, "a partition was made by chains of gold before the Holy of Holies"[8]. Hence Ezekiel also, who in his ideal delineations reproduced with all possible faithfulness the Temple at which he had himself served, gave to his own Sanctuary no curtain; and he placed before it "two doors with two turning leaves each"[9]. But the Temple of Zerubbabel, like that of Herod — for both resembled each other, except in size and splendour — had a vail or curtain[10]; for though the Holy of Holies, deprived of the Ark, was entirely empty[11], it was then, in accordance with more recent and severer notions, utterly shut out even from the gaze of the priests, and access to it was only per-

on the Feast of unleavened Bread, and on the Feast of Weeks, and on the Feast of Tabernacles" (2 Chron. VIII. 12, 13).

3 1 Ki. VI. 31, 32. The contrary statement of the Chronist (2 Chr. III. 14), who in his descriptions copies the second Temple, has no weight.

4 1 Ki. VI. 16 does not refer to a *closed door* before the Holy of Holies, but alludes to the partition-wall, twenty cubits high, which divided the two main parts of the structure (comp. *Mishn.* Midd. IV. 1).

5 1 Ki. VIII. 6, 7.

6 Exod. XXV. 13—15.

7 1 Ki. VIII. 8; comp. *Vatke*, Rel. des A. T. I. 332, 340, 540.

8 1 Ki. VI. 21. Thus the chains, by no means "enigmatical" (*Winer*, Real-Wört. II, 572), served an intelligible purpose; they were neither an idle ornament, nor an "opus reticulatum" above the door to allow the vapour of the incense to escape, nor a mere symbol to indicate the absolute seclusion of the Holy of Holies (*Bähr*, Der Salomon. Tempel, pp. 142, 143).

9 Ezek. XLI. 23. 24.

10 *Joseph.* Bell. Jud. V. v. 5 (καταπέτασμα); comp. Matth. XXVII. 51.

11 According to Jewish tradition,

mitted to the High-priest on one single occasion in the year[1]. Now, if it be remembered, that in the precepts regarding the Day of Atonement repeated mention is made of the vail (פרכת), through which the High-priest has to pass in order to reach the Holy of Holies[2], it follows, that the solemn day could, in the prescribed manner, not have been kept during the time of the first Temple.

Ezekiel, writing in the fourteenth year after the destruction of Jerusalem (B. C. 574)[3], and describing the future reorganization of public worship, introduces indeed expiatory ceremonials designed "to cleanse the Sanctuary" and "all who have sinned from error or simplicity"[4]; but these ceremonials differ widely from those of Leviticus. We find discrepancies with respect to the very time of the celebration. While the Pentateuch prescribes *one* day, namely the *tenth* of the *seventh* month, the prophet sets apart *two* days, viz. the *first* and the *seventh* of the *first* month. This difference may easily be accounted for, and forms a strong link in the chain of our arguments. In Ezekiel's time, the year still commenced, as it had commenced among the Hebrews from immemorial ages, at the season of the *vernal* equinox, or in the first month Aviv (Nisan)[5]; therefore, desirous to mark the new cycle of time by religious solemnities, the prophet recommended rituals of expiation to be performed on the first of Aviv, and to be repeated on the *seventh* day, a number familiar to the Hebrews as holy and significant[6]. However, after the Babylonian exile, the Jews not only employed those Chaldean names of the months[7], which occur in the later Books of the Hebrew Canon[8], but,

---

however, a stone stood in the place of the Ark (*Mishn.* Yom. V. 2, אבן היתה שם ... ושתיה היתה נקראת); see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 30 note 6.

1 Later traditions supposed between the Holy and the Holy of Holies even two curtains, with a space of one cubit between them (*Mishn.* Yom. V. 1).

2 Lev. XVI. 2, 12, 15.

3 Ezek. XLI. 1; comp. in general ch. XL *sqq.*

4 Ezek. XLV. 18—20.

5 Exod. XII. 2 and notes *in loc.* It is a gratuitous assumption, that in Ezek. XL. 1, Tishri and not Nisan is understood as "the beginning of the year" (בראש השנה).

6 See p. 207.

7 Nisan, Iar, Sivan, etc.

8 In Zechariah, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, and then in the Books of the Maccabees and subsequent writings; comp. *Talm. Jer.* Rosh. Hash. I. fol. 56 ed. Krotosch. (שמות חדשים עלו בידם מבבל); *Targ. Sheni* Esth. III. 7 (בירחא קדמאה). The division of the day in hours (שָׁעִין) has the same origin; the word שָׁעָה does not occur in the Old Testament (except Dan. IV. 16, where it has not the meaning of hour); up to the Persian period, we find no trace of any other division of time than morning, noon, evening, and midnight, besides three, and later four,

accommodating themselves to east-Asiatic customs, they began to date the civil year from the *autumnal* equinox, or the seventh month Ethanim (Tishri[9]). When they had made this change, they deemed it advisable to distinguish the first day of the seventh month as a religious festival or a "holy convocation"; as such it was appointed in the latest Books of the Pentateuch, in Leviticus and Numbers, under the names of "Day of Memorial" (יוֹם הַזִּכָּרוֹן) or "Day of blowing the trumpet"(יוֹם תְּרוּעָה), and it was then simply called New Year (רֹאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה). In the course of time, the *tenth* day of the same month was fixed for penitence and self-affliction, and for the restoration of inward purity through Divine forgiveness; for the number ten was considered as hardly less significant than seven; it was chosen to convey that God's spirit or power descended to manifest itself on earth; and thus we must understand the revelation of Ten Commandments and the infliction of ten Egyptian plagues[10]. Those who attribute the whole of the Pentateuch to Moses, have ever been unable to explain the disagreement under discussion, and have asked themselves in utter perplexity — How could Ezekiel venture to blot out from the new theocracy the holiest day of the year, and to substitute for it two days of his own arbitrary selection? The indignation of the Rabbins at this imagined heresy was so vehement, that they were anxious to banish the Book of Ezekiel from the Canon; they attempted to lower its authority by ascribing it not to Ezekiel, but to the men of the Great Synagogue; while some urged, both against reason and against the plain context of the passage, that Ezekiel did not ordain an annual festival, but alluded to an exceptional ritual performed in the time of *Ezra*; yet they finally acquiesced in the hope that, in due time, the prophet Elijah would harmonise the apparently fatal contradictions[11]. It is impossible to suppose that Ezekiel, a pious and learned priest, would have ignored or deliberately altered the most striking and most solemn day in the whole Hebrew year, if in his time that

---

night-watches (אַשְׁמֻרוֹת; comp. *Talm.* Berach. 3ª).

[9] תִּשְׁרִי from שרא to open, that is, Januarius; comp. *Hieron.* Comm. in Ezech. I. 1, Apud orientales populos post collectionem frugum et torcularia, quando decimae deferebantur in templum, October erat primus mensis et Januarius quartus; see also *Ideler*, Chron. I. 432, 492, 522.

[10] See *supra* p. 59; comp. *Philo*, De Septenar. c. 23, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα τῆς νηστείας ἄγεται δεκάτῃ μηνός, ὅτι ἡ δεκὰς παντέλεια.

[11] *Talm.* Shabb. 13ᵇ ("if it had not been for R. Hananiah, the Book of Ezekiel would have been suppressed, because his words contradict those of the Law"); Chagig. 13ª (בקשו לגנוז ספר יחזקאל); Menach. 45ª (פרשה זו אליהו עתיד לדרשה).

day had already been generally kept or authoritatively fixed: the fact that *he* knew of no such day, is sufficient proof that it was then not yet fixed.

But he deviates from the Pentateuch not merely in the time of the celebration: he prescribes rituals totally different from those of Leviticus. Apparently aiming at the expiation of the Temple rather than of the people, he merely ordains, that the blood of a young bullock slain as a sin-offering shall by the priest be put "on the posts of the Sanctuary, and upon the four corners of the ledge of the altar, and upon the posts of the gate of the inner Court"[1]. Is it necessary to point out how little this agrees with the complicated, significant, and imposing ceremonial of Leviticus?

It may, therefore, be taken as certain, that the Day of Atonement is of later origin than the earlier part of the Babylonian exile (or B. C. 570).

When the first colony of Jews who, by permission of Cyrus, returned from Chaldea under the leadership of Zerubbabel, arrived in Palestine (B. C. 538), we are told that, at the approach of the seventh month — that is, still the month Ethanim — they all assembled in Jerusalem, set up the brazen altar in its old place, "and offered burnt-offerings thereon to the Lord morning and evening; they kept also the Feast of Tabernacles as it is written, and offered the daily burnt-offerings by number according to the custom, . . . from the first day of the seventh month they began to offer burnt-offerings to the Lord"[2]. It is surely surprising that, in this notice, the Day of Atonement is neither mentioned nor alluded to[3]: when the first and the fifteenth of the month are named, though the former evidently not yet as a day of particular distinction, why was the intervening tenth day omitted, which, if celebrated even partially in the striking manner of the Law, must have produced a powerful impression upon the minds of men providentially released from a land of bondage, and just restored to their old homes, to commence a new and uncertain life full of struggles and dangers? No historian would, at that peculiar juncture, have failed to record the celebration of the Day of Atonement — if a celebration of any kind had taken place.

---

[1] Ezek. XLV. 19.

[2] Ezra III. 1—6.

[3] It cannot be referred to in the words, "And of all the festivals of the Lord that were consecrated" (ver. 5, ולכל מועדי יהוה המקדשים), for these words apply to the festivals solemnised after the Feast of Tabernacles (ואחרי כן), that is, after the 23rd of the month.

In the twentieth year of the reign of Xerxes (B. C. 445), Nehemiah obtained permission from the king to proceed to Judea, about the condition of which he had heard most discouraging reports, and to preside over the province as governor, armed with extensive powers. When he had for some time exercised his new functions; when through his energy the walls of Jerusalem had under the greatest difficulties been re-built and fortified; when the most flagrant social abuses had been remedied, and the civil organisation of the community been considerably strengthened: the people demanded, that Ezra, who zealously assisted the younger Nehemiah, should read to them "the Book of the Law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel"[4]. Ezra, complying with this request, assembled the people on the first day of the seventh month in an open place before one of the gates, and there recited to them portions of the Law, while learned priests and Levites explained the text. "The whole people wept when they heard the words of the Law" (ver. 9). Why did they weep? Because they had become aware, that from ignorance they had transgressed its precepts; just as king Josiah under similar circumstances had given vent to his bitter grief and vexation[5]. But they were told by their religious teachers — "This day is holy to the Lord your God; mourn not, nor weep"; and they were ordered to celebrate it by festive repasts, and by sending portions to the poor; "for", said Nehemiah, "the joy of the Lord is your strength" (ver. 10). On the following day, the reading of the Law was continued, and the people were instructed how to build and to adorn booths for the coming Feast of Tabernacles; and this they celebrated, on the fifteenth day of the month and the following seven days, by sacrifices, public recitals of the Law, and convivial rejoicing, in a manner as it had not been kept "since the day of Joshua the son of Nun" (vers. 13—18). Did the people receive no directions with respect to the Day of Atonement, which, according to the Pentateuch, falls between the first and the fifteenth day of the seventh month? It appears that they received none. The tenth day of Tishri was not solemnised. The detailed account, which chronicles the events almost from day to day, has nothing to record with regard to the tenth day. Under such circumstances, the silence of the text is in itself highly significant; but it becomes decisive by the statement that follows — "On the twenty-fourth day of this (the seventh) month", continues the narrative, "the children of Israel assembled with fasting, and with sackcloths, and earth upon their heads, . . . and they stood and confessed their sins,

[4] Nehem. VIII. 1. [5] 2 Ki. XXII. 11, 19.

and the iniquities of their fathers; and they rose in their places, and read in the Book of the Law of the Lord their God one fourth part of the day, and another fourth part they confessed, and worshipped the Lord their God"[1]. Then the Levites, in a long speech, dwelt upon the untiring love of God, and the constant trespasses of the Hebrews, from the earliest time down to their own days; and finally they drew up a covenant of allegiance to God's Law, to which the leading Jews put their seals, and which the people swore to observe[2]. Hence a Day of Atonement was indeed kept in that memorable year, but it was not the Day of Atonement prescribed in the Pentateuch; for it was solemnised, not on the tenth, but on the twenty-fourth day of the month, and it was solemnised in a singular manner.

Therefore, it may be stated as a result, that the Day of Atonement as ordained in the Pentateuch, is of later origin than Nehemiah's first governorship of Judea, or later than B. C. 440[3].

---

[1] Neh. IX. 1—3.

[2] Neh. IX. 4—X. 32.

[3] *George* (Jüdische Feste, pp. 301, 302), leaning upon uncertain arguments, fixes the middle of the exile as the date; comp. also *Wechsler* in Geiger's Jüd. Zeitschr. II. p. 124. — There is no cogent reason to prove that Isai. LVIII. 3 *sqq.* refers to a regular or annual day of fasting and penitence, still less to "the Day of Atonement"'; nor was that chapter of Deutero-Isaiah composed "long after the rebuilding of the second Temple"; it belongs inseparably to the section comprising chapters XL to LXVI, and written by the same author in the time of the exile. — In Zechar. VIII. 19 (comp. VII. 5), it is not stated that all fast days shall be abolished, nor even that the fasts there mentioned were then already repealed. — The fourteen days' consecration of the Temple by Solomon in the seventh month affords no proof on either side; for it commenced only on the Feast of Tabernacles (חָג, 1 Ki. VIII. 2, 65), that is, *after* the tenth of the month: therefore, the supposition of Rabbi Jochanan that the Hebrews exceptionally omitted the celebration of the Day of Atonement in that year, is gratuitous (*Talm.* Moed Kat. 9[a]). — These remarks obviate possible objections to our results. — The arguments, or rather assertions, of Bähr against the late origin of the Day of Atonement are extremely weak (Symb. II. 695—698); he observes truly, "Nothing is so indissolubly connected with all the chief parts of public worship as that festival": all the chief parts of public worship, and the organisation of the hierarchy are indeed of equally late origin. Movers (Phoen. I. 368) dogmatically contends, that "the rites of the Day of Atonement belong to the time of Moses as indisputably as any other portion of the Pentateuch"; but he is biassed in his arguments, for he vainly strives to identify Azazel and Typhon, and to prove that both imply remnants of the old Phoenician Moloch worship; and he, therefore, refers the 16th chapter to early Egyptian influence (see notes on XVI. 6—10). — Knobel (Lev. p. 487) admits, that the celebration of the Day of Atonement before the exile

We may now attempt to trace the origin of the Day of Atonement down to its final and permanent introduction.

For a long time after the conquest of Canaan, the Hebrews, mainly engaged in agricultural pursuits, had, except the Sabbath and the Newmoon, no other festivals than those connected with the produce of the soil, that is, they had virtually none but harvest festivals. Three such celebrations were naturally suggested by the climate of Palestine — at the beginning of the corn-harvest, at its completion, and at the ingathering of grapes and other fruits; they were appropriately designated by the corresponding names of the Feast of the Ears of Corn[12], the Feast of the Harvest or of the First-fruits[13], and the Feast of Ingathering[14]; and as the latter marked the termination of the agricultural year with all its labours, hopes, and results, it was described as being solemnised "at the end" or "at the revolution of the year"[15]. The Israelites kept these festivals chiefly with feelings of joy and gratitude, not unmixed with awe of that Power, in whose hands are plenty and famine. They presented, therefore, in addition to the firstfruits, *thank-offerings* and *holocausts*. Yet it can hardly be supposed, that every member of the community celebrated all the three festivals at the common Sanctuary; as a rule, each family seems to have visited the Tabernacle once a year, probably at the conclusion of the harvest or the vintage, and then to have offered up sacrifices and gifts, vows and prayers[16].

When, in the course of time, the Hebrews developed and fixed their historical traditions, which they dated back, as much as feasible, to the age of Moses, they were anxious to connect them with the three great agricultural holidays, the regular recurrence of which seemed particularly fitted to perpetuate their remembrance. The great ver-

---

cannot be proved, but he adds vaguely, that it may yet "essentially" have been fixed by Moses, but was, like the ordinances concerning sacrifices and priesthood, never observed! How, in support of this view, "the age of the Elohist", to whom Knobel attributes the 16th chapter, can be urged, is indeed surprising (comp. also *ibid.* pp. 529 *sqq.*, 541).

[12] חַג הָאָבִיב; comp. Exod. XIII. 4; XXIII. 15; XXXIV. 18; Deut. XVI. 1; see *infra* p. 274, note 4.

[13] חַג הַקָּצִיר בִּכּוּרֵי מַעֲשֶׂיךָ, Ex. XXIII. 16; XXXIV. 22; comp. Lev. XXIII. 10, יוֹם הַבִּכּוּרִים; Num. XXVIII. 26; later also called חג העצרת, Festival of Conclusion, see Comm. on Exod. pp. 453, 455; comp. *S. Cassel*, Azereth, in Sunem Part I.

[14] חַג הָאָסִיף, Exod. XXIII. 16; XXXIV. 22.

[15] Exod. XXIII. 16 (בְּצֵאת השנה); XXXIV. 22 (תְּקוּפַת השנה). — *Two* annual agricultural festivals were common amongst most ancient nations and tribes (compare *Knobel*, Levit. pp. 533, 534).

[16] 1 Sam. I. 3, 21; comp. XX. 6; 1 Ki. XII. 32, 33.

nal festival was the first to be thus enriched in meaning and import; it became the great anniversary of the release from Egyptian thraldom, the Feast of Passover[1], or the Feast of unleavened Cakes[2], which names themselves were meant to recall remarkable incidents of that miraculous deliverance. It received those additions at an early time for various reasons. The *beginning* of the corn-harvest[3] is, especially in a country of such varied conformation and climate as Palestine, not sufficiently marked and uniform to serve as a suitable epoch; nor is it in itself an occasion for rejoicing or a guarantee of abundance, as many anxious weeks follow till the final ingathering of the crops. It is, therefore, hardly surprising, that the historical significance of the festival should soon have outweighed its original or agricultural object, and that the names with which it is described refer more distinctly to the former than to the latter[4]. Yet the offering of a firstfruit sheaf of barley (עֹמֶר) tended to preserve its primitive character in constant remembrance; it was occasionally even considered as a separate celebration apart from the Pesach and from the Feast of unleavened Cakes; and it may have imparted to Passover the name of Feast of the Sheaf (חַג הָעֹמֶר) [5].

It appears that the Hebrew legislator found no historical event to be fitly grafted upon the second great agricultural festival, the Feast of Harvest. This is in itself so important and so clearly defined that it seemed to require no additional support; it was also termed Feast of Weeks[6], a name helping to prevent the obliteration of Passover as that agricultural festival from which the seven weeks down to the conclusion of the harvest were counted. Yet Jewish tradition, everywhere working out the Biblical notions, believed there was reason to assume that the Feast of Harvest coincided with the day of revelation on Mount Sinai, and thus established in this instance also a union of the natural and historical element, which

---

[1] חַג הַפֶּסַח, Exod. XXXIV. 25.

[2] חַג הַמַּצּוֹת, Exod. XXIII. 15; XXXIV. 18; Deut. XVI. 16; Lev. XXIII. 6.

[3] Deut. XVI. 9, מהחל חרמש בקמה.

[4] The term חג האביב does not even occur in the Old Testament; whether the word פֶּסַח points to some cosmic origin of Passover, because celebrated at the vernal equinox, when the sun "passes over" into the sign of Aries, must be left undecided; such origin can certainly not be traced in the Pentateuch (see Comm. on Exod. p. 184): the term διαβατήρια "the crossing or passing over" (*Plut.* Lucull. 24), which is used by Philo (Vit. Mos. III. 29; De Septen. cc. 2, 18), Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. VII. 32), and others, is simply a translation of פֶּסַח.

[5] Comp. *Philo*, De Septenar. cc. 18—20.

[6] חַג שָׁבֻעוֹת, Exod. XXXIV. 22; Deut. XVI. 9, 16.

was the more desirable at a time when, by the dispersion of the Jews, the former had entirely ceased to be applicable[7].

With regard to the third great festival, the process of amalgamation, though very slow, was yet accomplished in the Biblical times. In Deuteronomy, that festival is designated, not as in the older code of Exodus, as "Feast of Ingathering", but as "Feast of Tabernacles"[8]; but it had evidently still its former meaning and none else, for it is explicitly described as being celebrated "when the corn and the wine are gathered in"[9], which words correspond to "the end" or "the revolution" of the year; it was probably "the festival" *par excellence* (הֶחָג), as it took place when all the labours of the year were completed and all its rewards secured[10]. However, the new name, which is used in all the later historical Books[11], points at least to a new ceremony that had in the mean time been introduced — that of dwelling during the days of the festival in slight booths or tabernacles, temporarily constructed from the branches of thick or large-leaved trees, such as the myrtle, the palm- and the olive-tree[12]. The custom arose probably out of the ordinary circumstances under which the fruit is usually collected in vine-yards and olive-groves; and the wealth and liberality of nature, to which man owes his sustenance, could not have been more suitably represented or acknowledged. But the new name and the new custom suggested a welcome historical meaning of the festival: in Leviticus, all native Israelites are earnestly commanded to live in tabernacles during seven days; and it is in Leviticus that this reason is for the first time assigned — "that your generations may know, that I caused the children of Israel to dwell in tabernacles when I brought them out of the land of Egypt"[13]. However, both this reason and the precise law concerning the various vegetable productions to be employed on the Festival[14], originated many generations after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian exile; for in the time of Nehemiah, such a law was hardly known, and the practice differed from that prescribed in Leviticus[15].

---

[7] Comp. *Maim*. Mor. Nev. III. 43.

[8] חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת, Deut. XVI. 13; *Philo*, De Septenar. cc. 2, 24, ἡ τῶν σκηνῶν ἑορτή or simply σκηναί.

[9] באספך מגרנך ומיקבך.

[10] Comp. 1 Ki. XII. 32, 33.

[11] 2 Chr. VIII. 13; Ezra III. 4; Zech. XIV. 16, 18, 19.

[12] Comp. Neh. VIII. 15.

[13] Lev. XXIII. 42. 43.

[14] Lev. XXIII. 40.

[15] Comp. Neh. VIII. 15: three of the trees there named do not occur in Leviticus, which, on the other hand, has two productions not mentioned in that passage of Nehemiah; the concluding word of the verse כַּכָּתוּב "as is written" or "prescribed", viz. in the Law, is very strange, since we find in no part of the Law a pre-

But simultaneously with the historical, the inward and spiritual expansion of the Hebrew festivals was worked out. This expansion was the fruit of that growing conviction of the sinfulness of man, and of his need of expiation before a holy and perfect God, which is the main attribute of a pious frame of mind, and which, if manifested with earnestness and purity of purpose, invariably indicates the last and highest stage of religious life. We have on previous occasions attempted to describe this feeling of moral dependence and self-humiliation, as evinced in the Hebrew Scriptures, and especially in the Pentateuch [1]; it was naturally fostered and strengthened by the misfortunes and struggles of the exile, which the guilty and remorseful conscience of the nation readily attributed to past iniquities [2]; and it gave rise to the *sin-offerings*, the latest development of the noblest class of sacrifices, those of expiation. As these grew in depth and popularity, they were associated with all festive and solemn days, and were superadded to the older holocausts and thank-offerings [3]. They could not, before the Babylonian exile, have been invested with the minute ceremonials and the subtle gradations specified in Leviticus [4], as we have before proved; in the first Temple, they could not have been presented in the manner described by the levitical legislator, because that Temple had no curtain [5] against which the blood could be sprinkled [6]; in fact, they attained their highest and final form only during the time of Zerubbabel's Temple. And the crowning stone of that religious edifice, which demanded the incessant labour of more than a thousand years, was the Day of Atonement as instituted in Leviticus. It combined, as in one focus, all the scattered rays of spiritualism which in successive periods had helped to dispel superstition and frivolity; and it kindled a flame of devotion which, if rightly directed, might well cleanse the heart from egotism and pride, and raise the mind from worldliness to a yearning after light and truth.

---

cept identical with that of Nehemiah — a difficulty which will be discussed in the notes on XXIII. 40. On the three harvest festivals in general see Comm. on Exod. pp. 458, 459.

[1] See Comm. on Levit. I. pp. 3, 249—251, 495, 496; comp. also Ps. XXXIX. 9; LXV. 4; CIII. 3 *sqq.*; Prov. XX. 9.

[2] Comp. Ezra V. 12; VIII. 6, 7; IX. 6 *sqq.*; X. 1 *sqq.*; Neh. I. 6, 7; VIII. 2; IX. 16—37; X. 32 *sqq.*; XIII. 18; Zechar. I. 2—6; Tob. III. 3 *sqq.*; Prayer of Azar. vers. 5 *sqq.*; Judith VII. 28; Bar. I. 13, 17—22; III. 1 *sqq.*; *Mishn.* Taan. II. 1; Yom. VIII. 9; etc.

[3] See Num. XXVIII and XXIX.

[4] Comp. especially chapt. IV and notes in loc.

[5] See *supra*, p. 267.

[6] Comp. Lev. IV. 6, 17.

Thus the vast circle was completed: the festivals of the Hebrews, like nearly all their institutions, had passed through three distinct phases — the natural or cosmic, the historical or commemorative, and the ethical or spiritual —, and they were by this process more and more enlarged, enriched, and refined. It is remarkable, that we are able to trace those three phases in the preserved fragments of Hebrew literature, and, what is even more interesting, that we can trace them in the Pentateuch itself.

The "Book of the Covenant" in Exodus[7], which embodies the most important of the civil and religious laws, mentions, besides the Sabbath, only the agricultural festivals[8] — "three times thou shalt celebrate a feast to Me in the year", and "three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the Lord God"; two of them are simply described as relating to husbandry, viz. the Feast of Harvest (חַג הַקָּצִיר) and the Feast of Ingathering (חַג הָאָסִף), while Passover, though stated to take place in the month of "the green ears of corn" (חֹדֶשׁ הָאָבִיב), is already designated as the Feast of unleavened Cakes (חַג הַמַּצּוֹת), in reference to the exodus from Egypt[9]. No distinct directions are given with respect to the time and mode of celebration, except that the Feast of Ingathering is to be kept "at the end of the year", "when thou hast gathered in thy labours out of thy field"; and that, with regard to Passover, allusion is made to a previous injunction[10].

At the renewal of the Covenant after the worship of the golden calf, the same principles are maintained[11]: *three* festivals are commanded; all the laws are coupled with agriculture and its produce; even with respect to the Sabbath it is observed, "in the time of ploughing and of reaping thou shalt rest"; the names are the same as before, except that the Feast of Harvest is called the Feast of Weeks (חַג שָׁבֻעֹת) indicating its connection with Passover[12], and that the Feast of Ingathering is said to be kept at "the revolution of the year" (תְּקוּפַת הַשָּׁנָה), which is synonymous with "the end of the year". Detailed injunctions are wanting, as in the preceding ordinance.

The Book of Deuteronomy preserves essentially the same point of view[13]. It amplifies, rather than extends, the older statements. It is more fluent in language and more regular in arrangement, as may be

---

[7] Ch. XX. 19—XXIII. 33; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 376 *sqq*.

[8] Exod. XXIII. 14—17.

[9] See *supra*, p. 274.

[10] Exod. XXIII. 15 (כאשר צויתך; comp. XII. 15 *sqq*., 39; XIII. 3).

[11] Exod. XXXIV. 18, 21—23.

[12] See *supra*, p. 274.

[13] Deut. XVI. 1—17.

expected from the literary advancement of the time; but it supplies no new materials. It attempts a fuller description and a kind of system; yet it knows no other than the three time-honoured agricultural festivals. It brings the celebration of these festivals into closer and more direct alliance with the national Sanctuary, or "the place which the Lord chooses to let His name dwell there"[1]; but it assigns to them no higher meaning and gives no additional reason. It insists upon offerings and free-will gifts to be presented in the House of God; but it appoints them to be used for social and charitable, rather than purely religious purposes[2]. As regards the names, there is but this difference that the Feast of Ingathering is termed the Feast of Tabernacles (חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת), but this new name involves no change of meaning in the festival itself[3].

In the middle portions of the Pentateuch — Leviticus and Numbers — we enter upon an entirely distinct phase. In those Books the festivals appear in their complete and final extension. We find in two passages a well-digested survey of all the sacred days in the year, together with a statement of their origin, their nature, and their mode of celebration by means of sacrifices and other rites[4]; and in addition to this, a special description is given of one day of peculiar sanctity[5]. Besides the Sabbath and the New-moon, the three ancient agricultural festivals are introduced; with respect to the Feast of Tabernacles, a historical is coupled with the natural reason — because the Israelites dwelt in booths during their wanderings in the desert; and in all instances, sin-offerings are added to the older holocausts. Then for the first time mention is made of two new festivals — "the Day of blowing the Trumpet" (יוֹם תְּרוּעָה) or "a Memorial of blowing the Trumpet" (זִכְרוֹן תְּרוּעָה), to be kept, as a day of rest (שַׁבָּתוֹן) and of holy convocation, on the first of the seventh month[6], and "the Day of Atonement" (יוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים) set apart for the most perfect rest (שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן)[7], for fasting, and the expiation of sins through the intervention of the High-priest[8]. The dignity and position in which this functionary here appears, and the rigid distinction made between "priests" and "Levites", which is not yet known to the Deu-

---

[1] Deut. XVI. 2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16.

[2] Comp. vers. 10, 11, 14—17.

[3] See *supra* p. 275.

[4] Comp. Lev. XXIII and Num. XXVIII. XXIX.

[5] Lev. XVI.

[6] Lev. XXIII. 24; Num. XXIX. 1.

[7] Lev. XVI. 31; XXIII. 32.

[8] In Exod. XXX. 10 also, the Day of Atonement is mentioned or rather pre-supposed, "And Aaron shall make an atonement upon its horns once in a year with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement; once in the year shall he make atonement upon it throughout your generations; it

teronomist[9], bespeak, like the sin-offerings, the very late origin of the whole ceremonial[10].

Yet the introduction of the Day of Atonement can easily be understood; for it is essentially the institution of sin-offerings concentrated and intensified; days of general fasting and penitence were in all periods proclaimed on particular occasions, whether of public danger, misfortune, or guilt[11]; and at least four such days were, from the beginning of the exile, kept as regular anniversaries, in mournful remembrance of the siege, the capture, and the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the final overthrow of the last remnant of independent nationality[12].

But how can we account for the origin, and explain the meaning of the "Day of blowing the Trumpet", which both in Leviticus and Numbers is so obscurely alluded to, that it almost appears as if

---

is most holy to the Lord"; but the section of which that verse forms a part (XXX. 1—10), and which clearly stands in a wrong place (since it ought to conclude ch. XXV), is acknowledged to be a very late interpolation.

[9] See Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 598—600.

[10] See on the very gradual rise of the office of High-priesthood, l. c. pp. 631—633.

[11] Comp. Judg. XX. 26; 1 Sam. VII. 6; XXXI. 13; 1 Ki. XXI. 9, 12; Jer. XXXVI. 6, 9; Joel. I. 14; II. 12, 15; Esth. IV. 3, 16, 17; Ezra VIII. 21; Neh. IX. 1; 2 Chr. XX. 3; 1 Macc. III. 47; Judith IV. 9, 13; see also 2 Sam. I. 12; XII. 16; 1 Ki. XXI. 27; Isai. LVIII. 3; Jer. XIV. 12; Jon. III. 5, 7; Ps. XXXV. 13; LXIX. 11; CIX. 24; Ezr. IX, 5; X. 6; Neh. I. 4; 1 Chr. X. 12; Judith VIII. 6; *Mishn.* Taan. I. 4—7; *Talm.* Taan. 26[a]; Matth. IX. 14; Luke II. 37; XVIII. 12. The Essenes fasted during three, nay often during six successive days (*Philo*, Vit. Cont. c. 4). Justinus (XXXVI. 3), in the confused account he gives of the Jews, observes, that they fast every Sabbath (septimum diem . . . in omne aevum jejunio sacravit); which Jewish tradition expressly forbids (*Mishn.* Taan. II. 10; comp. Judith VIII. 6; *Martial.* IV. iv. 7; *Sueton.* Aug. 76). In Exod. XXXIV. 28, and in Matth. IV. 2 and Luke IV. 2 (the 40 days of Moses on Mount Sinai, and of Christ in the desert), no proper or ordinary fasting is meant; nor in 1 Sam. I. 7, 8.

[12] Viz. (1.) In the *fourth* month (on the ninth day, when Jerusalem was taken; Jer. XXXIX. 2; LII. 6, 7; Zech. VIII. 19; later changed to the seventeenth day, the supposed date of the storming of Jerusalem by Titus; comp. *Talm.* Taan. 26); (2.) In the *fifth* month (on the seventh or tenth day, when Jerusalem was burnt and destroyed; 2 Ki. XXV. 8—10; Jer. LII. 12—14; Zech. VII. 5; VIII. 19; later changed to the ninth, the alleged day of the destruction of Jerus. by Titus; comp. *Jos.* B. J. VI. viii. 1, 5); (3.) In the *seventh* month (Zech. ll. cc.; according to tradition the third day; see *Talm.* Rosh Hash. 18[b]; when the Jewish governor Gedaliah was murdered, 2 Ki. XXV. 25; Jer. XLI. 1; *Talm.* l. c.); and (4.) In the *tenth* month (on the tenth day, when the siege of Jerusalem commenced; 2 Ki. XXV. 1; Jer. XXXIX. 1; LII. 4;

its origin and its meaning had been intentionally veiled[1]? We may answer these questions with some distinctness. From the preceding deductions it cannot be doubtful, that that festival was instituted in the post-Babylonian time. Now, when the Jews, after the establishment of the Persian rule, returned from the captivity, they so far conformed to east-Asiatic customs that they began the year, not as before, with the spring or the first month (Nisan), but with the autumn or seventh month (Tishri, p. 268). This change was carried out gradually and with some difficulty[2], since it stood in direct opposition to a distinct command of the Pentateuch[3]. But when it was once adopted, the first day of that month, or the New-year's day, was deemed to require some striking solemnity, and was, therefore, raised into a festival, just as Ezekiel, considerably more than a century before, when Nisan was still the beginning of the year, proposed a holy festival on the first and seventh day of that month[4]. A kind of historical support for this new institution may have been found in the memorable meeting, held on that day in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, when the former read the Law to the people, and exhorted them to piety and rectitude[5]. Nor is it impossible, that the desire of having *seven* days of holy convocation during the year[6], facilitated the introduction of an additional festival completing that number

---

Ezek. XXIV. 1, 2; Zech. VIII. 19; *Talm.* l. c.). It would be impossible to prove that these fast-days were established "simultaneously with the Day of Atonement" (so *George*, l. c. p. 294).

[1] Comp. Lev. XXIII. 23—25; Num. XXIX. 1—6.

[2] It took deeper root when the Jews, in common with all Syrians, adhered to the Seleucidic era (B. C. 312, מנין שטרות aera contractuum), which also commenced about the autumnal equinox, and which the Jews preserved till about A. C. 1000, when it gave way to the present era of the Creation of the World. Yet even in the first Book of the Maccabees, the years still commence with Nisan, though in the second Book with Tishri. The months also are, throughout the Old Testament, and even in the Books of the Maccabees, counted from Nisan (comp. 1 Macc. IV. 52; X. 21; 2 Macc. XV. 36). But Philo (De Septenar. c. 19) describes Nisan as "the seventh month both in number and order, according to the revolutions of the sun, but the first in power" (ἕβδομος . . . ἀριθμῷ τε καὶ τάξει κατὰ τὸν ἡλιακὸν κύκλον, δυνάμει πρῶτος); and Josephus (Ant. I. III. 3) calls the second month when the Deluge began (Gen. VI. 11) Marcheshvan, and counts, therefore, from Tishri, but he may have done this with respect to events *before* the exodus, in reference to Exod. XII. 2.

[3] Exod. XII. 2; see notes in loc.

[4] Ezek. XLV. 18—20; see *supra* p. 268.

[5] Neh. VIII. 1 *sqq.*; see *supra* p. 271; comp. also Ezra III. 1 *sqq.*

[6] Viz. 2 on Passover, 1 on Pentecost, 2 on Tabernacles, 1 on the Day of Atonement, and 1 on New-year.

which the Hebrews almost uniformly associated with their religious ordinances[7]. The nature and import of the New-year's day were readily fixed. The commencement of a fresh period, with all the uncertainties it shrouds, with all the trials it may possibly have in store, was apt to call forth among a people like the Hebrews — so serious and so little sanguine, yet so impressionable and so easily awed — feelings of anxious anticipations, against which they struggled with prayer, self-humiliation, and expiatory sacrifice. This character was given to the New-year by Ezekiel in his ideal descriptions[8], and it was greatly intensified when, in the course of time, the first day of Tishri was linked with the tenth; for then the New-year was considered as the commencement, and the Day of Atonement as the culmination of the penitential season extending over the significant number of *ten* days, of which the first and the last were signalised as particularly momentous[9].

This is not the place to point out how eagerly later Judaism unfolded the precepts regarding those two days which, in holiness and solemnity, were raised infinitely above all other festivals of the year[10]. With respect to the Day of Atonement, the Pentateuch

---

[7] Philo (De Septenar. cc. 2 *sqq.*) counts *ten* festivals — "ten being the perfect number" (τέλειος ἀριθμός) — adding to the five named in the preceding note "every day" (ἡμέρα πᾶσα), the Sabbath, the New-moon, and dividing the Passover into three distinct holidays — "the killing and eating of the paschal lamb" on the 14th day of Nisan, the "feast of unleavened cakes" from the 15th to the 22nd, and the offering of the first sheaf (δράγμα, עֹמֶר) on the 16th day: but this separation has no basis in the Bible. The פֶּסַח and חג המצות were indeed originally two different phases of Passover, but the term פֶּסַח was not long restricted to the eating of the paschal lamb, but was used, like חג המצות, for the entire festival (see Comm. on Exod. p. 181).

[8] In Nehem. VIII. 9—12, elements of joy prevail in accordance with the peculiar circumstances of the time: when the Law was read, as there stated, the first day of Tishri was not yet an appointed festival (for the reading was continued on the second day), though that fact may have helped to give rise to its introduction.

[9] On the connection between the two days see *Talm.* Rosh Hash. 16[b] (ג׳ ספרים נפתחו בר״ה וכ׳); *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 43, "New-year is like a preparation and introduction for the Day of Atonement."

[10] See *Talm.* Rosh Hash. and Yoma; *Orach chayim* §§ 581—624; etc. In the Pentateuch, the Day of Atonement is not exactly called "the greatest of the festivals" or "the most holy of the holy times", as Philo (De Septenar. c. 23) observes; the term שבת שבתון is also applied to the Sabbath (Exod. XXXI. 15; XXXV. 2; Lev. XXIII. 3), and to the Year of release (Lev. XXV. 4), and שבתון alone to the Sabbath (Ex. XVI. 23), New-year (Lev. XXIII. 24), Taber-

itself gave a strong proof of the singular importance which was attached to it very soon after its introduction; for it ordained, that on that day the Hebrews were to proclaim the year of jubilee with all its privileges and all its social changes[1]. Later tradition, anxious to connect so holy a celebration with some remarkable event in Hebrew history, and thus to stamp it, like all other festivals, as a commemorative anniversary, contended that it was on the tenth day of Tishri that Moses, after having stayed forty days on Mount Sinai (for he is supposed to have gone up on the first of Elul), came down with the second tablets of the Law, and announced to the people God's gracious pardon for their worship of the golden calf[2].

The Jewish doctors and scribes might have looked with just pride upon the institution of the Day of Atonement, which testified to the vast progress that had been made in religious thought and theocratic organisation: we in our age, who view it by the light of so many new truths, indeed appreciate its spiritual depth and power, but we cannot help being astonished at finding, even in so late a period, the admission of a pagan element — the sin-laden goat sent into the wilderness to the evil demon Azazel — a fiction of Persian dualism and superstition, which almost counterbalances the value, and certainly dims the purity, of the other features of the ritual, and which should warn us not to accept any intellectual achievement of past times as final. The introduction of that element is so significant in its bearings and inferences, that it seems desirable to examine its origin, and to consider the organic relation in which it stands to kindred conceptions. This will be attempted in the following treatise.

---

nacles (XXIII. 39), and the Year of release (XXV. 5).

[1] Lev. XXV. 9; see notes *in loc.* The Year of release (שמטה) began on the Feast of Tabernacles (comp. Deut. XXXI. 10).

[2] See Exod. XXXIV. 27—29; *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 46; *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 43.

# B. THE DOCTRINE OF ANGELS AND SPIRITS,

OR

# THE MONOTHEISM OF THE BIBLE.

The idea of one incorporeal and omnipresent God, "whom the heaven and the heaven of heavens do not contain", may have been fathomed by some profound and gifted minds among the Hebrews, but it proved too abstract and too refined for the mass of the people. At no period polytheism lost its hold upon the community, and the causes and conditions in which it rooted, though at times mitigated or modified, never ceased to operate. Even when the existence of one eternal Deity was acknowledged, a compromise with paganism was indispensable; and it was accomplished by the mythology of angels and spirits. These represented to the popular mind the visible manifestations of God's power, and its individual effects in nature and in human life; they revealed the Infinite in a finite form, and made it accessible to external perception; they clothed the spirit in a material form, and engaged the senses, if they did not fascinate the imagination. Though hardly remnants of old and degraded Hebrew idols[1], they may be regarded as the tribute by which idolatry was reconciled to Hebrew monotheism, and was prevailed upon to tolerate it. They were themselves the mystic ladder reaching from earth to heaven.

For according to the simple notions of the Bible, the earth is the centre of the universe, while heaven, with the sun and moon and the myriads of stars, is a canopy over the earth, and the abode of God, from whence He descends to visit the earth[2]. Whenever He does

---

[1] Comp. *De Wette*, Bibl. Dogm. I. § 108.

[2] Comp. Gen. III. 8; XI. 5, 7; XVIII. 1, 2, 17; etc.; see Comm. on Genes. pp. 20—26.

descend, He appears in bodily shape, or as an angel, He and the angel being identical. Hence there was at first no distinction of good and evil angels; being all alike the organs of God's will, they were all good and holy[1]; and they vanished when they had fulfilled their mission, to reappear when a new miracle of Divine intercession was to be wrought[2]. In later times, the Hebrews abandoned a childlike conception which limits God in space, and makes Him corporeal almost like a heathen deity; but still desirous to establish a personal intercourse between heaven and earth, they conceived Him as the lord of angels, whom He sends in forms perceptible to mortal eyes, while He Himself remains in His celestial realms, an unchangeable spirit. Thus the notions concerning angels fluctuated and changed; and a clear result on this important subject can hardly be arrived at unless we distinguish and examine the literature of different periods, namely — (1.) the Canonical Books composed before the Babylonian exile; (2.) those compiled during or after it, together with the Apocrypha, and the works of Philo and Josephus; (3.) the New Testament; and (4.) the Talmud and the Rabbinical writings.

## 1. THE ANTE-BABYLONIAN TIME.

At an early period, the belief in spirits was introduced into Palestine from eastern Asia through the ordinary channels of political and commercial interchange. We find the Hebrews at all epochs familiar with angels in nearly all their varied qualities and functions. The angels are the "messengers" or "servants" or "sons" of God[3], "exceedingly awful" in appearance and wonderful in attributes, endowed with more than human intelligence and wisdom, and conspicuous for more than human righteousness[4]. Though no mortal can see them without forfeiting his life, they present themselves on earth in human shape, wrestle with human beings, or taking them by the hand in times of danger, lead them away in safety[5]. They are therefore called "men"[6]; occasionally they share the human wants, and

---

[1] See *infra* ch. II.

[2] See Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 418 *sqq*.

[3] בְּנֵי אֵלִים, בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, עַבְדֵי אֱלֹהִים; Gen. VI. 2, 4; Job I. 6; II. 1; IV. 18; XXXVIII. 7; Ps. XXIX. 1; LXXXIX. 7; Dan. III. 25; etc.

[4] 1 Sam. XXIX. 9; 2 Sam. XIV. 17, 20; XIX. 28; Zech. XII. 8; comp. Gen. III. 5, 22. Whether Gen. I. 26 (נַעֲשֶׂה אדם בצלמנו וגו׳) and XI. 7 (נֵרְדָה וְנָבְלָה) imply angels, cannot easily be decided; comp. also Isai. VI. 8 (ומי ילך־לָנוּ).

[5] Gen. XIX. 16; XXXII. 25.

[6] אִישׁ, אֲנָשִׁים, Gen. XVIII. 2, 16, 22 (comp. XIX. 1); XXXII. 25 (where Targ. Jon. has מלאכא כדמות גבר); Josh. V. 13; Ezek. I. 5 (דמות אדם); Zech. I. 8—10.

having connection with the daughters of men, they become the progenitors of hero- and giant-races[7] — to which notions heathen mythology offers striking analogies[8].

They are sent as God's representatives, whenever His holy and awful presence cannot be endured by sinful men[9]. We find — usually as *dei ex machina* — angels who help and protect[10], save and redeem[11], and provide food for the forlorn and helpless[12]; who announce remarkable incidents and disclose the course of future events[13]; who console and comfort[14], advise and direct[15], and stimulate men to deeds of courage or heroism[16]; or who warn reprove, and punish[17]. Angels inspire and teach prophets[18], who are themselves called "angels" or "messengers of God"[19], like the priests in later times[20].

Their number is infinite. They form the "camp of God", or are "His hosts", "His army"[21], and "His mighty heroes"[22]. They belong to His celestial Court or "Council"[23], and surround His throne as His ministers or as the executors of His decrees[24]. Hence their ordinary

---

[7] Gen. VI. 2, 4 (where that intercourse is not, as in later writings, represented as iniquitous, or as the "fall of the angels"; comp. 2 Petr. II. 4; Jude 6, 7; Testam. Rub. c. 5; Hen. VI. 2—8; X. 11; XII. 4; XV. 2 *sqq.*; XIX. 1; LIV. 6; (see also *Kurtz*, Die Ehen der Söhne Gottes etc. 1857; Die Söhne Gottes in 1 Mos. VI. 1—4 etc. 1858); Gen. XVI. 13; XVIII. 2 *sqq.*; XIX. 1 *sqq.*; Judg. VI. 22; XIII. 6, 16, 18, 20, 22; comp., however, *infra*.

[8] Comp. *Herod.* II. 143; see *Preller*, Griech. Myth. II. 4—6.

[9] Exod. XXXIII. 2, 3; comp. XXXII. 34. Hence the later Rabbinical maxim אֵין מַזָּל לְיִשְׂרָאֵל (*Talm.* Shabb. 156; etc.), that is, God entrusts the welfare of Israel not to a guardian angel (מזל), but watches over it Himself; whenever He deviates from this rule, He does so to punish the Hebrews for disobedience or other transgressions (comp. *Talm.* Berach. 7[a]; see *infra*).

[10] Gen. XXIV. 7, 40; Ex. XIV. 19; XXIII. 20—23; XXXII. 34; XXXIII. 2; Ps. XCI. 1, 11, 12; comp. Gen. XXXII. 2, 3; 2 Ki. VI. 17.

[11] Gen. XLVIII. 16; Num. XX. 16; Ps. XXXIV. 8.

[12] 1 Ki. XIX. 5, 7.

[13] Gen. XVI. 10—12; XVIII. 2; XIX. 1; XXII. 16—18; Judg. XIII. 3.

[14] Gen. XXI. 17, 18.

[15] Gen. XVI. 9; XXII. 11, 12; XXXI. 11.

[16] Judg. VI. 11; 1 Ki. I. 15; comp. Josh. V. 14, 15, שר צבא יהוה.

[17] Judg. II. 1, 4; V. 23; Ps. XXXV. 5, 6.

[18] 1 Ki. XIII. 18; 2 Ki. I. 3; comp. Dan. VIII. 16.

[19] Isai. XLIV. 26; Hagg. I. 13; Mal. III, 1, 23; Eccl. V. 5; 2 Chr. XXXVI. 15, 16; comp. Isai. XLII. 19; see also *Midr. Rab.* Lev. I. 1 (נקראו הנביאים מלאכים); *ibid.* Num. XVI. 1; *Yalk. Shim.* I. § 427 Lev. init.

[20] Mal. II. 7; comp. *Midr. Rab.* Num. XVI. 1 (הכהנים נמשלו למלאכים).

[21] Comp. the later designation פמליא של מעלה "the upper host" (family).

[22] Comp. אֶרְאֶלָּם, Isai. XXXIII. 7; גִּבֹּרֵי כֹחַ, Ps. CIII. 20.

[23] סוד, Ps. LXXXIX. 8.

[24] Gen. XXVIII. 12; XXXII. 2, 3; Deut. XXXIII. 2; Josh. V. 14, 15; 1 Ki. XXII. 19; 2 Chr. XVIII. 18;

abode is in heaven[1], and God Himself is called the "Lord of Hosts"[2]. Yet the term "host of heaven"[3] means usually the stars[4]; for these were, especially in later times, looked upon as a well-organized army fighting the battles of God's favourites[5], like the Fravashis or tutelary star-angels of the Persians[6]; or they were simply pictured as living and sentient beings, like the ζῶα λογικά of Plato[7]; they shouted and rejoiced when the world was created[8], and they were filled with dismay when they beheld the devastation of the Holy Land[9]; they worship the glory of God[10] and submit to His decrees[11]; yet, not being spotless[12], they sometimes rebel against His sovereignty, and refuse to appear or to shine at their appointed times, for which offences they are kept fettered in a heavenly prison[13].

There are "angels of peace" (מ' שָׁלוֹם), who feel pity and compassion, and weep bitterly at the sight of desolation and human misery[14]; there are the fiery Seraphim with six wings, who stand round God's throne in His celestial Sanctuary (הֵיכָל), ready to execute His commands, and thus praising Him in alternating choirs, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts, the whole earth is full of His glory"[15]; and there are the Cherubim, symbols of God's presence[16], the ministers of His

---

Isai. VI. 1—7; Job I. 6; II. 1; comp. Isai. XXIV. 21; Ps. LXXXIX. 7, 8; CIII. 20, 21; CXLVIII. 2; Dan. VII. 9, 10; Henoch I. 9; XIV. 22, 23; XL. 1; LX. 1; LXXI. 8, 13; Matth. XXVI. 53; Luke II. 13; *Philo*, De Somn. I. 22 (ἰσάριθμοι ἄστροις).

[1] Gen. XXII. 11; Judg. XIII. 20; comp. Dan. IV. 10; Luke II. 15; XXII. 43; etc.

[2] יהוה צבאות or אלהי צ'; 1 Sam. I. 3, 11; IV. 4; XV. 2; 2 Sam. V. 10; Ps. LXXX. 5, 8, 15, 20; LXXXIX. 9.

[3] צבא השמים; Deut. IV. 19; XVII. 3; 2 Ki. XVII. 16; XXI. 3, 5; XXIII. 4, 5; Isai. XXIV. 21 (צבא המרום, comp. ver. 23); XL. 26; Jer. VIII. 2; XIX. 13; Zeph. I. 5; Ps. XXXIII. 6; Neh. IX. 6; comp. Job XXV. 5; Matth. XXIV. 29 (αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν).

[4] Comp., however, 1 Ki. XXII. 19 (2 Chr. XVIII. 18, God sits on His throne, and at His right side stands כל צבא השמים); Ps. CXLVIII. 2 (where מלאכיו and צבאיו are parallel); Dan. IV. 32 (חיל שמיא, in juxtaposition with דארי ארעא); Luke II. 13 (στρατιὰ οὐράνιος); sometimes angels and stars are used promiscuously, as in Job. XV. 15 (where קדושים and שמים stand in parallelism).

[5] Judg. V. 20, מן השמים נלחמו הכוכבים ממסלותם.

[6] *Boundehesch* c. 5; comp. *Spiegel*, Avesta, III. p. XXXI.

[7] Comp. *Gesen*. Comm. über d. Jesaias, on XXIV. 21.

[8] Job XXXVIII. 7, ברן יחד כוכבי בקר.

[9] Isai. XXIV. 21, 23.

[10] Nehem. IX. 6.

[11] Dan. IV. 32.

[12] Job XXV. 15; comp. XV. 15.

[13] Henoch XVII. 13—16; comp. Jude 13, ἀστέρες πλανῆται; Job XXXVIII. 31, התקשר מעדנות כימה וכ'.

[14] Isai. XXXIII. 7.

[15] Isai. VI. 1—7.

[16] Exod. XXV. 18—20; XXVI. 1; 1 Ki. VI. 23—28; VII. 29; therefore one of His attributes is יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרֻבִים, 1 Sam. IV. 4; 2 Sam. VI. 2; Isai. XXXVII. 16.

power and will, and the guardians of the unapproachable paradise[17]. On the other hand, we have angels of death (מ' מָוֶת)[18] and angels of revenge or punishment[19], a destroying angel (מ' הַמַּשְׁחִית) who spreads pestilence[20], a "deceiving angel" who misleads prophets as a "lying spirit"[21], and Satan himself (הַשָּׂטָן), the wily tempter, who in the form of the serpent enticed the first couple to disobedience, and thus robbed them of a deathless existence of innocence and happiness[22].

It would be unwarranted to distinguish between "the established belief of the Hebrews" and "popular superstition"[23]; we have no means of fixing the boundary line between both; we must consider the one to coincide with the other, or we should be obliged to renounce all historical enquiry. The belief in spirits and demons was not a concession made by educated men to the prejudices of the masses, but a concession which all — the educated as well as the uneducated — made to pagan polytheism.

## 2. THE POST-BABYLONIAN TIME.

When the Jews, ever open to foreign influence in matters of faith, lived under Persian rule, they imbibed among many other religious views of their masters, especially their doctrines of angels and spirits, which, in the region of the Euphrates and Tigris, were most luxuriantly developed. The old notions were indeed partially retained[24], but they were also modified, enlarged, and infinitely multiplied. From this time, the angels, never again identified with God, assume a greater independence, display a more busy activity as instruments in the government of the world, and appear in regular gradations of rank and dignity; and some of them are specially

---

[17] Comp. Ps. XVIII. 11; Gen. III. 24; see Comm. on Exod. p. 480.

[18] Prov. XVI. 14.

[19] Ps. XXXV. 5, 6.

[20] 2 Sam. XXIV. 16, 17; 2 Ki. XIX. 35; Isai. XXXVII. 36; 1 Chr. XXI. 12, 15; 2 Chr. XXXII. 21; comp. Sir. XLVIII. 21; 1 Macc. VIII. 41; 2 Macc. XV. 22; 3 Macc. VI. 5.

[21] 1 Ki. XXII. 19—22.

[22] Gen. III. 1 *sqq.* (see Comm. on Gen. pp. 123, 124); comp. 1 Sam. XXIX. 4; 2 Sam. XIX. 23; 1 Ki. V. 18; XI. 14, 23, 25.

[23] So, f. i., *Cölln*, Bibl. Theol. I. 198, 199; II. 73, 231; etc.

[24] Comp. Isai. XXIV. 21; LXIII. 9 (מלאך הפנים); Ps. LXVIII. 18; LXXVIII. 49; LXXXII. 1; LXXXIX. 7, 8; CIII. 20, 21; CIX. 6; CXLVIII. 2; 1 Chr. XXI. 1; Zech. I. 8 *sqq.*; III. 1—3; IV. 4; XII. 8; XIV. 5; Mal. III. 1 *sqq.*; Dan. III. 25; IV. 10, 14; VII. 9, 10; VIII. 16; XV. 15; Sir. XLV, 2; Baruch VI. 7; Song of Three Holy Children, vers. 26, 27; Susan. vers. 55, 59; 2 Macc. XV. 23: see the notes *supra passim*.

distinguished by names, which the Jews themselves admit to have borrowed from their heathen rulers, like the names of the months[1]. The best and purest of the angels possess Divine intelligence[2], and act as God's stewards and delegates on earth[3], or as "ministering angels" (מ' הַשָּׁרֵת), like the Persian *Jazatas* or *Izeds*[4]. They perform by God's direction the work deemed beneath His greatness or holiness, such as the creation of sinful men, and the punishment of the wicked which would not become the Lord of mercy. They are the mediators and arbiters[5] between heaven and earth, since men, never completely purified, must dread to approach the Divine presence. As "interceding angels" (מ' מֵלִיץ) they teach and guide the pious, bring their supplications before the celestial throne, and bear witness to all virtuous deeds[6]. Their chief is Mittron or Metatron[7], corresponding to the Persian *Mithra*, the mediator between eternal light and eternal darkness; he is the embodiment of Divine omnipotence and omnipresence[8], the guardian of the world[9], the instructor of Moses[10], and the preserver of the Law, but also a terrible avenger of disobedience and wickedness[11], especially in his capacity as supreme judge of the dead.

There are seven chief or arch-angels created from the beginning[12], and they harmonise with the Persian *Amshaspands* (Ameshaçpentas), the immortal overseers of the world, conceived in accordance with the seven chief councillors at the Persian court, who were the only persons privileged to appear at pleasure before the great king[13]. Four of them, standing on the four sides of God's throne, and from thence

---

1 *Talm. Jer.* Rosh Hash. I. fol. 56[b] ed. Krotosch. (שמות המלאכים עלו בידן מבבל); *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. XLVIII. 9.

2 Οἱ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγοι.

3 Ὑποδιάκονοι, πρεσβευταί, ὕπαρχοι.

4 I. e. worthy of sacrifice; comp. *Talm.* Rosh Hash. 24[b].

5 Μεσῖται καὶ διαιτηταί.

6 Comp. Job XXXIII. 23; Zech. I. 12—14; Tobit XII. 12—15; *Philo*, De Gigant. cc. 3, 4; De Plant. c. 4; De Confus. Ling. cc. 35, 36; De Migr. Abr. cc. 22, 23; De Mundo c. 3; *Porph.* Abst. II. 38.

7 מיטטרון, מיטטרא.

8 *Talm.* Sanh. 38[b], שׁמו כשם רבו.

9 שר העולם, *Talm.* Sanh. 94[a].

10 Though this office is attributed to other angels also, as Michael (*Yalk. Shim.* I. § 940, fol. 304 vol. 2, אני הייתי לרב והוא היה לי לתלמיד), or Sagnugael (*Targ. Jon.* on Exod. III. 2, and *Menach. Rekan.* in loc.).

11 He was supposed to be meant by the severe and unpardoning angel who accompanied the Hebrews in the desert instead of God (Ex. XXIII. 21; *Talm.* Sanh. 38[b]; comp. *Albo*, Ikkar. II. 28; see also *Hengstenb.* Christol. I. pp. 239—245).

12 שָׂרִים or הַשָּׂרִים הָרִאשֹׁנִים, Dan. X. 13; XII. 1; ἀρχάγγελοι, 1 Thess. IV. 16; Jude 9.

13 Esther I. 10, 14; *Herod.* III. 84; comp. 1 Ki. X. 8; 2 Ki. XXV. 19; see *Kohut*, Jüd. Angel. pp. 21—23.

sent forth on their missions to the four quarters of the world, are singled out as "princes of the angels of the Divine presence"[14], and entrusted with clearly defined duties. They are not only the holy protectors or watchful "guardians" of individuals[15] — the Persian *Fervers* or *Fravashis*, or human souls[16] — but they are also the defenders of communities and empires[17]; appearing, like the Homeric gods, as blooming young men[18], they accompany their favourites, Mentor-like, on dangerous voyages to distant lands[19]; and they come to assist the Hebrews or to terrify their enemies[20].

They usually bear the names of Michael, the patron of Israel[21]; Gabriel, the interpreter of visions and the keeper of Paradise; Uriel, the Lord of light and fire and the heavenly luminaries; and Raphael, the great healer[22]. Yet, as is natural in popular fancies slowly, if

---

14 שָׂרֵי מַלְאֲכֵי הַפָּנִים; comp. Isai. LXIII. 9.

15 Comp. Gen. XLVIII. 16, המלאך הגואל אתי מכל רע.

16 Dan. IV. 10, 14, 20, עירין (comp. Henoch XII. 2, 3; XX. 1, "the holy angels that watch"; even the fallen angels are called "guardians of heaven" or "holy guardians", Hen. I. 5, 10, 12, 15; XII. 4; XIV. 1, 3; XV. 9; XVI. 1, 2; as the prophets are designated שֹׁמְרִים or צֹפִים, Isai. XXI. 11, 12; LII. 8; LXII. 6; Jer. VI. 17; etc.); Symm. and Aquil. ἐγρήγοροι; this became, in later times, the usual designation of angels among Christian writers, and it partly coincides in meaning with Amesha-çpentas, that is, "the holy ones that never sleep" (comp. *Bopp*, Vergleich. Gram. § 45); עיר and קדיש are generally coupled; the עירין seems certainly to denote angels of higher rank and position, and to form a heavenly council (comp. *Lengerke* on Dan. IV. 10, pp. 164—170, 176, 177).

17 Dan. X. 13, 20, 21; Acts XII. 15; Revel. I. 20; etc.; comp. *Herod.* VII. 53; *Hesiod*, Op. et Di. 250 *sqq.*; *Apulej.* De Dogm. Plat. Lib. I. med. (p. 155 ed. Nisard).

18 Comp. *Jos.* Ant. V. vi. 2 (νεανίσκου μορφῇ); VIII. 2, 3 (νεανίᾳ καλῷ παραπλήσιος καὶ μεγάλῳ); comp. Ezek. IX. 2; Zech. I. 8; Dan. VIII. 15; IX. 21.

19 Dan. XII. 15 *sqq.*; Tobit III. 17; V. 4, 21; IX. 5; XII. 12—19; Wisd. XVI. 20.

20 2 Macc. III. 24—26, 33, 34; X. 29, 30; XI. 6, 8, 10; 3 Macc. VI. 18; comp. 2 Ki. VI. 17.

21 He is designated אפיטרופוס ἐπίτροπος, and is parallel with the Persian Vohumanô, "Ahura's first masterpiece"; comp. *Kohut* l. c. p. 24.

22 Comp. *Talm.* Yom. 23ᵃ; Derech Erets c. 4 (sect. לעולם תהא); *Origen.* in Num. Hom. XIV. 2 (officium Raphaelis qui medicinae praeest); *Volkmar*, Das vierte Buch Esra, p. 12 ("Uriel ist der Abglanz des Urlichtes, das in die irdische Nacht leuchtet"). Raphael is also called סריאל "he who causes disease to disappear"; *Talm.* Berach. 51ᵃ; see Tobit ll. cc.; Zech. III. 9; IV. 10 (where עֵינֵי is not to be changed into עִירֵי "guardians", comp. III. 9 עֵינַיִם); Dan. VIII. 16; IX. 21; X. 13, 21; XII. 1; 2 Esdr. IV. 1, 36; V. 20; 4 Esdr. IV. 1; V. 20; X. 28; Luke I. 19; 1 Thess. IV. 16; Jude 9; Revel. IV. 5; VIII. 2, 3; XII. 7; Henoch. IX. 1; XXI. 9; XXVII. 2; XXXIII. 3; XL. 2—10; LXXXV. 3, 4; LXXXVII. 2, 3; XC. 21, 22; etc.;

ever, fixed as dogmas, the names fluctuate; for the latter two are promiscuously given as Urjân and Surjân[1], or as Raphael and Phanuel (פנואל)[2]; or other archangels besides those four are mentioned by name[3]; and occasionally no more than six are counted, to whom God Himself is added to make up the holy number of seven[4]; just as Ormuzd is sometimes simply one of the seven prince-angels or Amshaspands, a created being with bodily form, and an emanation of the first principle of all things, the Zeruane-Akerene, but sometimes the all-powerful creator of the universe and of the other six Amshaspands, and the revealer of all heavenly wisdom[5].

They are invested with fanciful attributes, by which they appeal to the imagination, and by which they may be identified. As agents of Divine punishment, they hover between heaven and earth holding in their hand a drawn sword[6]. They are clothed in priestly linen[7] ,and girt with a belt of the finest gold. Their body is like chrysolite, and their arms and feet resemble polished brass; their head is surrounded by a resplendent halo, their face flashes like lightning, and the sound of their voice and of their wings is as the din of a vast multitude, or as the noise of mighty waters[8]. They ride on horseback, in complete armour of glittering gold and precious stones[9]; or they dart

---

comp. Ezek. IX. 2; *Targ. Jon.* Gen. XI. 7, 8; *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 4; *Midr. Rabb.* Exod. XVIII. 2.

[1] Identical with Urjâl אוריאל and Surjâl סוריאל, *l* and *n* being interchanged.

[2] Comp. Henoch IX. 1; X. 1; XL. 9; LIV. 6; LXXI. 8, 9, 13; *Talm.* Berach. 51[a].

[3] As Raguel (רעואל) and Sarakiel (סרכיאל, Henoch XX. 4, 6), and others (4 Esdr. IV. 36; *Targ. Jon.* Deut. XXXIV. 6).

[4] Comp. Ezek. IX. 2 *sqq.*

[5] Comp. *Rhode*, Heil. Sage, pp. 315—317; *Spiegel*, Zend-Avesta, Einleit. p. VII. — Other names of angels occur, as רִדְיָא or רִידְיָא (Pers Areduyâo), the angel of rain (*Talm.* Yom. 21[b]; Taan. 25[b]), and יוּרְקָמִי, the angel of hail, who was anxious to extinguish the flames of the furnace into which the three friends of Daniel had been thrown (*Talm.* Pesach. 118[a]); זַגְנַזְגָאֵל, who appeared to Moses in the burning bush (*Targ. Jon.* Ex. III. 2), and זַגְזַגְאֵל who, with Michael and Gabriel. was engaged at the death and burial of Moses (*Midr. Rabb.* Deut. XI. 5); עוזה and עזאל, who came down to the earth and consorted with the daughters of men (*ibid.*; see notes on XVI. 6—10); comp. Henoch VI. 7; LXIX. 2; *Talm.* Pesach. 111[b]; Gitt. 31[b].

[6] 1 Chr. XXI. 16, 30; Susan. vers. 55, 59; comp. Num. XXII. 23; *Jos.* Ant. VII. xiii. 3.

[7] See Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 531, 532.

[8] Ezek. I. 7, 13; IX. 1—3, 11; XL. 3; Dan. X. 5, 6; XII. 6, 7; 3 Macc. VI. 18; Henoch XXXVIII. 4; LVIII. 3—6; LXI. 1; LXXI. 1; *Yalk. Shim.* II. § 925; comp. Ps. CIV. 2; Matth. XXVIII. 3; Mark XV. 5; Luke II. 9; XXIV. 4; Acts X. 30; Revel. I. 13—16; X. 1.

[9] 2 Macc. III. 25; X. 29; XI. 8; comp. V. 2—4.

through the air "on the swift wings of the wind", and flit unchecked through the universe[10]. Yet, on the other hand, their bodily frame is purely ethereal or spiritual[11]; they see, but are not seen; they require no food, for they subsist upon the radiant beams of God's glory, although they sometimes *appear* to take sustenance during their earthly missions. They are exempt from sin and passion, and subject to no human desire and temptation. They live for ever, and work joyfully in unison and peace, free from hatred and envy. Imbued with God's light and truth, they are initiated into all knowledge and all secrets of the future[12]. The visions of Ezekiel describe agile and fiery Cherubs and Chajoth (חַיּוֹת), and Ophannim (אוֹפַנִּים), that is, wheels of chrysolite, closely following the movements of the Cherubs and Chajoth, whose spirit is in the wheels: they are hardly angels, but rather emblematic creatures typifying the rapid approach of God, and enveloped in a blaze of fire like bright amber (חַשְׁמַל), or like torches and the glare of lightning; they are provided with four wings and four faces, the face of a man, of a lion, an ox, and an eagle; and they possess straight feet walking onward without turning, and eyes everywhere, with which they see in all directions[13].

Then the evil spirits also were considerably multiplied, and, though at first mentioned only as strange and isolated beings, they were soon brought into relation with established dogmas, and at last formed an essential part of an enlarged religious system. They are either designated by the general terms of "lords" (שֵׁדִים)[14], "wicked

---

[10] Bel and Drag. 36; *Avoth R. Nathan* 37 (הולכין מסוף העולם ועד סופו); comp. 1 Ki. XVIII. 12; 2 Ki. II. 16; Dan. IX. 21.

[11] Whence Josephus calls them usually φαντάσματα (Ant. I. xx. 1; V. vi. 2; viii. 2; etc.; so also Wisd. XVII. 4, 15); and Maimonides (Yesod. Hattor. II. 3) attributes to them צורות בלא גולם כלל, without גוף וגויה; comp. Mor. Nev. I. 49.

[12] Tobit XII. 19; *Targ. Jon.* Gen. XVIII. 8 (וְדָמֵי לֵיהּ כְּאִלּוּ אָכְלִין); *id.* XIX. 3; Henoch XV. 3 *sqq.*; Matth. XXII. 30; Luke XX. 36; *Joseph.* Ant. I. xi. 2 (δόξαν παρέσχον ἐσθιόντων); *Philo*, De Abrah. c. 23 (ἱεραὶ καὶ θεῖαι φύσεις); De Plant. No. c. 4 (ψυχῶν θίασος ἀσωμάτων); De Confus. Ling. c. 34; De Somn. I. 22; see also *Av. R. Nathan* c. 37; *Talm.* Chag. 14—16; Bab. Mets. 86[b]; *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. XLVIII. 12 (אין יצר הרע שולט במלאכים), 19 (נראין כאוכלין); LIII. init., 1; *ibid.* Exod. XXIII. 2, 3; *ibid.* Lev. XXIV. 3; *ibid.* Num. XXI. 7 (מזיו שכינה הם ניזונים); *Yalk. Shim.* § 1071 (ad Nehem. IX. 6); *Albo*, Ikkar. II. 28. In Wisd. XVI. 20 manna is called "angels' food"; and the Sept. renders in Ps. LXXVIII. 25 לחם אבירים by ἄρτον ἀγγέλων.

[13] Ezek. I. 4—21; X. 9—17; XLI. 18—20; comp. *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 4; *Talm.* Rosh Hash. 24[b].

[14] Jewish writers connect שֵׁד with שדד, and explain "spirits whose abodes are in deserted places" (במקום שדוד; comp. *Nachman.* on Lev. XVII. 7).

spirits"[1], "demons" or "devils" (δαιμόνια) — the Persian *Devs*[2] —; or they bear more specific appellations, as "he-goats" (שְׂעִירִים or satyrs), whom they were fabled to resemble either in appearance or lasciviousness; Lilith (לִילִית), supposed to massacre children which she waylays by night; or Alukah (עֲלוּקָה), the blood-sucking female Vampire lurking in ambush for lonely travellers; or they are introduced as dancing goblins haunting deserts and dismal solitudes, which they fill with their wild shrieks and their ghastly revelries, and as malignant fiends to be propitiated by sacrifices, and even by holocausts of children[3]. We have the voluptuous Asmodeus, later raised to the rank of prince of demons[4], famous for his relentless jealousy, and yet capable of being subdued and chased back to his native wilderness[5]. We see, above all, Satan rise to greater and more perilous eminence both with regard to his power and the diversity of his functions. While his name is not even mentioned in the ante-Babylonian writings — though he is active at the Fall of man —, he plays in later works a most important and an obtrusively busy part. He is "the enemy" *par excellence*[6]. He is not only the cunning tempter[7], but the mischievous accuser, eager to bring men's guilt before the throne of God[8]. As he grows in daring and presumption, he comes forward as the traducer of the High-priest Joshua, and even ventures to oppose the angel of the Lord[9]. He is the ever active originator of human sin and impiety, and is, therefore, under the name of Azazel, included in the expiatory ritual of the Day of Atonement[10].

---

[1] Tob. VI. 7, πνεύματα πονηρά.

[2] *Sept.* and *Vulg.* Deut. XXXII. 17; *id.* XCVI. 5; *id.* CVI. 37; *id.* Isai. LXV. 11, where אלילים, שדים, and גד are rendered by δαιμόνια, demons being considered as heathen idols (see *infra* sect. III., p. 301; Bar. IV. 7; Hen. XIX. 1).

[3] See Lev. XVII. 7, and notes in loc.; Deut. XXXII. 17; Isai. XIII. 21; XXXIV. 14; Ps. CVI. 37; 2 Chr. XI. 15; Sir. XXI. 27; Baruch IV. 7, 35; Henoch XL. 7; LXV. 6; comp. *Targ.* Ps. XII. 9; Matth. XII. 43; Luke XI. 24; 1 Cor. X. 20; Rev. IX. 20; *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 30; see Comm. on Lev. I. 368, 374; *Höhlemann*, Neue Bibelstudien, pp. 343—364.

[4] See *infra* sect. IV.

[5] Tob. III. 8; VI. 14, 15; VIII. 3.

[6] הַשָּׂטָן, everywhere with the article, except in 1 Chr. XXI. 1, while in the parallel passage 2 Sam. XXIV. 1 יהוה stands instead of שטן (arab. الشيطان, syr. סטנא, etc.); comp. Ps. CIX. 6.

[7] The verb שטן is usually *to incite* (2 Sam. XIX. 23; comp. 1 Chron. XXI. 1, וַיָּסֶת); but it occurs also in the sense of *resisting* or *checking* (Num. XXII. 22, 32).

[8] Job I. II, where Satan is by no means a good angel, employed as overseer over the moral conduct of men; comp. *Hengstenb.* Christol. I. 35, 36.

[9] Zech. III. 1, 2.

[10] See *infra*, and notes on XVI. 6—10.

This remarkable advance in demonology cannot be surprising, if we consider that the Persian system known as that of Zoroaster, and centring in the dualism of a good and evil principle[11], flourished most, and attained its fullest development, just about the time of the Babylonian exile. The Jews were sufficiently prepared for the partial adoption of that system by their current views of saving and destroying angels; and they could readily familiarise themselves with the Amshaspands and the Devs, the one the creatures of the beneficent Ormuzd (Ahuramazda), the others those of the pernicious Ahriman (Agromainyus). Now we find this heathen dualism nowhere expressed with greater plainness than where we should least expect it — in the ordinances regarding the Day of Atonement, which enjoin, that "Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats, one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for Azazel"[12]. "The Lord" and "Azazel" stand in clear contradistinction. Even if the exact functions of Azazel should never be ascertained, the position which he was supposed to occupy in the moral world cannot be mistaken. Compelled to shun the cheerful life of towns and communities, and to withdraw to dreary and deserted regions, he yet lures men to transgression and offence, disturbs their inward peace, and tries to undermine their happiness. In order to indicatee, that harmony of mind has been restored, the sins of the Israelites, symbolically transferred upon the head of a goat, are sent back to him who occasioned them; and thus removed from the hallowed abodes of God's people, they remain for ever associated with the evil demon and his native wilderness.

So far the Hebrew rites agree with the pagan fiction, and they are indeed at variance with a pure and rational creed. But they follow their prototype no farther, and do not essentially forsake the path of monotheism. The goat was no sacrifice presented to Azazel, no offering meant to appease his wrath[13]; it was not slaughtered, but left in the desert — somewhat cruelly — to its fate[14]; it did not work the atonement of the people, which was effected solely by the blood

---

[11] See Comm. on Gen. pp. 53, 54, 87, 88.

[12] Lev. XVI. 8.

[13] So, f. i. *Movers* (Phoeniz. I. 369), who inappropriately compares the expiation of the Egyptians in times of pestilence or drought (*Plut.* Is. 73; see *Hengstenb.* Mos. und Aegypten, pp. 169 *sqq.*, "the notion of a sin-offering pre-supposes holiness and hatred of sin on the part of the being to whom it is presented".

[14] In later times, it was hurled down a rocky precipice (*Mishn.* Yom. VI. 6; see notes on XVI. 6—10): then at least the Hebrews did not believe, that "Azazel, the executor of Divine judgments, would inflict due punishment on the vicarious goat sent to him into the desert" (*Movers* l. c.).

of the second goat killed as a sin-offering[1]; it served, in fact, merely as a symbol of complete removal. Azazel himself possesses no independent power; his anger cannot harm, and his favour cannot grant pardon; he is not approached with prayers or lustrations; he is reckoned of no account, and in the hands of God alone is remission of sins. Although, therefore, Azazel and his goat are in themselves a stain on the levitical legislation, they do not taint the main principle of Judaism — God's absolute and undivided sovereignty.

The same remarks apply to all the angels and spirits of the Old Testament. These are completely subordinate to the dominion of the Deity; they have no more authority than is entrusted to them by God for special purposes; they are devoid of all personal weight and influence; they serve the one omnipotent Lord as His ready instruments; and to Him they are bound to offer praise and glorification[2]. Occasionally indeed they represent the powers of the physical world — "He makes the wind His messengers (angels), the flaming fire His servants"[3]; yet they are not personifications of nature. Nor are they ever deified or invoked, whether as cosmic forces or as saints[4]: their worship is not expressly forbidden, because it is excluded by the first two Commandments[5]. Though they divided, they never shared the majesty of God. Their position of dependence is expressed in their very names. They are neither deities nor Divine emanations, but created by God like men, and not begotten by Him, as has been vainly inferred from the appellation "sons of God" (בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים); yet not even their creation is mentioned in the Hebrew Scriptures, for there is no place for them in the Hebrew cosmogony[6].

They are indeed the "holy ones"[7]; yet in the searching light of God they are not exempt from moral failings[8]. They are not all-

---

1 Vers. 15, 16.

2 Ps. XXIX. 1; CIII. 20, 21.

3 Ps. CIV. 4; comp. CXLVIII. 8.

4 Job V. 1; comp. Deut. IV. 19; XVII. 3.

5 Comp. Ex. XXII. 19; Deut. IV. 35, 39: the interdiction is not implied in the command to abstain from paying homage to the "host of heaven" (Deut. IV. 19; XVII. 3), for here this term denotes the sidereal bodies and nothing else; see p. 286.

6 It is certainly not implied in the words כל צבאם (in Gen. II. 1), which merely summarise the detailed account of the first chapter, and add no new element. As regards Rabbinical speculations see *infra*.

7 קְדשִׁים, קַדִּישִׁין, ἅγιοι, ἱεροί; Ps. LXXXIX. 6, 8; Job V. 1; XV. 15; Zech. XIV. 5; Dan. IV. 10, 14, 20; VIII. 13; Tob. VIII. 15; XI. 14; Sir. XLV. 2 (where angels, and not priests, are meant); Hen. XII. 2; XX. 1, 4; LXI. 10; *Targ. Jon.* and *Jerus.* Deut. XXXIII. 2, 3; etc.

8 Job IV. 18; XV. 15; comp. 1 Cor. VI. 3, "Know you not that we shall judge angels?"

powerful, and Jacob, wrestling with his celestial opponent, gained the mastery[9]. They cannot accept Divine honours: thus the angel who appeared to Manoah and his wife deprecated sacrifices, and said, "If thou wilt offer a burnt-offering, thou must offer it to the Lord"[10]; the angel Raphael, in much later times, impressed upon Tobit, "Not of any favour of mine, but by the will of our God I came, wherefore praise Him for ever"[11]; and the Talmud and the Midrashim unswervingly clung to the same views[12]. The angel charged to lead the Hebrews into Canaan, was indeed to be revered and implicitly obeyed, and he pardoned no rebellion; yet he was himself powerless, and he derived all authority from God, whose "name was in him"[13]. The destroying angel was simply an instrument of God, who commanded him when to deal perdition, and when to stay his hand[14]. The serpent, fatal to the first couple, could tempt and mislead, but it had submissively to bear God's curse and retaliation[15]. In the time of king Ahab, the "lying spirit" proposed to create confusion, but he received his mandate from God, "Thou shalt deceive and prevail, go forth and do so"[16]. Satan himself, though looking with fiendish envy upon Job's piety and happiness, was unable to disturb the one or destroy the other; charged by God with the strictest commands which he dared not to overstep, he was obliged to render a regular account of his actions; and baffled in his schemes, he had no share whatever in deciding Job's ultimate fate; in a word, he waged war against Job, but not against God. When he attempted calumny against the High-priest Joshua, he was resisted and curbed by the Divine malediction[17]. He appears, in fact, invariably as one of the celestial ministers at God's throne; he pays Him allegiance like the angels; and, unlike Ahriman who is constantly at war with Ormuzd, he never ventures opposition or rebellion[18].

Yet it would be unwarrantable to divest the spirits of the Bible of their personality, and to reduce them to abstract powers executing God's will[19], to mere emblems of His presence[20], or symbols of His working in nature, in great events, and in human thoughts or emotions[21];

---

9 Gen. XXXII. 29; Hos. XII. 5; see *supra* pp. 25—27.

10 Judg. XIII. 16.

11 Tobit XII. 18.

12 See *infra*; comp. *Albo*, Ikkar. II. 28.

13 שמי בקרבו; Ex. XXIII. 21; comp. Eccl. V. 5.

14 2 Sam. XXIV. 16 *sqq.*; 1 Chr. XXI. 12 *sqq.*; 2 Ki. XIX. 34, 35.

15 See Comm. on Gen. p. 88.

16 1 Ki. XXII. 22.

17 Zech. III. 1, 2.

18 Comp. Comm. on Gen. pp. 399—401.

19 *Cölln*, Bibl. Theol. I. 191, 192, 410, etc.

20 כבוד השכינה, *Midr. Rabb.* Ex. XXXII. 4.

21 Maimonides, apparently in this

to incarnations of His word, or beams of His essence, into which they return without an existence or "meaning of their own"[1]; and still more to "metaphors of a pious fancy"[2], employed "for the dramatic animation of the scene"[3], or "for poetic adornment"[4]. Angels and spirits were certainly not conceived with uniformity by all, nor in the same manner at different periods; yet they obtained steadily a stronger hold upon the national mind, and gradually became objects of doctrine and creed. It is true, the angelology of the Old Testament is fragmentary, without unity and organic connection; and the notions on the subject were at all times vague and floating: but so were the notions on many other points of Hebrew theology, and on God Himself. The main interest of the inquiry lies in that fluctuation. The Israelites, always ready for progress and change, felt their way like all other nations; and adopting or assimilating new ideas, they built up a comprehensive system by the labour of ages: that system in all its completeness was then, by a natural operation of the mind, represented as having been worked out from the beginning on fixed principles, and, for greater support, it was finally attributed to some great and revered name of antiquity, if not to Divine revelation. This process was repeated with respect to all important institutions; and it affords the only safe clue to a rational interpretation of the Scriptures, whether of the Old or the New Testament.

But in spite of the beneficial and creditable restrictions referred to, the admission of ange s and of a tempting and accusing demon was too dangerous a laxity to remain without deplorable effects. The unity of God was threatened from two different sides. First, God Himself might be identified with His messengers or manifestations, and thus be endowed with bodily form; and secondly, the power of evil, which often enjoys temporary triumphs on earth, might be represented as an irresistible principle, and thus be invested with independent authority antagonistic to that of the Deity Himself. Both

instance also unable to appreciate Biblical notions with impartiality, and eager to graft upon them Aristotelic and Arabic conceptions, converts the angels into "prophetic visions" (במראה הנבואה, Yesod. Hattor. II. 5, 7; Mor. Nev. I. 49; II. 6), or into "physical and intellectual forces" (Mor. Nev. II. 71, e. g. the force that works in the germ is the true angel of God; etc.).

[1] *Hupfeld*, Quellen d. Genesis, p.218.

[2] *Schenkel*, Bibel-Lexicon, I. 111.

[3] *Hupfeld*, Theosoph. oder Mythol. Theol. pp. 9, 11.

[4] The fact that מַלְאָךְ is etymologically *message*, not messenger (*Sack*, Comm. theol. p. 19; *Ewald*, Krit. Gram. § 134, p. 245), affords no proof; the word never actually occurs in abstract, but always in concrete meaning.

these mistakes were actually made; for a later religious phase taught an incarnate God and a contumacious Devil. The Old Testament effectually paved the way for such errors. For in many passages, especially in earlier writings, it introduces angels, who, in the course of the narrative, prove to be God Himself[5]; and thus the Hebrews were made familiar with the idea of impersonation, even irrespective of the influence of other Eastern systems. Hence we can hardly be astonished to find that the Fathers of the Church, with few exceptions[6], considered in all passages throughout the Old Testament "the angel of the Lord" to be identical with Christ, and understood the three messengers who came to Abraham as the second person of the Godhead, or the Logos, accompanied by two created angels[7], which view, though now indeed discarded by critics, still occupies its place in dogmatic works[8].

On the other hand, the Old Testament occasionally attributes to Satan the power of leading even God's favourites astray, and bringing upon them disgrace and misery. Thus "Satan stood up against Israel and provoked David to number Israel"[9]: it is true that, according to the older account, God Himself incited the king to commit the offence[10]; but this was justly deemed incompatible both with Divine holiness and Divine justice, and was therefore abandoned, like the questionable hardening of Pharao's heart[11]. In the time of the exile, and for centuries after it, thoughtful men urged indeed, that God is the Author of both good and evil, of blessing and punishment, of light and darkness, since they acknowledged only rela-

---

[5] Gen. XVI. 7—13; XVIII. 2, 3, 17 *sqq.*; XXI. 17—19; XXII, 11, 12; XXXI. 11, 13; XXXII. 25, 29, 31; XLVIII. 15, 16; Exod. III. 2—7; XIII. 21 and XIV. 19; Judg. VI. 11 *sqq.*; XIII. 21, 22; see also Gen. XVIII. 10 and XXI. 1 (comp. *Albo*, Ikkar. II. 28); Num. XXII. 9, 20, 22 *sqq.* Inaccurate is the view of Jewish writers — "the messenger speaks in the name of the sender" (השלוח ידבר בלשון שולחו, *Ebn Ezra* on Exod. III. 2; *Hamburger*, Real-Encycl. p. 506; a. o.): this applies to the prophets who, for the sake of brevity, are sometimes said to have done themselves what they did by the power, or announced in the name, of God (comp. Gen. XXVII. 37; XLIX. 7; Ezek. XIII. 19; XXXII. 18; XLIII. 3), but it does not apply to those angels who are at once messengers and Sender.

[6] As Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory.

[7] Comp. *Pfeiffer*, Dub. vex. pp. 137 *sqq.*

[8] Comp. f. i. *Hengstenb.* Christol. I. 215—251 (the argumentation is, in the author's usual manner, subtle and adroit, but untenable); so also Hofmann, Baumgarten, Kurtz, a. o.

[9] 1 Chr. XXI. 1.

[10] 2 Sam. XXIV. 1; comp. 1 Sam. XXVI. 19.

[11] Comp. James I. 13, 14.

tive, not absolute misfortunes, and regarded "all partial evil" as "universal good"[1]. In fact, the distinction between "good" and "evil" angels is foreign to the Old Testament: the angels charged to overthrow Sodom and Gomorrah, were the same as those who saved Lot and his family; the angel sent to destroy Sennacherib's army was distinctly called "a good angel"[2]; and "a holy guardian" came to punish the pride of Nebuchadnezzar[3]. Yet Zoroaster's doctrines gradually exercised a perceptible influence; and then sinful deeds were traced, not so much to the innate perversity or weakness of the human heart[4], as to the allurement and seduction of the arch-enemy of all virtue. The Wisdom of Solomon declares that "through envy of the devil came death into the world, and they that hold of his side find it"[5]; and these notions became in later times current both among Christians and Jews[6]. Sirach contends, "When the ungodly man curses Satan, he curses his own soul"[7]. Philo speaks of "unholy angels (ἀνίεροι) unworthy of any address", and of demons who, properly wicked mortals, assume the name of angels, and entice men to sensual excesses[8]. Josephus is indeed extremely free in his treatment of Biblical spirits. He either entirely omits the angels in his narrative[9]; or he substitutes for them God Himself[10] or Divine Providence[11]; or he assumes in their stead indistinct superhuman visions and oracles[12], a mysterious voice[13] or even some human being[14]; while he occasionally changes a theophany into the appearance of an angel or spirit,

---

[1] Isai. XLV. 7; LIV. 16; comp. 1 Sam. XVI. 14, 16, 23; XVIII. 10 (רוח רעה מאת יהוה); Judg. IX. 23 (וישלח אלהים רוח רעה); Am. III. 6; Lament. III. 38; Job II. 10; see *supra* p. 68.

[2] Ἀγαθὸς ἄγγελος, 2 Macc. XV. 23; comp. XI. 6; 1 Macc. VII. 41; 3 Macc. VI. 18.

[3] Dan. IV. 10, עיר וקדיש; comp. also Henoch XX. 4; *Talm.* Bab. Bathr. 16a; *Midr. Rabb.* Ex. XV. 33 (God is both the accuser and the defender of men); *ibid.* Gen. I. 8 (everything is good, even judgment and punishment, and it is wrong to say, "two principles" (שתי רשויות) have created the world).

[4] Comp. Gen. VI. 5; VIII. 21; Jer. XVII. 9, 10.

[5] Wisdom II. 24.

[6] Comp. *Targ. Jon.* Gen. III. 6, (וחמת איתתא ית סמאל מלאך מותא); Revel. XII. 9.

[7] Sir. XXI. 27.

[8] De Gigant. c. 4, with reference to Ps. LXXVIII. 49.

[9] Ant. I. xix. 9; comp. Gen. XXXI. 11.

[10] Ant. I. xiii. 4; comp. Gen. XXII. 11, 12.

[11] Ant. X. x. 5 (θείᾳ σώζονται προνοίᾳ); comp. Song of Three Holy Children, ver. 26.

[12] Ant. I. xix. 1; V. ii. 7; IX. ii. 1; comp. Gen. XXVIII. 12; Judg. II. 1 *sqq.*; 2 Ki. I. 3 *sqq.*

[13] Ant. II. xii. 1; VIII. xiii. 7; comp. Ex. iii. 2; 1 Ki. xix. 5, 7.

[14] Ant. VIII. xiii. 7; comp. 1 Ki. xix. 5, 7.

as in Jacob's wrestling with God[15]. Yet he as often follows the Bible in noticing angels[16]; and, though like the Palestinian Apocrypha Baruch and Tobit, he never mentions Satan, he frequently introduces demons and malicious spirits, which he considers as the departed souls of the wicked, as did the Greeks and later Jews[17]; he contends that they take possession of men and strike them with foul and incurable diseases, especially disorders of the mind; but that they may be exorcised by incantations and mysterious spells, especially by those ascribed to the ingenuity of Solomon[18]; and he declares that he himself saw how a certain Eleazar "drew out a demon through the nostrils" of a tortured sufferer by means of a "burning" root (βαάρας) and of Solomonic formulas, and how at Eleazar's command the spirit, as he went out of the man, overturned a basin of water[19]. On such fruitful soil had the Persian teaching fallen among the Jews.

## 3. THE NEW TESTAMENT.

More remarkable still is the expansion in which the spirit-world appears in the New Testament.

The *angels* ceased entirely to be mere types or symbols of Divine Providence, and were, in all cases, regarded as personal beings endowed with a well-defined individuality. In the speeches of Christ, it is true, they are introduced without mythological adornment, without classification, names, or fanciful appearance; nor are they charged with authority over empires or with intercession for individuals. But in the writings of the apostles, an exuberant imagination busily invests them with the most striking attributes and the most marvellous powers. Encompassed by a cloud with a bright radiance, and a rainbow encircling their heads, with faces like the sun or

---

15 Ant. I. xx. 2; see p. 25.

16 As Ant. I. xi. 2 (Abraham in Mamre); IV. vi. 3 (Bileam); etc.

17 *Hor.* Epod. V. 91 *sqq.*; *Philostr.* Apoll. III. 38; "to have a demon" was synonymous with being insane (*Aeschyl.* Choeph. 566; *Eurip.* Phoen. 888; *Plut.* Marcell. c. 20; etc.).

18 See *infra* ch. IV.

19 *Jos.* Ant. VI. viii. 2; xi. 3; VIII. ii. 5; Bell. Jud. VII. vi. 3; comp. Tobit VI. 7, 16, 17; VIII. 2, 3; see also *Herod.* III. 33; *Heliod.* Aeth. IV. 10; *Lucian*, Philopseud. cc. 16, 17 ("there are people who by formulas can free the possessed from demons. I need hardly mention the great master of the art, the famous Syrian, who cures the patient for ever, if necessary by threats, where spells are unavailing. I have myself once seen such a spirit come out, who was black and smoky in appearance" (μέλανα καὶ καπνώδη τὴν χρόαν).

lightning, and feet like pillars of fire[1]; the Seven Spirits stand on the four corners of the earth to command and rule the winds[2], and to perform God's behests among men[3]. Vast numbers — "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands" — all clad in fine white linen, and riding on white horses, surround the throne of God, glorifying Him, offering incense on a golden altar, and bringing before Him the prayers of the righteous. One preaches the everlasting gospel to all lands and all nations, another declares the Divine wrath to the godless, and some scatter terrible plagues over the earth with the blast of their trumpets; while others, visibly appearing among men, announce to them great and remarkable events, especially such as concern the new dispensation. They lend their aid to pious sufferers, shield those for whom they have been appointed as special guardians, and carry the souls of the virtuous into heaven[4]. One of them was supposed to "come down at certain seasons into a pool and to trouble the water", so that, "whosoever first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatever disease he had"[5] — a conception so strange that the passage has, though without reason, been suspected as spurious[6]. But they decline worship; for they are merely servants of God like the apostles, and subject to His tribunal[7]. They are neither perfect in knowledge nor in wisdom[8], yet are they able to interpret heavenly visions and revelations[9]. Full of love and compassion, they rejoice at the sinner's repentance and the growth of God's kingdom[10]. For both in heaven and on earth they minister particularly to their lord Christ, whom they will surround at his second advent, and whose decrees they will execute in the day of judgment[11].

---

[1] Rev. X. 1; XIV. 6; Matth. XXVIII. 2, 3; Luke XXIV. 4; Acts I. 10; X. 30; XII. 7; see *supra* p. 290.

[2] Rev. VII. 1.

[3] Rev. I. 4; III. 1; IV. 5; V. 6; VIII. 2.

[4] Luke XVI. 22.

[5] John V. 4.

[6] De Wette observes (in loc. p. 89 ed. 4): "existing testimonies do not suffice to pronounce the passage spurious."

[7] Col. II. 18; 1 Cor. VI. 3; Revel. XIX. 10; XXII. 8, 9.

[8] Matth. XXIV. 36; comp. 1 Pet. I. 12; Hebr. I. 4 *sqq.*

[9] Rev. I. 1; XXII. 6, 16; *Origen.* in Num. Hom. XIV. 2, et rursus angelis opus est qui praesint operibus sanctis, qui alternae lucis intellectum et occultorum Dei agnitionem ac rerum Divinarum scientiam doceant etc.

[10] Luke XV. 10; 1 Pet. I. 12.

[11] Comp. Matth. I. 20; II. 13, 19, 20; IV. 11; XIII. 39—42, 49; XVI. 27; XVIII. 10; XXII. 30; XXIV. 31; XXV. 31; XXVI. 53; XXVIII. 2, 3; Luke I. 11—22; II. 9—14; XX. 36; XXII. 43; John I. 52; Acts X. 3—7; XII. 7—11, 15; XXVII. 23, 24; Rom. VIII. 38; 1 Cor. IV. 9; XIII. 1; Gal. I. 8; 1 Thess. III. 13; IV. 16; Hebr. I. 4, 5, 13, 14;

But singular and surprising are the notions of the New Testament regarding *men possessed by demons*[12]. They are so perplexing, that it seems difficult to understand by what perversion of thought and by what anomalies of historical development, such fancies could possibly be grafted upon any monotheistic religion.

The chief and ruler of the demons is Satan, who now stands out in all his moral hideousness. His nature is sufficiently indicated by his names; for he is described as the "Slanderer" or "Devil" (διάβολος); the "Accuser" of men before God day and night; "Beelzebub"[13] or "Beelzebul"[14] and "Belial" (Beliar); the "great Dragon" or the "old Serpent", who deceives the whole world; "the Liar and the father of lies"; the "Wicked"; the "Prince" or "the God of this world" of frivolity, sin, and ignorance, or "the Prince of the Power of the air"; the "Adversary" who, "as a roaring lion, walks about seeking whom he may devour"; the "Messenger of death"; "the Author of all evil", of deceit and calamity, from the beginning of the world; the wily "Antagonist" of God's kingdom, of Christ's followers and his work; the cunning "Seducer" of the weak, and the shameless tempter of the pious and of Christ himself[15]. His subjects or "angels" are the demons or the wicked and unclean spirits[16], often identified with the pagan idols[17], and classified according to their rank as principalities, powers, and rulers of darkness[18]. Now these demons enter into the bodies of men, and vast numbers of them, up to a "legion", often dwell in one individual. They afflict their wretched victims with melancholy or raving madness, with epilepsy and paralysis, with loss of speech,

---

XII. 22; 1 Pet. III. 22; 2 Pet. II. 11; Jude 9, 14; Rev. V. 11, 12; VII. 1—3, 11, 12; VIII. 3 *sqq.*; XII. 7; XIV. 6 *sqq.*; XV. 1 *sqq.*; XVI. 1 *sqq.*; XVIII. 1 *sqq.*; XIX. 10, 14; XXII. 9.

[12] Δαιμονιζόμενοι, ἔχοντες δαιμόνια, ὀχλούμενοι ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων.

[13] Comp. 2 Ki. I. 2, 3, 6 בַּעַל זְבוּב, the lord of flies or noxious insects.

[14] Dominus (בַּעַל) stercoris (זֶבֶל); comp. *Lightfoot* in Matth. XII. 24 (Op. II. 323).

[15] Σατᾶν or Σατανᾶς, διάβολος, κατήγωρ (in Jewish writings frequently קטיגור, or the participle מקטרג or מ׳ הגדול, in contradistinction to the defender סניגור συνήγορος or פרקליט παράκλητος), Βεελζεβούβ (Βεελζεβούλ), Βελίαλ (Βελίαρ), δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος (הנחש הקדמוני or הנחש הראשון; comp. *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. XXII. 15; *ib.* Num. XIX. 11 הנחש פתח בלשון הרע תחלה ונתקלל; *ib.* Deut. V. 10, 11); ὁ πονηρός, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, ὁ ἐχθρός, ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁ πειράζων.

[16] Δαιμόνια, δαίμονες, πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα, πνεύματα πονηρά, πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας, πν. ἀσθενειῶν.

[17] See *supra* p. 292, note 2.

[18] Ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, and κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότου τούτου; Eph. VI. 12; comp. I. 21; 1 Cor. XV. 24; Rom. VIII. 38.

sight, and hearing; or they force them to live in rags and tatters near tombs or in deserts. But they are cast out or "rebuked" by Christ through the spirit and holiness of God, and by his disciples and other believers through the power of his name; and then they escape to parched and dreary places (ἄνυδροι τόποι), seeking rest which they never find; or they are driven into unclean beasts, such as swine, which then are seized with wild frenzy, and furiously rush into death; yet sometimes they return from their desolate retreats with other demons as auxiliaries, to enter and torment the wretched sufferer anew, and to render his condition worse than ever. They appear in many shapes, even as frogs. They differ in degrees of iniquity. Like the false prophets, they often utter predictions, and work signs and wonders, for deceit and destruction. Yet they believe in God, and tremble before His holiness. Fallen by their own guilt, like Satan, from an original state of innocence, "as lightning falls from heaven" [1], they govern in the realms of darkness; but in due time they will be condemned, subdued, and disarmed by the Messiah, and, bound in everlasting chains, they and their master will be hurled down into the fathomless pit, where, in the lake of fire and brimstone, they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever. This final overthrow of Satan and his subordinate hosts, his ultimate expulsion from the kingdom of this world, and the transformation of men from "children of the devil" into "children of God", are among the principal objects of Christ's work and mission [2].

---

[1] It is well known, that some Fathers of the Church (as Gregory of Nyssa and Nazianzen, and Basil) and with them many modern theologians (as Michaelis, Baumgarten, Delitzsch, a. o.), place the fall of the angels and the struggle of Satan between the first and second verses of Genesis, when the world, originally perfect, was transformed into a "bottomless abyss" (see, however, Comm. on Gen. p. 61).

[2] These remarks are based upon a large number of passages, which prove how much the minds of the New Testament writers were absorbed by their demonology. See Matth. IV. 1—11, 24; VIII. 16, 28—35; IX. 32—34; X. 1, 8, 25; XI. 18; XII. 22—28, 43—45; XIII. 19, 38—42; XV. 22, 28; XVII, 15, 18; Mark I. 12, 13, 23—27; III. 22; V. 2—13; VI. 13; VII. 29, 30; IX. 17—29; XVI. 17; Luke IV. 1—13, 33—36, 41; VI. 18; VIII. 2, 12, 27—36; IX. 39; X. 17—20; XI. 15, 18—26; XIII. 11, 16, 32; XXII. 3, 31; John VII. 20; VIII. 44, 49; X. 20; XII. 31; XIV. 30; XVI. 11; Acts V. 3, 16; X. 38; XIII. 10; XVI. 16—18; XIX. 3; XXVI. 18; Rom. VIII. 38; XVI. 20; 1 Cor. V. 5; VII. 5; X. 20, 21; XV. 24—27, 54—57; 2 Cor. II. 11; IV. 4; VI. 15; XI. 3, 14, 15; XII. 7; Ephes. II. 2; VI. 11—13, 16; Col. I. 13; 1 Thess. II. 18; III. 5; 2 Thess. II. 9, 10; 1 Tim. I. 20; III. 6, 7; IV. 1—3; V. 15; 2 Tim. II. 26; Hebr. II. 14; James II. 19; 1 Pet. V.

Vain attempts have been made to banish the demonology from the number of Christian doctrines, merely because it is fantastic and irrational. Jesus and the apostles, it has been contended, accommodated themselves to popular superstitions and fancies, but did not permit them to influence the new faith — of which, however, they form an essential part. Still more objectionable is the assumption that, for moral and practical ends, they used the "current language", but did not connect with it the current notions, since they did not take the terms in their literal sense. Such principles, applied as they have been to other difficult subjects also, as the Biblical statements in reference to natural sciences, render a sound interpretation impossible[3]. It is indeed remarkable that the fourth gospel, though occasionally mentioning angels[4] and the "devil" or "the prince of this world"[5], only once or twice alludes to demons[6]; but it would be unsafe to conclude from this silence of Christ's most familiar disciple, that "Jesus did not believe demons to be real powers"[7], and that the other evangelists represent incorrectly their master's views on the subject[8]. Satan is a prominent, if not almost the central figure in Christian dogmas. Jesus and his disciples recognise his hostility to human peace and righteousness as a formidable force[9]; they assign the fullest reality to the suffering of the "possessed" and to its presumed cause; and they are, according to the gospels, distinguished from the bulk of the people merely by their closer alliance with the Divine spirit, before which the mischievous creatures tremble. Therefore, their teaching implies a clear dualism. Paul distinctly contrasts the empire of Satan, or of malice and darkness, with the empire of God and Christ, or of virtue and light. It is a futile endeavour to de-

---

8, 9; 2 Pet. II. 4; 1 John III. 8—10; IV. 1—3; Jude 6; Rev. II. 9, 24; IX. 1; XII. 3, 7—10, 13—17; XIV. 12—15; XVI. 13, 14; XIX. 20; XX. 1—3, 7—10.

[3] The arguments brought forward in defence of those views are necessarily weak; comp. f. i. *Cölln* Bibl. Theol. II. 73 ("the wisdom of the physician seemed to demand indulgence to prejudices, which facilitated the success of the cure"; etc.); *ib.* p. 231; *De Wette*, Bibl. Dogm. I. § 242; etc.

[4] I. 52; V. 4; XII. 29; XX. 12.

[5] VII. 20; VIII. 44; XII. 31; XIV. 30; XVI. 11.

[6] VIII. 48, 49; X. 20, 21.

[7] *Cölln*, Bibl. Theol. II. 73; comp. p. 233; see also the wavering and symbolising remarks of *Schenkel* in his Bibel-Lexic. I. pp. 115—118 (Satan is merely "die gottentfremdete Macht der Zeitlichkeit, Diesseitigkeit, Sinnlichkeit, dessen, was im vierten Evangelium Welt heisst, überhaupt").

[8] Comp. *De Wette*, Bibl. Dogm. I. § 241.

[9] Comp. John XII. 31; XIV. 30; XVI. 11; etc.

prive Satan of a personal existence, and to regard him as "a hostile power of evil ever at work against the good"; or to attribute to him "merely a symbolical meaning", as a "type of iniquitous worldliness" and of "ungodly sensualism": such shadowy abstractions are contradicted by the narratives of the apostles, if not by the speeches of Christ, and they cannot be forced into the writings of Paul without entirely altering and distorting his system. It is true, Satan's condemnation is already pronounced; his dominion is even now powerless to harm the devoted believers in Jesus, though these are few in number; and his strength will be utterly broken, like the rule of death and hell, great day of judgment, when Christ shall appear again on earth as perfect conqueror, and when the empire of ever-lasting life shall begin — just as the Parsees believe that Ahriman's authority will be annihilated at the final triumph of Ormuzd after a struggle of 12,000 years. But in the mean time, the main bulk of mankind are kept in his toils. He is the prince of this world and the instigator of evil. He "takes his children captive at his will", and forces them to serve him as his "ministers" (διάκονοι), to wage war against truth and light, to foster error, superstition, and apostasy, to entrap the unwary in "the lusts of the flesh", to stir up strife and dissension among communities, and to bring persecution and misery upon the faithful. Against his malignant attacks and seductive snares men must ever be fortified; or else they relapse into his grasp, whether temporarily for correction and improvement, or for eternal torture; and with fiendish malice, and armed with "all powers and signs and lying wonders and unrighteous deceit", he strives to frustrate every noble effort of sin-born and sin-laden humanity[1].

One additional process remained to be accomplished. The manifold attributes of God and the various manifestations of His power were, by the influence of Greek philosophy, and especially of Platonic ideas[2], comprised in one supreme and all-embracing Intelligence; the unity of the Divine Being, divided by numberless angels, spirits, and demons, was restored in a new form, under the name of "Logos" or the Divine Word. The Jews were familiar with this notion through the *Honover* of the Persians, which was conceived as the all-creating Word of Ormuzd and one with his mind, as the purifier of every uncleanness and the future destroyer of Ahriman's empire[3]; and thus the

---

1 Comp. Acts XXVI 18; 2 Cor. VI. 15; Col. I. 13; Eph. VI. 11—13; 2 Tim. III. 26; etc.

2 *Plato*, Republ. VI. 18, 21 (p. 507 B, 511 A); Timaeus c. 18 (p. 51 E, 52 A); comp. *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. XV. 13.

3 Comp. Izeshne c. XIX; Vendid. XI. XIX; etc.

fourth gospel commences, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God . . . All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made"[4]. In this manner the Trinity was completed — God the Father, the incarnate Son, and the Logos.

## 4. THE TALMUD AND THE MIDRASHIM.

In these works, Iranic fancies and superstitions are most abundantly reflected; yet the contrasts between Talmudic and the Persian doctrines are as interesting as their parallels: for from the earliest times, the Hebrews modified rather than adopted or originated ideas. We must here confine ourselves to a rapid survey of an almost endless field, and must entirely resist the temptation of following the Kabbalah into the fantastic and gorgeous mazes of its spirit-world.

The angels — so teach the Rabbins — were brought forth by God out of nothing, or else out of fire[5] or water[6], out of air or the snow which lies piled up beneath the throne of God, and which was also employed for the formation of the world. It has been warmly disputed whether they were produced on the second day of Creation, or on the fifth, or at dusk on the sixth; but all doctors agree that they were not called into existence on the first day, lest sceptics contended, that Michael and Gabriel or other spirits assisted God in fashioning the world[7]. For Judaism, keeping aloof from Gnostic views, never regarded God as a "demiurgos", nor attributed to angels the power of creation, and the office of universal government[8]. On the contrary, anxious in no manner to imperil the strictest monotheism, the Rabbins rather lowered the nature and position of the angels; for they declared that these "created beings"[9], blind and powerless tools in the hand of God with whom they ought never to be confounded[10], must give Him a full

[4] The *Vatch* or Word of the Hindoos has a similar power and mission; comp. *Colebrooke* in Asiat. Res. VIII. p. 403.

[5] As Gabriel.

[6] As Michael.

[7] *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 4; *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. I. 2, 3, 8; *ib.* Exod. XXX. 5; comp. *Yalk. Shim.* I. § 5; *Pirk. Av.* V. 6; *Talm.* Sanh. 38[a].

[8] Yet certain modern schools of theology, misled by a fallacious logic and the semblance of philosophic argument, have attempted to revive that pagan theory, which was considered to have been discarded for ever (comp. *Hupfeld*, Theosoph. und Mytholog. Theolog. pp. 10, 11).

[9] *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. LXXVIII. 1, בכל יום ויום בורא הקב"ה כת של מלאכים וכ'; *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. II. 6, 10, "God has created all intelligences (angels) and heavenly orbs", whereas Aristotle considers them as *eternal*, and as emanating from the deity *of necessity*.

[10] *Talm.* Sanh. 38.

account of their actions, and are liable to punishment[1], and even to death, if they presume to penetrate into mysteries beyond their appointed sphere. They must, therefore, not be represented in images for the purpose of worship[2], nor be appealed to in prayer, which would be regarded as blasphemy[3], and certainly not be honoured by one of the four chief modes of homage — prostration, sacrifice, burning of incense, and libation[4]. However, it is their office to bring man's supplication before God[5]; therefore, as "they do not understand the Aramaic dialect"[6], except Gabriel who is familiar with all languages, individuals ought not to pray in Chaldee[7], though congregations may offer up their prayers in any tongue, since God Himself is present among them[8].

The angels are permitted to exercise only rigid justice (מדת הדין), and do not share the Divine privilege of granting pardon. They stand in need of mutual assistance[9]; nay, they are frequently called upon to serve mortals[10]; and it was a current maxim, that "good men are superior to angels"[11]: thus while the latter were unable to give names to the animals, Adam did so without difficulty[12].

Like the Persian Fervers, the angels are numberless. When Jacob, after his flight from Laban, feared the perilous encounter with Esau, he was protected by two "camps" of well-equipped hosts, each consisting of 120,000 angels[13]. They are constantly increasing; for every

---

1 *Talm.* Chagig. $16^a$.

2 *Targ. Jon.* Ex. XX. 20; *Mechilt.* in loc. p. 80 ed. Weiss, לא דמות מלאכים וכ'; *Talm.* Rosh Hash. $24^b$ (לא תעשון כדמות ... מלאכי השרת; comp. *Bechai* on Exod. XX. 4, p. $70^a$ ed. Lemberg, שלא יעשה צורת המלאכים וכ').

3 *Talm. Jer.* Ber. IX. 1; *Talm.* Chag. $15^a$. Yet in that remarkable apocalyptic work, the fourth Book of Esdras, prayers are addressed to angels (XIII. 13), because these appear, as in the earlier Canonical Books, as nearly identical with God, or as His visible embodiments (see *Volkmar*, Das vierte Buch Esra, pp. 12, 185, 321, 401).

4 *Talm.* Sanh. $60^b$; comp. *Maim.* Hilch. Akk. II. 2 (שלא לעבוד ... לא מלאך וכ'); III. 3, 11 (אסור לצור דמות חמה... ומלאכים); *Albo*, Ikkar. II. 28.

5 *Talm.* Shabb. 6.

6 שאין מלאכי השרת מכירין בלשון ארמי.

7 Comp. *Talm.* Shabb. $12^b$: the Scriptures were translated into Chaldee, lest the angels oppose and disparage them.

8 *Talm.* Sot. $33^a$; comp. also Tosaph. Berach. $3^a$.

9 *Midr. Rabb.* Lev. XXX. 1 (העליונים צריכין צדקה אלו מאלו).

10 *Talm.* Taan. $11^a$; *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. LXXV. 3, 6; etc.; comp. *Talm.* Sanh. $59^b$, "Adam was sitting in the garden of Eden, and ministering angels roasted meat for him" (צולין לו בשר).

11 *Yalk. Shim.* I. § 427 (Lev. init. גדולים צדיקים יותר ממלאכי השרת); *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. VIII. 1.

12 *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 13; *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. XVII. med. (חכמתו מרובה משלכם).

13 *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. LXXV, 6; LXXXIV. 2.

word which God utters becomes an angel[14]; every good deed which a man performs, becomes a tutelary angel who never forsakes him[15]; the souls of the pious, as Henoch, Moses, and Elijah, are after death offered by Michael, the heavenly High-priest, on the celestial altar, and are then converted into angels[16]; new angels are perpetually created to glorify God[17], and 694 myriads join daily at His throne, singing hallelujahs, playing the timbrel, and dancing[18].

There are two chief groups of angels — those charged to extol the Divine majesty, and those entrusted with heavenly missions to men[19]. The former — divided into four sections led by Michael and Gabriel, Uriel and Raphael[20] — emerge daily by God's behest from the stream of fire (נְהַר דִּי נוּר) which flows beneath His throne, and thither they return after having sung His praises[21]; or they pass away altogether to be replaced by new creations, since no angelic choir exalts the Lord twice[22]: the great chiefs only (שָׂרִים), as Michael and Gabriel, Metatron and Sandalphon (סנדלפון), are exempted from this transitory existence, in deference to the holiness of the six days of Creation, during which they were produced[23]; Sandalphon, who, when standing on the earth, reaches with his head into heaven, and is so much

---

[14] *Talm.* Chag. 14ª, כל דבור ודבור שיוצא מפי הקב״ה וכו׳, derived from Ps. XXIII. 6.

[15] *Midr. Rabb.* Ex. XXXII. 3.

[16] *Talm.* Chagig. 12ᵇ; comp. *Midr. Rabb.* Deut. XI fin.

[17] *Midr. Rabb.* Lament. III. 22 (fol. 57 ed. Stett.); see *infra*.

[18] *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. LXV. 12; *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 12; *Talm.* Sanh. 59ᵇ; comp. Dan. VII. 10; see *supra* p. 288. A still more lavish number of stars is given — there are 291,600,000 heavenly captains, under each of whom serve 365,000 stars (*Talm.* Berach. 32ᵇ).

[19] Later Rabbins propounded a division in ten classes — the number of heavenly spheres (סְפִירוֹת) — based upon descriptions of Ezekiel and notices in other Biblical Books — viz. Holy beast-angels (חיות הקדש), the highest of all; Wheel-angels (אופנים); Light-angels (אראלים, Isai. XXXIII. 7); Amber-angels (חשמלים); Fire-angels (שרפים); Messenger-angels (מלאכים); gods (אלהים); Sons of God (בני אלהים); Cherubs (כרובים); and Men-angels (אישים); see *Maim.* Yesod. Hattor. II. 7.

[20] *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 4; *Midr. Rabb.* Num. II. 8; *Maim.* Mor. Nev. II. 10.

[21] *Talm.* Chag. 14ª; *Midr. Rabb.* ad Lament. III. 22 (fol. 57 ed. Stett.); comp. Dan. VII. 10; Henoch XIV. 19; LXXI. 1, 2; *Targ. Jon.* and *Jerus.* Gen. XXXII. 27 (מטת שעתהון דמלאכיא למשבחא); *Midr. Rabb.* Ex. XXIII. 2, 3; *ib.* Lev. XXXI. 3; comp. *ib.* Gen. LXV. 12.

[22] *Talm.* Chagig. 14ª, כל יומא ויומא נבראין מלאכי השרת מנהר די נור ואמרו שירה ובטלו; *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. LXXVIII. 1, אין כת של מעלה מקלסת ושונה וכ׳; *ib.* Lament. III. 22, בכל יום ויום בורא הקב״ה כת של מלאכים חדשים ואומרין שירה חדשה והולכין להם.

[23] *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. LXXVIII. 1; *Bechai* on Gen. XXVIII. 12 p. 86ª, יש מלאכים קיימים נצחיים לעד וכ׳.

X 2

taller than his companions "as the distance a man can walk in 500 years", usually takes his place behind the Divine chariot (מֶרְכָּבָה), and wreathes crowns for his Maker[1].

The messenger-angels receive their orders "behind the curtain" (מאחורי הפרגוד)[2], like the ministers of the Persian kings; for God is mysteriously enthroned in the seventh heaven[3], which is also the abode of the Chajoth, the Ophannim, and the Seraphim, who carry the Divine chariot[4]. He executes no decree without having first consulted His heavenly host[5]. As a rule, a single angel never performs more than one mission at a time, nor are several angels charged with the same mission[6]. They must not stay on earth longer than seven successive days; if they exceed this time, they are forbidden to return into heaven[7].

They plead before God for the pious: thus they offered to cool down the fiery furnace into which, according to a Talmudic legend, Abraham was thrown by Nimrod; they interceded for Isaac when he was about to be sacrificed; they saved Moses when Pharaoh sought his life, "an angel descending from heaven, and taking the place of Moses, who in the mean time escaped"; and they delivered Hananiah and his two companions from the flames[8]. — Every man has his own guardian angel[9], or even two[10]. Corresponding to the seventy nations and the seventy languages which were supposed to exist on earth, seventy chief protecting angels were counted[11]; and though in reality

---

1 *Talm.* Chagig. 13b.

2 *Talm.* Berach. 18b; Sanh. 89b; Yom. 77a; *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 4.

3 Comp. *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. LXXVIII. 32, הקב״ה עשה ששה רקיעים ובשביעי יושב; *Av. R. Nath.* c. 37.

4 Comp. *Talm.* Chag. 12b, 13.

5 *Talm. Jerus.* Sanh. I. fol. 18a ed. Krotosh.; *Talm.* Sanh. 38b (אין הקב״ה עושה [בעולמו] דבר אלא א״כ נמלך בפמליא של מעלה [בבית דין]); *Targ. Jon.* Gen. XI. 7 (where נֵרְדָה וְנָבְלָה is thus paraphrased: "God said to the seventy angels that were standing before Him"); *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. VIII. 2; *ibid.* Eccl. II. 12 (הקב״ה ובית דינו עשאוהו); comp. *Maim.* Mor. Nev. II. 6; *Bechai* on Gen. I. 26.

6 *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. L. 1 (אין מלאך אחד עושה שתי שליחות וכו׳); *Targ. Jon.* and *Jerus.* Gen. XVIII. 2 (לית איפשר להד מן מלאכי מרומא דישתלח בידיה יתיר מן מילא חדא); comp. *Talm.* Bab. Mets. 86b; Derech Erets c. 4 (sect. לעולם יהא); *Maim.* Mor. Nev. II. 6; see, however, Tobit III. 17.

7 This happened to עוזה and עזאל (see p. 290 note 5), who then became evil demons.

8 *Talm.* Pesach. 118 (אמר גבריאל... אמר יורקמו... ארד ואצנן וכ׳, and ארד ואצנן וכ׳); *Midr. Rab.* Gen. LV. 3, 6; *ib.* Ex. I. 22; *Yalk. Shim.* II. §. 969.

9 *Targ. Jon.* Gen. XXXIII. 10 (מלאכא דִידָךְ); *id.* XLVIII. 16 (מלאכא דזמינת לי למפרק יתי).

10 *Talm.* Chag. 16a; Taan. 11a; comp. Matth. XVIII. 10; Acts XII. 15; *Origen.* Contr. Cels. VIII. 34; also *Max. Tyr.* Diss. 26 fin.; *Arrian*, Epictet. I. 14; *Censorin.* De Die Nat. c. 3.

11 Sept. Deut. XXXII. 8 (κατὰ ἀριθ-

the Hebrews require no tutelary or interceding spirit, since, by virtue of their faith, they can always approach God Himself [12], they are yet watched over by the arch-angels Michael and Gabriel [13], who ever defend them. Thus Michael warded off Haman's calumnies [14]; and angels were supposed to have been concerned in all important incidents of history, especially the revelation on Mount Sinai, when twenty-two, nay sixty myriads descended with God [15]; although the Law proceeded from the Lord Himself and from Him only.

The stars, then still more closely associated with the angels than in the Biblical times (p. 286), were considered to exercise a paramount influence over men as well as over the animal and vegetable kingdoms: "the stars make rich, and the stars make wise", said Rabbi Chanina [16]; they grant life, children, and sustenance [17]; they join the angels in their glorification of God [18]; they existed from the beginning as intellectual and highly endowed beings; and though their knowledge does not equal the wisdom of the angels, it far surpasses that of men [19]. Like the Persian Fravashis, they are both the prototypes and the guardians (מַזָּלוֹת) of all visible creations, and "there is no single plant on earth which has not its pattern in heaven" [20].

---

μὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ for לְמִסְפַּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל); *Targ. Jon.* Gen. XI. 7, 8; *Midr. Rabb.* and *Yalk. Shim.* ad ll. cc.; *Midr. Rabb.* Num. II. 1; XIX. 4; *Talm.* Sot. 33[a].

[12] See *supra* p. 285 note 9.

[13] *Midr. Rabb.* Ex. XVIII. 2 (עשאן הקב"ה סניגורין לישראל); *Targ. Jon.* Gen. XXXII. 25; *id.* XXXVIII. 25.

[14] *Midr. Rabb.* Esth. III. 8, fol. 9 ed. Stett., כל מה שהיה המן מקטרג את ישראל מלמטה היה מיכאל מלמד עליהם סניגוריא מלמעלה; *ib.* Exod. XVIII. 2, למה מיכאל וסמאל דומין לסניגור וקטיגור עומדין בדין וכ׳.

[15] *Midr. Rabb.* Num. II. 2; *Tanchum* on Exod. XX. 1 (יתרו 16); *Bechai* on Ex. XIX. 16, p. 64[a]. This idea was derived from the Bible itself: Deut. XXXIII. 2, Sept. ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ; Ps. LXVIII. 18; Acts VII. 53; Gal. III. 19; Hebr. II. 2; comp. *Jos.* Ant. XV. v. 3 (ἐν τοῖς νόμοις δι' ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθόντων).

[16] *Talm.* Shabb. 156[a], מזל מחכים מזל מעשיר; comp. *Albo*, Ikkar. III. 18.

[17] *Talm.* Moed Kat. 28[a], לא בזכותא ... אלא במזלא תליא מלתא.

[18] Comp. *Maim.* Mor. Nev. II. 5; he contends that the stars are not "dead bodies like the fire or the earth", but "intelligent beings", "worshipping God by song and praise"; and he expressly protests against the metaphorical acceptation of such terms as "the heavens declare the glory of God" (Ps. XIX. 2); see also I. 72; II. 7, 12 *sqq.*

[19] *Maim.* Yesod. Hattor. II. 9; *Albo*, Ikkar. II. 11 (יש להם גרמים תנשות); III. 3 (הם בעלי גוף ונפש משכלת); IV. 4; etc.

[20] *Talm.* Shabb. 156[a]; Pesach. 2[b]; Bab. Kam. 16[a]; Sanh. 91[b]; *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. X. 1; LXV. 12; *Maim.* Mor. Nev. II. 10; *Spiegel*, Avesta, I. Exc. 1; comp. *Origen.* in Num. XIV. 2, opus est angelis qui praesint animalium nativitati, virgultorum plantationumque, et ceteris pluralibus incrementis, etc.

These were the views of the Pharasaic schools. The Essenes also not only attached very high importance to the functions of the angels, but searched the mystic significance of their names [1]. The Sadducees alone rejected the belief in angels, for the same reason which induced them to reject the doctrines of immortality and resurrection — because they doubted the existence of disembodied spirits [2]; but their sect was in later times neither large nor influential.

The *evil spirits* or *shedim* (שֵׁדִים) assume in Jewish writings even larger dimensions than the devs in the works of the Parsees, who dwell with predilection upon the creatures of light. But their power is significantly circumscribed; for they are never allowed, like the devs, to attack or to disturb the good angels; and hence they are not, like their Persian originals, laden with curses and imprecations; on the contrary, as they must perform the commands of God, they contribute to His glory, in spite of their knavish trickery. Men may even make them obedient and useful. The half-shedim, who resemble human beings in appearance, are especially docile and tractable; one of them, "the shed Joseph", enlightened a Rabbi as to the attributes of his king Asmodeus; another was compelled by his master Rabbi Papa to perform for him all kinds of domestic services [3]. But no mortal exercised more absolute dominion over the spirits than king Solomon; he subjected and governed them at his pleasure, as he subjected and governed the winds. "Whenever he was in a cheerful mood, he summoned before him the wild beasts and the birds of heaven, the demons and the night-spectres, to let them dance in his presence, and to awe them with his power". He understood their speech as they understood his. For never could human hands alone have accomplished all his wonderful buildings. Securing the help of supernatural beings [4], he commanded an army of "genii and men and birds" [5]. Some of the demons dived for him into the seas, and brought up precious pearls, others obtained in distant lands valuable works of art for the adornment of his palaces [6]. But all assisted him in the erection of the Temple; for this, the most splendid of his works, he forced into his service even the formidable Asmodeus, who lives on a high mountain,

---

[1] *Joseph.* Bell. Jud. II. VIII. 7.

[2] Acts XXIII. 8.

[3] *Talm.* Pesach. 110[a]; Chull. 105[b]; comp. Yevam. 122[a].

[4] Thus were interpreted the words in Eccles. II. 8, "I procured mistress and mistresses" (שִׁדָּה וְשִׁדּוֹת).

[5] *Koran* XXVII. 17, جنوده من الجن والانس والطير.

[6] *Koran* XXI. 82, ومن الشياطين من يغوصون له.

whence he daily ascends into heaven, to listen to the instruction which God imparts to His angels, and then to diffuse it on earth to man's misfortune. Solomon's valiant general Benaiah managed by stratagem to inebriate him; then throwing round his neck a chain on which the holy name of God was inscribed, he brought him into the royal palace. At that time Solomon was perplexed how to obtain the wonderful worm *shamir*, which had been produced towards the evening of the sixth day of Creation[7], and which by its mere touch broke and fashioned the hardest stones; it was only by means of that worm, that the king could hope to carry out the Divine injunction, that no iron instrument should be used in the construction of the altar[8]. Therefore, when he saw Asmodeus, he at once ordered him to procure the *shamir*. After many subterfuges, the demon assisted Benaiah in wresting the worm from the prince of the sea by the aid of a certain bird, probably the hoopoe, the Arabic *hud-hud* (هدهد)[9]. When, by false and tempting promises, he had obtained release from his fetters, and had moreover secured Solomon's holy ring, he grew forthwith into a colossal giant touching the earth with his feet and heaven with his head; he devoured the king, and then vomited him forth a distance of four hundred parasangs; and assuming Solomon's form, he sat upon his throne, and consorted with his wives even during their impurity. Solomon was all this time obliged to wander about, and to beg alms for his subsistence; but at last he succeeded in seizing his signet and chain, when he held the tetragrammaton before the monster, and thus compelled him to flee[10].

The demons are of both sexes, shedim and shedoth[11] — the Persian *Devs* and *Pairikas*. Their origin is infinitely varied. Satan was created together with Eve when she was formed from Adam's rib[12]. The demons arose from the soul of Adam after his first disobedience, from the spirits of the sinful people who lived at the time of the Deluge, and from the minds of the worst of those who built the Tower of

[7] *Pirk. Av.* V. 6.

[8] Exod. XX. 25; 1 Ki. VI. 7.

[9] Comp. *P. Cassel*, Shamir, pp. 72 *sqq.*; see *supra* p. 154.

[10] Comp. *Targ. Shen.* Esther; *Talm.* Gitt. 68; Sot. 48[b]; see also *Targ.* Eccl. II. 4; *Midr. Rabb.* Cant. init. (הכל משיעין את המלך ... ואפילו רוחות ואפילו שדים ואפילו מלאכי השרת); *ibid.* Num. XI. 3, 6; *Jos.* Ant. VIII. II. 5 (μαθεῖν . . . καὶ τὴν κατὰ τῶν δαιμόνων τέχνην εἰς ὠφέλειαν καὶ θεραπείαν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κτλ.). These legends are supposed to have a parallel in the Iranic myths about the hero-king Takhmo-urupis or Tahmuraf; comp. *Kohut*, Jüd. Angelog. pp. 84—86.

[11] שֵׁדִים, שֵׁדוֹת.

[12] *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. XVII. 2, כיון שנבראת נברא שטן עמה; *Bechai* on Gen. II. 21, p. 24[b] (ad ויסגור — "here the letter ס occurs for the first time, to teach that Satan — שטן — was created together with the woman"!).

Babel; and they are continually generated from the shades and misdeeds of the wicked[1], from the spine of the godless who never bend down to worship their Creator[2], and from unchaste dreams and nocturnal accidents[3]. When, after the Fall, Adam was doomed to die, he lived apart from his wife for 130 years, because he was unwilling to produce sinful and perishable beings; but during that time, both were joined by male and female demons, and became the fruitful parents of mischievous goblins and evil spirits[4].

The demons are not less numerous than the angels; for they "surround mortals as the earth surrounds the root of the vine"; and every man has at all times thousand shedim on his left, and ten thousand on his right side, all ready to ensnare him; if he could see their crowd, he would wonder how he was able to live in the world[5]; though any one might behold them by throwing upon his eyes the ashes of certain parts of black cats[6]. They hover mainly in the lower regions of the air, which they completely fill[7]. When they descend on the earth, they delight in taking up their abode on certain shrubs or trees, as the caper-bush (פרחי) and spearwort (זכבי), in companies of at least sixty on one plant[8], or on nut trees in groups of nine; it is, therefore, most dangerous to sleep under or near such plants. Often they dwell in ruins and deserted solitudes, which should, therefore, be scrupulously avoided[9], or in privies[10], and under gutters[11]. It once happened, that porters, who were carrying a cask of wine, desirous of resting themselves, set down their burden beneath a gutter; not long afterwards a demon came and broke the cask. The men went to Rabbi Mar Bar Ashi, who, blowing a trumpet, summoned the spirit, and asked him sternly, why he had committed the offence? "Because they put the cask on my ears", he replied. "But you have no business", rejoined the Rabbi, "to stay at a frequented place; you must pay for the wine". A certain time was allowed him to procure the money; the term had long expired when he at last made his appearance; upbraided

---

[1] *Talm.* Sanh. 109[a]; *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 34; *Yalk. Shim.* II. § 196.

[2] *Talm.* Bab. Kam. 16[a].

[3] Comp. *Sohar* on Gen. VI. 1 *sqq.*

[4] *Talm.* Erub. 18[b]; Yevam. 61; *Sohar* l. c.; *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. X. 10; *Yalk. Shim.* I. § 42; *Bechai* on Gen. V. 3, fol. 32[b].

[5] *Talm.* Berach. 6[a] (כי כסלא לאיניא, see *Rashi* in loc.), 51[a].

[6] *Talm.* Berach. 6[a].

[7] Comp. Ephes. II. 2; see also *Diog. Laert.* Prooem. 7 (εἰδώλων πλήρη εἶναι τὸν ἀέρα); VIII. 32; IX. 7 (πάντα ψυχῶν εἶναι καὶ δαιμόνων πλήρη).

[8] *Talm.* Pesach. 111[b].

[9] *Talm.* Berach. 3[a].

[10] *Talm.* Berach. 62[a]; Shabb. 67[a]; Gitt. 70[a], where very curious conceits may be read.

[11] *Talm.* Chull. 105[b] דלא יתבי תותי מרזיבא.

by the Rabbi for the delay, he answered, "We have no power over things that are tied up and sealed, or measured and counted, and we must wait till we find things lying about free and unguarded"[12]. — Demons abound especially in the northern parts of the earth, which, left unfinished by God as a challenge to any other deity or power to supplement the deficiency, are veiled in darkness (צפון), and thence they spread over the whole world[13].

Being active at all hours in attacking both individuals and multitudes[14], they are generally divided into demons of morning, noon, and night[15]. Those of noon[16] fall eagerly upon men while taking rest in the heat of the day[17]. But the most mischievous are those who roam about at night, and those that send lying and deluding dreams. Man must therefore salute no one in the dark, for it might be a demon[18], nor must he sleep alone in a house on peril of being seized by a lilith[19]. Whosoever ventures out by himself before the morning dawn or the cockcrow, must expect misfortune[20]. Rabbi Jose, the son of Rabbi Jehudah, said, "Do not go out unattended in the night, especially on Wednesdays and Sabbaths, for then Lilith haunts the air with her train of eighteen myriads of wicked spirits, every one of which has the power of doing harm". On those nights men should drink no water, except out of white vessels after having recited "the seven voices" alluded to by David[21], or after having uttered a certain mysterious formula[22], or called some person present by name, or struck with the lid upon the vessel, or thrown something into it, or driven away Shavriri (שברירי), the

[12] *Talm.* Chull. $105^b$.

[13] *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 3 (פנת הצפון ברא ולא גמרו כי); *Yalk. Shim.* II. § 263; comp. *Nachman.* on Lev. XVII. 7, fol. 96 ed. Pressb.; see also *Vendid.* XIX. 1, 140—147; *It.* XXII. 25.

[14] *Talm.* Kiddush. $29^b$.

[15] צפריין, טיהרין, and ליליין or טלנין (comp. *Targ.* Cant. IV. 6). Rashi, following older authorities, explains in Ps. XCI. 6 מִדֶּבֶר יִמְקֶטֶב, "these are names of shedim, the one injures by night, the other at noon"; also on ver. 5 (עד המעשה כחץ) and Targ. in loc. (שדין דמהבלין בטיהרא); comp. *Midr. Rabb.* Num. XII. 4 (יש מזיק שהוא פורח באויר כעוף וכ׳).

[16] Comp. *Sept.* Ps. XCI. 6, δαιμόνια μεσημβρινά.

[17] *Targ.* Cant. IV. 6; *id.* Ps. XCI. 5, 6. A similar superstition prevailed among the Greeks and Romans (*Philostr.* Her. I. 4), and others.

[18] *Talm.* Megil. $3^a$; Sanh. $44^a$; Erub. $63^b$.

[19] *Talm.* Shabb. $151^b$, אסור לישן בבית יחידי וכ׳; comp. Berach. $43^b$.

[20] *Talm.* Derech Erets $25^a$, sect. היוצא בדרך לבדו וכ׳; Yom. $21^a$. According to Persian notions also, the cock, that is, the bird Parôdars or Kahrkatac, chases away the night-daevas; comp. *Vendid.* XVIII. 36, 40, and ibid. *Spiegel*, note on § 52; see *supra* p. 25.

[21] Viz. Ps. XXIX. 3—5, 7—9, "the voice of the Lord is upon the waters," etc.

[22] לול שפן אנגרין אגרדפין.

demon of blindness, by crying aloud, "My mother has warned me to heed Shavriri, Vriri, Riri, Ri; I yearn for water in white vessels"[1].

At no time is it advisable to drink from any utensil without having previously poured out some of its contents, because demons may have quenched their thirst from the same vessel. When once the ministering shed of Rabbi Papa, who had been sent to fetch water from the river, was rebuked for having stayed out too long, he said, "I was obliged to wait till the bad water of which the demons had drunk, had flowed away"[2]; but when he saw his master pour out some of the water before he drank, he said, if he had been aware that such was his custom, he might have come back sooner. Rabbis and students of the Law are particularly persecuted by demons: their clothes wear off and tear sooner than those of other people, because "the shedim constantly rub themselves against them"[3].

According to some, especially Palestinian doctors, the demons are incorporeal, or consist of air and fire; for God, having created their souls towards the evening of the sixth day, was prevented from fashioning their bodies on account of the approaching Sabbath[4]. Yet, ordinarily, they are conceived, like the angels, as being provided with wings, which enable them to move rapidly from one end of the world to the other[5]. For the sake of mischief and deception, they often assume the "image" (בבואה) of a man[6], and, in fact, any shape; one of them, for instance, appeared as a dragon with seven heads[7], and another taught Rabbi Chaninah the whole Law in the guise of a frog; one resembles a calf with a revolving horn issuing from the middle of the forehead, and another (Ketev) has one eye fixed on the heart, and any creature, whether man or beast, that looks at it, must die[8]. They eat and drink like men — in this respect unlike the Persian devs, who take no food, because eating in the present state of the world is a *good* thing —, and like men they propagate and die[9]. As a rule,

---

[1] *Talm.* Pesach. 111, 112; Avod. Zar. 12$^{b}$; *Midr. Rabb.* Num. XII. 2.

[2] *Talm.* Chull. 105$^{b}$, 106$^{a}$, עד דחלפו מים הרעים.

[3] *Talm.* Berach. 6$^{a}$, הני מאני דרבנן דבלו מחופיא דידהו.

[4] *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. c. vii. fin.; *Yalk. Shim.* I. § 12.

[5] *Talm.* Chag. 16$^{a}$; *Av. Rab. Nath.* c. 37.

[6] Though not "the image of his image" (בבואה דבבואה); *Talm.* Yevam. 122$^{a}$; Gitt. 66$^{a}$.

[7] *Talm.* Kidd. 29$^{b}$.

[8] *Midr. Rabb.* Num. XII. 4. Satan appeared once in the shape of a bird (בציפרתא); *Talm.* Sanh. 107$^{a}$.

[9] *Talm.* Chag. 16$^{b}$; *Av. Rab. Nath.* c. 37; *Nachman.* on Lev. XVII. 7. Cain was considered as the son of Eve and Sammael (*Yalk. Chad.* 1$^{a}$, § 12.

one hundred demons expire daily[10]; and Noah therefore took a couple of them into the Ark, lest the race became extinct[11]: Lilith alone and her offspring are except from death. They may be bound and chained[12]. Often they quarrel among themselves, nay they kill each other, and summon the aid of the pious against their opponents[13].

They know the future which, like the angels, they hear "behind the curtain"[14]; yet they ought not to be consulted on Sabbath; indeed to avoid danger, it is prudent not to consult them at all; if yet their advice is sought, it should be done by means of oil or of egg-shells[15]. Some of them even frequent the places of worship, and study the Law like the Jews, and are hence called "Jewish devils" (שדין יהודאין); thus it often happens in Synagogues on Sabbaths, that, although there appears to be ample room, the people feel inconveniently crowded, because the demons press between them to listen to the sermon or religious discussion[16].

The female demons are subjected to the rule of their queen Lilith[17], who is pictured with wings and long flowing hair[18], and who, delighting in wild gambols, like most spectres, is called, "the evil dancer" or Mochlath[19]. Yet Mochlath and Lilith are occasionally treated as two distinct she-devils, the former being attended by 478, the latter by 480 companies of demons[20], the one dancing and singing, the other incessantly howling[21]: both live in constant enmity against each other; yet they meet in open feud only on the Day of Atonement, and while they are thus engaged in strife, the Jews are enabled to send up to God their prayers and confessions, unmolested by accusers and slanderers.

---

[10] *Seph. ben Sir.* 9ª (quoted by *Eisenm.* Entd. Judenth. II. 417), בכל יום מתים מאה מן השדים.

[11] *Bechai* on Gen. VI. 19 ad מכל החי, p. 37ª (מן ימחי באייר); they came of themselves into the Ark, and are hinted at in the words כל כנף (Gen. VII. 14) — שהם טסים באויר.

[12] *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 45; *Talm.* Berach. 6ª.

[13] *Yalk. Shim.* II. § 680.

[14] *Talm.* Chag. 16ª; *Av. Rab. Nath.* c. 37; *supra*, p. 308.

[15] שרי שמן ושרי ביצין מיתרין לשאול בהן; *Talm.* Sanh. 101ª.

[16] *Talm.* Berach. 6ª, האי דוחקא דהוי בכלה מינייהו הוי.

[17] *Talm.* Gitt. 68ª.

[18] *Talm.* Erub. 100ᵇ; Nidd. 24ᵇ; she is sonsidered to correspond to the Persian *Bùshyançta*, the female demon of indolence and sleep.

[19] אַגְרַת בַּת מַחֲלַת, *Talm.* Pesach. 112ᵇ; *Midr. Rabb.* Num. XII. 4 (אגרת בת מחלת ומרכבתה); comp. Isai. XIII. 21.

[20] According to the numerical value of their respective names מחלת and לִילִית.

[21] According to the real or supposed meaning of their names, from חלל and ילל.

The male demons, as has been observed, are ranged under their chief Ashmadai (Asmodeus, אַשְׁמְדַאי)[1], the Persian *Aeshma*, who is the auxiliary of Ahriman in his warfare against Ormuzd[2]; or they obey the rule of Satan or Sammael[3]. Asmodeus is consistently pictured as malignant, wrathful, and insatiably lascivious; he weeps at men's happiness, and exults at their misfortune; he mocks the weak, and strives to weaken the strong; he abuses his marvellous skill for villany, and he ruthlessly employs his knowledge for mischief[4]. He is the demon of matrimony and "the patron of faithless couples"[5]. Sometimes he is identified with Sammael or Satan himself, as the type of moral and physical evil: for Sammael (סַמָּאֵל) is the angel of death[6] who, by instilling a drop of gall (סַם) into the mouth of the sick, causes the sudden cessation of life; and Satan is, like Ahriman, at once the Deceiver, the Accuser, and the Destroyer of man and of all organic life, and therefore, even more usually than Sammael, the Angel of Death.

This character of Satan and his associates is systematically worked out in the Midrashic expositions of the history of the patriarchs and other eminent men. It is developed with particular fulness in connection with Abraham's intended sacrifice of Isaac[7]. At the time of the exodus, Sammael, presenting himself before God, expressed surprise that He was dividing the Red Sea for a people defiled by the worst forms of idolatry; then, in order to turn away his attention, God delivered up to him the pious Job, "who was one of Pharaoh's counsellors", and, like Balaam and Jethro, one of his conjurors; and while the Accuser was busy in harassing his victim, the Israelites crossed the sea in safety[8]. Fifteen hundred myriads of accusing angels (מקטרגין) endeavoured, to prevent God from favouring the Israelites with His glory (שכינה). After the worship of the golden calf, at which Satan was present dancing and singing[9] and deluding the Hebrews[10], he exultingly impeached them before God; but

---

[1] *Talm.* Gitt. 68; Pesach. 110[a]; *Targ.* Eccles. I. 12.

[2] The etymology from אַשְׁמָא and דאי or dev, and the meaning "he who has vehement desires", seem precarious.

[3] *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 13, סמאל השר הגדול שבשמים; *Midr. Rabb.* Deut. XI. 3, מלאך סמאל הרשע ראש כל השטנים; *Talm.* Gitt. 68[a].

[4] *Talm.* Gitt. 68; comp. *Eisenmeng.* Entd. Judenth. I. 350—362.

[5] *Talm.* Pesach. 110.

[6] Comp. *Targ. Jon.* Gen. III. 6.

[7] Comp. *Talm.* Sanh. 89[b]; *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 32; *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. LVI. 1; *Yalk. Shim.* I. §§ 98, 99; *Tanchum.* Gen. XXII (p. 39[a] ed. Stett.).

[8] *Midr. Rabb.* Exod. XXI. 4.

[9] *Targ. Jon.* Ex. XXXII. 19, וסטנא הוה בגויה מטפז ומשורר.

[10] Comp. *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 45, סמאל נכנס לתוך העגל והיה גועה להתעות וכ.

Moses put him to flight, and pleaded for the people[11]. When the arch-angels Gabriel and Michael shrank from the Divine behest of taking away the soul of the great lawgiwer, Sammael was entrusted with the mission. He found Moses writing the holy name of God, his face radiant like the sun, and in appearance like an angel. The prophet, recounting the great deeds of his life, refused to give up his soul to the demon, who, returning to God, asked for fresh instructions; and when the charge was renewed, Sammael rushed with his drawn sword upon Moses, who by touching his adversary with his staff, forced him to flee; he pursued him with the holy name of God, tore off his horn from between his eyes, and struck him with blindness; whereupon God Himself, accompanied by the three arch-angels Gabriel, Michael, and Sagsagel, took back the soul of His greatest and most faithful prophet[12]. Undaunted by the failure of his subordinate, Satan now contended with Michael for the privilege of burying the body of Moses, but he was as signally humiliated as Sammael; and the great chief was buried by "immortal powers"[13].

All these conceptions, however strange and fanciful, contrast favourably with their Persian prototypes: Ahriman and Ormuzd are "twins", both existed from the beginning, and the former is a creator like the latter; whereas the Jewish Satan, not coeval with God, was created like the angels and like men; he was originally even a good spirit, a great prince in heaven[14], endowed with twelve wings, while the Seraphim have only six and the Chajoth four; but when he grew contumacious, he was expelled from the celestial abodes, and then he rode down to the earth upon the back of the serpent; but finally he will be curbed by the Messiah, who will at the same time subdue death, and bring hell within the boundaries of Paradise[15]; then he will be thrown into the flaming abyss[16], and, in the time of resurrection, will be attacked by the angel Gabriel and annihilated for ever[17].

Yet in spite of this moderation, which is more prominent in the

---

11 *Midr. Rabb.* Exod. XLIII. init.

12 *Midr. Rabb.* Deut. XI. 4; *Yalk. Shim.* I. § 940, fol. 304 col. 2, 3.

13 *Philo*, Vit. Mos. III. 39 (ἐτάφη... χερσὶν οὐ θνηταῖς, ἀλλ' ἀθανάτοις δυνάμεσιν); Jude 9; comp. *Lightfoot*, Op. I. 353; see also *Midr. Rabb.* Exod. XVIII. 2, "Michael and Sammael stand before God, Satan accuses, and Michael defends Israel; Satan speaks again, but is at last silenced by Michael."

14 *Yalk. Shim.* I. § 25, היה סמאל שר גדול בשמים.

15 *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. XXX. 5; *ibid.* Num. V. 12.

16 This ultimate triumph is typified by a light preserved under God's throne; comp. *Talm.* Succ. 52[a]; *Yalk. Shim.* II. § 359.

17 Comp. *Talm.* Bab. Bathr. 75[a].

Palestinian doctors who were less exposed to Persian influence, it would be erroneous to represent the Jewish demonology as a harmless fancy, and to consider the spirits, not as powers of mischief, but simply as "wayward goblins". The shedim bear the distinctive names of "injurers" and "destroyers" [1], they send every kind of disease and infirmity, as heart-burn, erysipelas, and asthma [3], leprosy of garments and of houses; even death is inflicted by the demons Ketev (קֶטֶב) and Meriri (מְרִירִי) [4]; these rage most fiercely during the three weeks preceding the anniversary of the destruction of Jerusalem, killing any one who happens to look at them, and in this manner king Hezekiah is believed to have met his death [5]. The shedim fill the whole world, and if those shut up in the depths of the seas were to be let loose, they would destroy the whole earth [6]. They keep man in perpetual alarm, and force him to unceasing warfare. They have indeed, like Satan and Ahriman, no power over the pious; they keep aloof from those who are praying, or studying the Law; and they may be disarmed by prescribed exorcisms and incantations [7]. But who can look upon himself as perfectly pious? And who can maintain a breathless study of the Law and unbroken devotions, or be ever ready with potent spells, to ward off the terrible hosts?

---

The preceding sketch, it is hoped, will help to illustrate the history of monotheism in its various stages, as reflected in the Hebrew Scriptures, the Apocrypha, and the New Testament. It will be easy to decide how far there is truth in the popular view that the Jews returned from the Babylonian captivity "a people of Puritans", averse to all material notions of the Deity, and how far they adhered to the lofty spiritualism of the prophets; and the reader will be able to trace the sources from which the demonology of the Talmud, the Fathers, and the Catholic Church has been derived. No one indeed can fail to perceive, that the later Jewish authorities, however they may have enlarged or modified the earlier conceptions of the supernatural world, never ceased to look upon God as the absolute Lord of all created beings, though the danger of

---

1 מַלְאֲכֵי חֲבָלָה, מַזִּיקִין.

2 קירדייקוס, καρδιακός, καρδιαλγία.

3 *Talm.* Gitt. 67[b]; Sanh. 101[a].

4 Deut. XXXII. 24; comp. Ps. XCI. 6.

5 *Midr. Rabb.* Num. XII. 14, חזקיהו ראה אותו ונפל על פניו ומת.

6 *Bechai* on Exod. XX. 4, p. 70[a] ואלמלא ניתנה להם רשות לעלות היו מחריבים את העולם.

7 *Talm.* Macc. 10[a]; Shabb. 30[b]; Kiddush. 29[b]; Sanh. 44[b]; etc.; comp. Bundehesh c. 1.

adopting a double principle was not always avoided[8]: yet the numberless spirits, recognised as real powers both by the people and their learned teachers, and the assumption of a busy interference of those beings in all the concerns of life, plainly implied the desertion of an unqualified monotheism. Dividing man's attention in many directions, they could not fail to disturb that harmony which flows from the principle of one all-pervading and all-ruling Deity.

---

[8] Comp. *Talm.* Chag. 15[a]; Acher (Elisha ben Abujah) recognised שתי רשויות, see p. 298 note 3.

# TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY.

## CHAPTER XVI.

SUMMARY. — After the death of Aaron's two eldest sons, God commands him through Moses to enter the Holy of Holies only on one day of the year (vers. 1, 2), and then not in his usual official robes, but exclusively in garments of white linen; on that occasion he is to provide himself with a young bullock for a sin-offering, and a ram for a holocaust, while the people has to furnish two kids of the goats for expiation, and a ram for a holocaust (vers. 3—5). While he is preparing to offer up the bullock, the two goats are placed at the entrance of the Tabernacle, and by lot he sets apart one of them for God, and the other for Azazel, to whom it is to be sent into the wilderness; he appoints the one as a sin-offering for the people, and expiates the other by causing it to stand at the Tabernacle "before the Lord" (vers. 6—10). He now sacrifices the bullock as a sin-offering, to secure atonement for himself and the whole priesthood (ver. 11). Then taking a censer and filling it with live coals from the brazen Altar in the Court, and two handfuls of pounded incense, he enters the Holy of Holies for the first time; there he throws the incense on the coals, so that the rising cloud covers the Mercy-seat on the Ark (vers. 12, 13). Returning to the Court, he takes some of the blood of the bullock, enters for the second time the Holy of Holies, and sprinkles a part of the blood with his finger on the front or eastern side of the Mercy-seat itself, and a part, by a sevenfold aspersion, on the ground before it (ver. 14). He goes back to the Court, where he deposits the vessel with the remaining blood of the bullock; kills the goat appointed as a sin-offering for the people, passes a third time into the Holy of Holies with some of the blood of that goat, and proceeds with it exactly as he has done with the blood of the bullock (ver. 15): thus the expiation of the Holy of Holies is completed (ver. 16). Now he returns to the Court, puts some of the bullock's blood (which he had left in the Court) together with some of the goat's blood (which he still holds in his hand) all round the horns of the brazen Altar, and sprinkles seven times upon its surface: thus he expiates the Holy and the Court (ver. 17—19). Now he orders the live goat to be brought to him; he lays both his hands upon its head, confesses all the sins of the people, and transfers them to the animal, which a man, appointed for the purpose, leads into a lonely part of the desert (vers. 20—22). The High-

**priest now enters again the Holy, where he lays off the linen garments; he then bathes himself in water and puts on his splendid official vestments. Appearing in the Court, he sacrifices the two rams as holocausts, the one for himself, and the other for the people; and thus the expiation is finally accomplished. He throws the fat and the fat parts of the two sin-offerings into the flames on the brazen Altar (vers. 23—25); while the flesh of both victims with their skins and their dung is burnt beyond the boundaries of the camp; the man who performs this duty becomes unclean, and must bathe himself and wash his garments before he is allowed to return into the camp; and the same lustrations are required of the person who takes the goat to Azazel into the desert (vers. 26—28). — These ceremonies shall, in perpetuity, be performed by the High-priest every year on the tenth day of the seventh month, when all the members of the Hebrew community, both natives and strangers, are to fast and to abstain from any work whatsoever (vers. 29—34).**

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they approached be-

**1, 2.** The varied compilation of Leviticus attempts, though with indifferent success, a certain continuity or even system of arrangement. The hand of the final reviser, labouring to reduce the miscellaneous materials at least to some semblance of unity, is manifest in various links and transitions; and it is unmistakable in the connection which he desires to establish between a preceding narrative and the rituals of the Day of Atonement: Nadab and Abihu died because they had entered the Sanctuary in an unlawful manner and at an irregular time (X. 1,2) — thus the High-priest, if he wishes to avoid a similar catastrophe, must not go into the Holy of Holies at all seasons, but only on one day in the year, and has then to perform certain minutely prescribed ceremonies. Yet this connection is slight, if not artificial; and the Day of Atonement is so circuitously and so indirectly approached that its date and nature are only mentioned at the end of a long description, as if by way of appendix (vers. 29 *sqq.*). This peculiarity of style adds weight to the internal evidence which tends to prove, that we have before us the first written law on the Day of Atonement, which is not even mentioned by its current name (יוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים); and it stands in marked contrast to the clear and precise injunctions later given on the same subject:"—Also on the tenth day of this seventh month there shall be a holy Day of Atonement; it shall be a convocation to you; and you shall afflict your souls, and offer an offering made by fire to the Lord. And you shall do no work in that same day; for it is a Day of Atonement, to make an atonement for you before the Lord your God . . . It shall be to you a perfect Sabbath, and you shall afflict your souls: in the ninth day of the month in the evening, from evening to evening, shall you celebrate your Sabbath" (XXIII. 27, 28, 32; comp. also Num. XXIX. 7—11).

But it must be confessed that, up to a certain point, the means prescribed are thoughtfully adapted to the ends which they were intended to serve; and they embrace almost the whole of the impressive ritual which an advanced hierarchy had been able to devise. In unfolding the text we may,

**fore the Lord and died; 2. And the Lord said to Moses, Speak to Aaron thy brother, that he must not come at**

therefore, find opportunities of pointing out the genius of Hebrew symbolism.

It would hardly be possible to carry farther than is done in these ordinances, the caste-like division of the people and, in exact correspondence with it, the strict separation of the different parts of the Tabernacle (comp. Exod. XL. 34, 35; Num. IV. 15, 19; see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 578, 588—591). The manner in which the High-priest had to prepare himself for his functions, was scrupulously prescribed by Jewish tradition. Seven days before the festival, he was separated from his wife, and conducted into a special cell (פלהדרין). During this week he zealously practised the numerous manipulations required by his office; and the elders read and expounded to him the ordinances of our chapter. In the night from the ninth to the tenth day of Tishri, when it was deemed expedient to ward off sleep, he explained the rituals, if he was a scholar; and if not, they were explained to him by others; or he read, and if he could not read, others read to him, from interesting Books, such as Job, Ezra, the Chronicles, and Daniel. Should drowsiness overcome him, the priests were to keep him awake by all possible means, as by snapping their fingers, or by making him walk on the cold pavement of the Court. Thirteen priests were appointed by lot for the ordinary duties of the festival. When the ashes had been removed from the brazen Altar, and the chief of the priests (הממונה or סְגָן) had ascertained that morning had dawned, and the time for the early sacrifice had arrived, the High-priest was conducted to his bath, and the ceremonials of the day commenced (*Mishn.* Yom. I. 1—III. 2). To meet the emergency of his becoming disqualified for the service, a substitute was selected.

Philological Remarks. — The presumed connection of our chapter with the completion of the Tabernacle (*Wechsler* l. c. p. 121.), which was erected on the first day of the *first* month (Exod. XL. 2), is not obvious. The statement with regard to the golden Altar in Exod. XXX. 10, "And Aaron shall make an atonement upon its horns once in a year with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement", is hardly the germ out of which the institution of the Day of Atonement with its complex ceremonials has grown (*Gramberg*, Rel. Id. I. 123); the statement seems, on the contrary, to refer to that institution as firmly established; it implies, therefore, an instructive hint as to the date of the Pentateuch and the mode of its composition (p. 278). An artificial division of the chapter into *ten* commands has here also been proposed by Bertheau (Sieben Gruppen, pp. 193—196), but with the usual unsatisfactory result; he assumes that new injunctions begin at each of the eight verses which contain the name of Aaron up to ver. 25 (viz. at vers. 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 21, 23), that two more commence with vers. 26 and 27, while vers. 29—34 are merely an exhortatory appendix — as if the injunctions of fasting and complete rest were not as essential as any other command of our chapter. — קָרְבָתָם *their coming near* is the construct infinitive Kal with the feminine termination (קָרְבָה, Exod. XXXVI. 2; comp. XL. 32), like אָכְלָה, טֻמְאָה, מִשְׁחָה, etc; see Gramm. II.

all times into the Sanctuary within the vail before the Mercy-seat which *is* upon the Ark, lest he die; for I appear in the cloud upon the Mercy-seat.

3. Thus shall Aaron come into the Sanctuary: with a young bullock for a sin-offering, and a ram for a

§. XXXIX. 1. The translation of קרב as a transitive verb is, therefore, incorrect (so Sept. ἐν τῷ προςφέρειν αὐτοὺς πῦρ ἀλλότριον; comp. X. 1, ויקריבו···אש זרה; Vulg. offerentes ignem alienum; Engl. Vers. when they offered before the Lord; etc.). — The High-priest was to expiate the people on one day of the year (ver. 34), yet was he, on that day, to enter the Holy of Holies, not merely once (ἅπαξ, Hebr. IX. 7), but four times, as the detailed rituals show (see Summary). — קֹדֶשׁ (ver. 2) is in this chapter frequently employed for the Holy of Holies (so vers. 3, 16, 17, 20, 27), and is described with great minuteness as the place "within the vail, before the Mercy-seat which is upon the Ark" (Sept. τὸ ἅγιον τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος); it is once called מִקְדַּשׁ הַקֹּדֶשׁ (ver. 33), and not as usual קֹדֶשׁ הַקֳּדָשִׁים (Exod. XXVI. 33, 34; Lev. XXI. 22; Num. IV. 19; etc.). — The words בֶּעָנָן אֵרָאֶה וגו' can hardly have any other meaning than that pointed out above (similarly Sept., Vulg., Targ. Jer., Rashi, Saad., Ebn Ezr. a. o.); they cannot fitly signify that whenever the High-priest enters the Holy of Holies, he must produce a cloud over the Mercy-seat by fumigation (comp. ver. 13); for if that were the only condition, he might enter any number of times; moreover, the cloud in which God *appears* (אֵרָאֶה) is the very reverse of the cloud of incense intended to *veil* His presence or its sacred symbol; and the former is always of miraculous or Divine origin, while the latter is not. — The Masoretic accentuation of the second verse is strange; the athnach which is under לַפָּרֹכֶת would more appropriately stand under יָמוּת; it has been supposed that that accentuation is meant to express the view of the Pharisees, that the High-priest was to throw the incense on the coals in the Holy of Holies itself (vers. 12, 13), though at some distance from the Ark, in opposition to the view of the Sadducees, who held that the incense was to be put on the coals already in the Court, since it could not reverently be done "before God", and since otherwise the High-priest, when entering, would see the Ark (*Talm. Jer.* Yom. $39^{a}$ ed. Krotosch.; *Talm.* Yom. $19^{b}$, $53^{a}$): with the received accents the words in question are to be thus translated — "Speak to Aaron thy brother that he must not come at all times into the Sanctuary within the vail, *nor must he proceed* to the Mercy-seat which *is* upon the Ark" (comp. *Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. II. 29—31). There can be no doubt that the fumigation commenced in the Holy of Holies itself (ver. 13); and the Biblical text is unconcerned about the Pharisaic scruples that the High-priest, after having passed through the vail from the Holy, might possibly see the Ark.

**3—5.** In harmony with the general rule that the victim or offering presented must be the property of him who presents it, the High-priest was obliged to procure from his private means a young bullock and a ram, by which his own atonement and that of his order was to be wrought, while the people had to provide for their purification two

**burnt-offering. 4. He shall put on a holy linen tunic, and he shall have linen drawers upon his flesh, and shall be girded with a linen girdle, and with a linen mitre**

kids of the goats and a ram. For though the religious chief of the nation stood on a high eminence of sanctity, because he was endowed with the spirit of God, he was never declared sinless or infallible; he was "the holy of the Lord" in so far as he alone was appointed to act as intercessor for the people at the throne of mercy; but in every other respect, he was not above the meanest of the nation; he had to strive by every effort to preserve or to restore his moral purity; and, like all mortals, he depended on the compassion of God the Judge. Therefore, he had indeed to present for his sin-offering the *victima maxima* — a young bullock — as a mark of his high position in the theocratic commonwealth, but he was to offer it, and indeed to perform all the subsequent ceremonies of expiation, not in those splendid vestments made for "glory and distinction" and proclaiming his exalted prerogatives both by their costly materials, their skilful workmanship, and their symbolical significance, but in "holy garments" of plain white linen — linen being the ordinary material for priestly robes throughout the ancient world, and the white colour typifying purity and meekness —; and those garments were to consist not of eight, but, like those of the ordinary priests, of four pieces only — the tunic, the drawers, the girdle, and the mitre (מִצְנֶפֶת): of these none but the last-named indicated superiority over the other members of the priesthood, whose head-covering, so characteristic in Eastern official attire, was a lower and less striking "turban" (מִגְבָּעָה; see Comm. on Lev. I. 101, 102, 531). But, on the other hand, the High-priest, though in ordinary times merely equal in dignity to the community as a whole, stood above it on the Day of Atonement, when he alone officiated by virtue of his special election and exceptional holiness, and when, more than on any other occasion, it was evident that "the crown of the anointing oil of his God was upon him" (XXI. 12). While his sin-offering, therefore, was a bullock, that of the people was only a kid of the goats; this was sufficient to mark the difference suggested by the spirit of the ceremonial. Such was obviously the view taken by the author of our chapter; and thus only can we account for the opposition in which these injunctions stand to a general law prescribing that the sin-offering both of the people and of the High-priest shall be a young bullock, even for individual and ordinary transgressions throughout the year (IV. 3, 14). How this palpable contradiction may be historically explained, we have attempted to point out elsewhere (Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 40, 41; comp. also Num. XV. 24). — To the remarks made before (I. 101, 102) on the meaning attached to the white colour, we may join a few additional illustrations. A usual morning salutation among the Arabs is, "May thy day be white"! to which the inevitable reply is, "May thine be like milk"! (comp. *Burckhardt* Bed. p. 297). Pythagoras declared, that "white is an indication of good nature, and black of a bad one" (*Diog. Laert.* VIII. 35). Therefore, angels and holy men were commonly represented as clad in garments "white as snow", especially of linen, for fine

**shall he be attired: these *are* holy garments; and he shall wash his flesh in water, and put them on. 5. And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel**

"white linen is the righteousness of saints". The Greek and Roman priests, varying the colour of their garments according to the deities they served, offered their sacrifices to Ceres in *white* robes (see Dan. VII. 9; X. 5; Ezek. X. 2; 4 Ezr. II. 39; XLIV. 45; Henoch LXI. 18; Matth. XXVIII. 3; Rev. III. 5; IV. 4; VI. 11; VII. 9, 14; etc.; and *supra* p. 290; comp. also *Plato*, Legg. XII. 7; *Ovid*, Fast. VI. 619; *Gell.* Noct. Att. X. 15).

Philological Remarks. — Josephus (Ant. III. x. 3) observes distinctly, that the bull sacrificed by the High-priest for himself was not furnished by the people but ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀναλωμάτων τοῦ ἀρχιερέως. — The High-priest was, on the Day of Atonement, indeed not to wear the "golden" (בגדי זהב) but the "white garments" (בגדי לבן), nor was he even to be "distinguished by a greater number of garments" (מרובה בבגדים); yet it would be quite inappropriate to consider the linen raiments of resplendent white as unsightly "robes of mourning or penance", like "sackcloth and ashes" (Baumgarten, Keil, a. o.). We have already referred to the surprising divergence between the statements of Josephus and those of our passage; for he observes, that the white garments were used on all ordinary occasions, the golden ones only on the Day of Atonement, or also on the three great festivals (Bell. Jud. V. v. 7; Ant. XVIII. iv. 3; see Comm. on Lev. I. 575, 581); and it has not unnaturally been supposed that the text of Josephus is corrupted. In the time of the second Temple, it was customary for the High-priest to wear in the morning the "golden" vestiments at the ordinary or daily burnt-sacrifice and the other regular ministrations in which he took part; and then, before he commenced the rites of expiation peculiar to the day, to put on the white garments, of which he possessed two sets, the one of Egyptian (Pelusian), the other of less expensive Indian linen; the former he wore in the earlier part of the day, the latter towards the evening when he brought the censer out of the Holy of Holies; for both sets the community allowed him 30 minae, to which, however, he might add at pleasure from his own means (*Mishn.* Yom. III. 4, 6, 7). — בְּזֹאת (ver. 3) "with this" or thus, the feminine standing for the neuter; see Gramm. § 84[b]. — עַל בְּשָׂרוֹ (ver. 4), a euphemism, Vulg. feminalibus lineis verenda celabit (comp. XV. 2 and notes in loc. p. 256). — בִּגְדֵי קֹדֶשׁ is the general and usual term for the pontifical vestments (Exod. XXVIII. 2, 4; XXIX. 29; XXXI. 10; XXXV. 19, 21; XXXIX. 1, 41; XL. 13). — The Samar. Vers. renders כתנת בד (ver. 4) by כיתנאה עברה evidently connecting בד with the Arabic باض *to be white* (similarly in ver. 32 and VI. 3). — According to tradition, the two goats ought to be like each other in colour (במראה), in size, in value, and in purchase money (לקיחתן), though, in practice, this rule was not insisted upon (*Mishn.* Yom. VI. 1; comp. *Epist. Barn.* c. 7; *Yalk. Shim.* I. § 572). — Minute regulations were fixed in case one of the goats died before the Day of Atonement, whether previous to or after the decision of the lot: in the latter case a new pair was provided, and the survivor of the original couple was "fed till it became faulty" (ירעה עד שיסתאב), when it was sold, and the

**two kids of the goats for expiation of sins, and one ram for a burnt-offering.**

**6. And Aaron shall bring near the bullock of the sin-offering which *is* for himself, and make an atone-**

money paid into the sacred treasury, though one Rabbi thought the animal ought to be starved to death (*Mishn.* Yom. VI. 1). — לְחַטָּאת (ver. 5) does not exactly signify *for a sin-offering*, as the one goat was no sacrifice (see p. 295), but more generally *for expiation of sins* (Sept. περὶ ἁμαρτίας); חטאת is indeed strictly sin-offering, but the author used that term for the sake of brevity, because it applies to the *principal* goat.

**6—10.** After the refined conceptions of the preceding verses, it is not a little startling to meet with a notion befitting, not the final, but the most rudimentary stage of religious education — the notion of the evil demon or devil Azazel, the author and the originator of sin, inhabiting deserts, and receiving back, through the medium of a goat, the trespasses to which his malignity has incited the Hebrews. The anachronism is indeed so surprising that it would leave the expositor in helpless perplexity, did not the history of the time in which this chapter was composed, afford a sufficient clue, which, in its turn, furnishes a strong corroboration of our conclusion concerning the date of the section. The preceding treatises attempt to elucidate this subject.

The ideas here conveyed nearly coincide with those of the Book of Zechariah (written about B. C. 520). In the latter work we read, that the High-priest Joshua was standing before the angel of the Lord, while Satan appeared at his right side to oppose him; but God said sternly to the evil demon, "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan, even the Lord that has chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee"; whereas He addressed the High-priest with these comforting words, "I have caused thy iniquity to pass from thee"; and in confirmation of this assurance, Joshua's unclean garments, the symbols of his own and the people's sins, were replaced by raiments spotless and festive (Zechar. III. 1—4). The analogies are so striking that an acute theologian has declared the passage in Zechariah to be "the oldest commentary on our chapter preserved to us" (*Hengstenb.* Bücher Mose's und Aeg. p. 168): but the relation between the two sections is rather the reverse; our chapter, if not exactly a commentary on the passage in Zechariah, is a *development* of the notions it implies; for the Azazel of Leviticus is a *later* phase of the Satan of Zechariah; and the Day of Atonement with its remarkable rites was instituted *after* the time of that prophet (comp. Rev. XII. 10, 11). If the Satan of Zechariah appears as the more malignant spirit, not content to remain in the background, and is neither dreaded nor propitiated, it ought not to be forgotten how zealous in doing mischief Azazel must have been considered, as all the sins of the people were attributed to his instigation.

In Apocryphal and later Jewish writings, the character, life, and fate of the demon Azazel or Azael (עֲזָאֵל) — for both names seem identical — are more fully unfolded. He was originally a good angel, and one of the chiefs of the two hundred who went down to the earth, stayed longer than the lawful time of seven days, and held carnal intercourse with mortal

ment for himself and for his house. 7. And he shall take the two goats, and let them stand before the Lord *at*

women, upon which they were converted into evil spirits (see pp. 308, 311; Henoch VI. 2—8; LXIX. 2). As such they instructed the women in sorcery, incantations, and conjuring by means of cut roots and faggots (Hen. VII. 1; comp. *Jos.* Bell. Jud. VII. vi. 3; Ant. VIII. ii. 5). Many of them made men familiar with various pernicious and alluring arts (Hen. VIII. 3). Thus Azazel, the most dangerous of all, taught them the manufacture of swords and knives, shields and armours, of looking-glasses and trinkets, and the use of the dyes and of paint for the face and the eye-brows, of the precious stones and the metals; he introduced, in fact, both instruments of destruction and articles of effeminating luxury (Hen. VIII. 1; comp. however LXIX. 6); he above all others fostered moral corruption among men, and he was occasionally aided by Semjaza himself, the chief of the fallen angels (IX. 6, 7; X. 8, 11). Incensed at his evil works, the arch-angels accused him before God, that "he diffused all iniquity on earth", disclosed to the world the heavenly mysteries (IX. 6), and incited men to blasphemy, violence, and crime (XIII. 2). Then God commanded Raphael to throw him with pinioned hands and feet into a pit in the desert of Dudael, to pile upon his body a heap of sharp stones, and to encompass him with dense darkness; and in this condition he remains until the great day of judgment, when he will be hurled into the burning abyss, together with his subordinate host of malignant demons (X. 4—6; XIII. 1, 2; LIV. 5; LV. 4; comp. LXIX. 1 *sqq.*; 2 Pet. II. 4; Jude ver. 6).

If surprise be felt at the distinguished position which Azazel, here introduced for the first time, later occupies in the spirit world, it should be remembered, that promotions of rank were not unusual in Hebrew demonology; thus Asmodeus, at first only a lascivious goblin, gradually rose to the dignity of prince of demons; and Satan himself grew step by step in attributes and power. Azazel must have been a prominent figure in popular belief before he could be employed for the part here assigned to him in the ritual of the holiest day of the year. The sources of the Jewish fictions respecting his nature and his sphere of activity, are not the obscure allusions made to him in our chapter, but the Eastern legends which for centuries had been gathered round his person.

While the High-priest was casting lots for the two goats, the young bullock intended for his own sacrifice was standing in the Court, and by so waiting in the sacred place, it was supposed to be hallowed, exactly as Azazel's goat, by waiting at the door of the Tabernacle or "before the Lord", was cleansed, and rendered fit to be used for its important purpose (vers. 6, 10). Both goats were indeed meant to effect complete obliteration of transgressions (לחטאת), and both alike were subjected to the Divine decision of the lot; yet it would be too much to consider both virtually as *one sin-offering* presented to God; the two worked out the desired object in a very different manner; the one was a victim intended to atone for sins, the other carried away sins already atoned for; the one was dedicated to God, the other to a different power (ver. 8). Therefore, they represented indeed no proper dualism; yet they implied the acknowledg-

**the door of the Tent of Meeting. 8. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats, one lot for the Lord, and**

ment of two opposite and opposing forces in the moral world, since Azazel, though passive in the ceremonial of the Day of Atonement, was considered to have been most active throughout the year as a tempter and instigator to sin.

The lots consisted of small tablets of box- or ebony-wood (אשכרוע) or of gold, and were kept in a wooden chest. Accompanied by the head-priest (סֶגֶן) and the chief of the hebdomadal division (ראש בית אב), the High-priest rapidly took out one lot with each hand, and put that which he held in his right hand upon the goat that was standing on his right side, and that in his left hand upon the goat at his left side, exclaiming at the proper time, "To the Lord a sin-offering!" This was the practice in Herod's Temple (*Mishn.* Yom. III. 9; IV. 1); but as our text speaks of the lot "coming up" (עָלָה, vers. 9, 10), it seems probable that, in earlier times, the usual method was observed of shaking the vessel till one lot "came up" or "came out" (יצא; Num. XXXIII. 54; Josh. XVIII. 11; XIX. 1, 10, 17, 24, 32, 40). On the head of Azazel's goat a red woollen thread was tied (לשון של זהורית), the colour symbolising the sins that were put upon the animal; and it was expected that finally that red thread would turn white, the colour of innocence and forgiveness.—As God and Azazel are contradistinguished, so are the Sanctuary and the wilderness, the one the abode of life and serenity, of blessing and holiness, the other a place of dreary isolation and hopeless sterility, and therefore the suitable haunt of goblins and evil spirits, who from their gloomy solitudes delude and mislead the minds of men. Moving in the same circle of ideas, the Talmud declares, that at the time of the Messiah, "the seducer (יצר הרע) will be driven into a deserted and desolate land, where he will find no human being against whom he can employ his wily arts" (*Talm.* Succ. 52[a]).

Philological Remarks.—The term וְהִקְרִיב (in ver. 6) is to be taken in its literal sense, "and Aaron shall *bring near* the bullock of his sin-offering"; for the killing or offering ensues later, after the lots have been cast for the goats (ver. 11). — Aaron's "house" (בֵּיתוֹ) means the whole priesthood forming one family, of which the High-priest is the head.—The word עֲזָאזֵל from the root עזל (عزل) to retreat, to work in seclusion, stands probably for עֲזַלְזֵל, the repetition of the two last radicals intensifying the notion of loneliness (as חצצר for חצרצר, קִלְקָלוֹן for קְלָלוֹן; comp. בָּבֶל for בַּלְבֵּל, גֻּלְגֹּלֶת and Syr. גוגלתא skull; etc.; see Gramm. II. p. 100; *Gesen.* Lehrgeb. p. 869; *Ewald*, Lehrbuch, § 158. c.); and it is probably identical with עֲזָאֵל, which occurs also in Henoch (Ἀζαήλ), besides Ἀζαλζήλ and Ἐξαήλ. There can be no doubt whatever that Azazel is *a personal*, *a superhuman*, and an *evil* being — in fact a wicked demon. This is so obvious, that it would never have been questioned but for dogmatic reasons. The eighth verse is in itself decisive — "one lot shall be for the Lord (ליהוה), and one lot for Azazel (לעזאזל)": we have here a clear antithesis; and as "the Lord" is a personal Being, so is "Azazel"; but as the one is appeased by a real sacrifice at the altar, the other receives back his due in the lonely desert frequented by unholy spirits. This acceptation fully suits all passages — "the goat on which Azazel's

the other lot for Azazel. 9. And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell, and appoint it

lot fell" (הגורל לעזאזל, ver. 10); "to send it to Azazel into the wilderness" (ibid.); and "he that takes away the goat to Azazel" (ver. 26). It was adopted by many Rabbins, some of whom identified Azazel and Sammael (see p. 316), or regarded the goat sent to the former as "a bribe" to the latter (*Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 46), or as an atonement for the conduct of Uza and Azael (p. 200; *Talm.* Yom. 67[b]; *Yalk. Shim.* I. § 572); and it was approved of by early Christian writers who identified Azazel with Satan (*Origen.* C. Cels. VI. 43, p. 305 ed. Spencer; *Iren.* Adv. Haer. I. 12; *Epiphan.* Haeres. XXXIV. 11), and by many later and modern scholars (as Spencer, Ammon, Rosenm., Cölln, Gesen., De Wette, Ewald, Vatke, Hengstenb., Maurer, Baumgarten, Reinke, Fürst, B. Bauer in Stud. und Krit. 1865 p. 351; Knobel, Hoelemann, Keil, Haevernick, a. o.; comp. also *Eisenmenger*, Entd. Judenth. II. 439, 440), though they differ in the identification of the demon, and in the explanation of some details of the ritual. The objections which have been raised against this view, are of little weight. Thus it has been urged that "the belief in an evil demon, to whom a goat bearing the people's sins might be sent, cannot be proved before the Babylonian exile" (*Winer*, Real-Wörterb. II. 659; *Ewald*, Krit. Gram. p. 243; *Gesen.* Thes. p. 1012): but our chapter was not written before the Babylonian exile; its date is considerably later than the Book of Job with its active Satan, and even later than the Book of Zechariah with its more developed Accuser; Azazel is, therefore, not merely "a liturgical idea"; nor is he "an isolated being" unconnected with the religious system of the Hebrews (*Winer* l. c. 384): appearing as the representative of every guilt and trespass, he is analogous to, if he does not coincide with, Satan, who occupies a clearly defined position in the history of Jewish theology. Hence it is hardly necessary to reply to the remark that "the Mosaic Azazel cannot be a heathen demon, since Moses never adopted such plain elements of polytheism", but that he is "the angel of destruction", who overthrew Sodom, killed the Egyptian firstborn, and decreed pestilence against David (*Movers*, Phoeniz. I. 369): is it more "Mosaic" to regard Azazel as a power co-ordinated to God and independent of Him? — But the view we have adopted appears even more acceptable if we glance at other opinions, most of which have been prompted by the desire of ridding the text of the obnoxious evil demon. Azazel has been regarded as the name of the goat itself, the word עֲזָאזֵל being derived from עז and אזל *to go away*; so the Septuagint (vers. 8, 10) and Philo (ἀποπομπαῖος the goat that is to be sent away, which word hardly coincides, as Gesenius believes, with Ἀποτροπαῖος, Ἀλεξίκακος, Deus Averruncus), Symmachus (τράγος ἀπερχόμενος), Aquila (ἀπολλυόμενος), Theodotion (ἀφιέμενος), Vulgate (caper emissarius), Luther (der ledige Bock), English Version (scapegoat); and similarly many modern interpreters (as Geddes, Vater, Hofmann, Merx, Bauer, a. o.; comp. also *Theodoret.* Quaest. 22 in Levit.; *Mishn.* Yom. IV. 2; VI. 1, 2, שעיר המשתלח, which is, however, not meant as a translation of עזאזל). But this rendering, though tolerable in some passages (vers. 8, 10[a]), is entirely inadmissible

*for* a sin-offering. 10. And the goat on which Azazel's lot fell, shall be made to stand alive before the Lord, to

in others, as "to send the goat to the scape-goat into the wilderness" (ver. $10^b$), and "he who takes away the goat to the scape-goat" (ver. 26); for in both these cases לעזאזל cannot be translated "*for* a scape-goat"; the goat and Azazel are obviously distinct from each other; and as regards the etymology, granted even that עֵז may be taken as *he*-goat (שׂעיר), the tsere could not be changed into shva, the ז having properly dagesh forte (as in עִזִּים, etc.). — Again, Azazel has been supposed to denote the *place* to which the goat is sent — whether "the steep or rugged mountain" (Saad., Arabs Erp. جبل عزاز, Gr. Ven. σκληροβάτης; so also Siphra, Yalk. Shim. I. § 572, Rashi הר עז וקשה צוק גבוה, Kimchi, Ebn Ezra הר חזק, Deyling, Lund, Clericus, a. o.), or "solitudes, lonely wastes" (plur. fract. عزائل from عزل removere, so Bochart, Carpzov, Jahn; or after the analogy of the 12th Arab. conjug. افعوعل, so Hackmann, Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 536). But why should a most unusual term which occurs in no other part of the Hebrew Scriptures, have been employed to express so familiar a notion? and one passage (ver. $10^b$) would yield this strange tautology, "to send it into the desert into the wilderness." And lastly, לעזאזל has been explained "for complete removal;" so the Septuagint (in ver. $10^b$ ἐξαποστεῖλαι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἀποπομπὴν καὶ ἀφήσει αὐτόν, where the same idea is with remarkable redundancy expressed three times, and in ver. 26 τὸν χίμαρον τὸν διεσταλμένον εἰς ἄφεσιν); while the Vulgate has merely et emittat eum in solitudinem (and similarly Bähr, Paulus, Tholuck, Philippson, Winer, a. o.).

But irrespective of the strange word, the sense would in all passages be forced and artificial (comp. *Gesen.* Thes. p. 1013, in hac ratione nescio quid frigidi est et jejuni); and the clear contradistinction between ליהוה and לעזאזל (ver. 8) would evidently be lost. — Azazel, then, is an evil demon; but he cannot be Typhon (*Hengstenberg*, Mos. und Aegypt. pp. 175, 178—181; *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 370; *Fürst*, Wörtrb. s. v.), nor "Mars-Typhon" (*Movers* l. c. 367 *sqq.*), nor Set, who inflicts on men the pernicious hot winds and all other calamities (*Roskoff*, Gesch. des Teufels, I. 184); for he belongs to Babylonian or Persian, and not to Egyptian mythology. Numerous other derivations have been proposed, as from עזז or עז *the strong one* (comp. עֱזוּז Isai. XLII. 25) and אל (by transposition instead of עֲזַזְאֵל, עֲזָזְאֵל) *might of God*, he being properly a fallen angel (comp. גַּבְרִיאֵל; see *Diestel* in Zeitschr. für histor. Theolog. 1860, pp. 20, 195; *Dozy*, a. o.), or *he attacks* or *defies God* (עזז taken like תקף); or from זל and זמה *complete abomination* (comp. also *Ewald*, Krit. Gram. p. 243 "impurity, unholiness, or sin"). These and many other equally curious explanations prove the perplexity that has been experienced on a subject which some Jewish doctors not unnaturally declared a mystery into which men ought not to enquire. That the word עזאזל "was expressly coined for the present occasion" (*Hengstenb.* Mos. u. Aeg. p. 167) is not probable; on the contrary, it must have been perfectly familiar to the people in the author's time. — The words וְעָשָׂהוּ חטאת (in ver. 9) mean "and he shall appoint (not present) it for a sin-offering", since the slaughtering of the goat ensued af-

make an atonement for it, *and* to send it to Azazel into the wilderness.

11. And Aaron shall offer the bullock of the sin-offering which *is* for himself, and make an atonement for himself and for his house, and shall kill the bullock of the sin-offering which *is* for himself. 12. And he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and both his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring *it* within the vail; 13. And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the Mercy-seat that *is* upon the testimony, lest he die. 14. And he shall take of the blood of the bullock and sprinkle

terwards (ver. 15). — The goat destined for Azazel was to be placed at the door of the Tabernacle לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו (ver. 10), which words can, according to Hebrew usage, only mean to *make atonement for it* (comp. vers. 16, 18; see Comm. on Lev. I. 476), that is, to expiate or sanctify the animal, and thus render it fit for the high religious purpose it was intended to serve. All other explanations are contrary to grammar and the context — f. i. "to make expiation through it", or "with it", or "upon it", or "to appease God": the preposition עַל in connection with כפר refers always to the thing or person expiated, and never to God; the suffix both in עליו and אתו applies to the same object, the goat; and the expiation of sins was mainly effected through the blood of the *slaughtered* goat. The Vulgate renders freely, ut fundat preces super eo. It appears that the "standing before God" alone expiated the animal, and that for this purpose no blood was applied, as has been supposed (so *Bähr* l. c. 684).

**11—19.** After these preliminaries the proper acts of expiation commenced. To render the sacrifice of his bullock more solemn, the High-priest put, according to later usage, *both* his hands upon the animal, and made this confession: "O Lord, I have failed, I have trespassed, I have sinned before Thee, I and my house. O Lord, grant atonement for the failings and trespasses and sins with which I have failed and trespassed and sinned before Thee, I and my house, as it is written in the Law of Thy servant Moses, For on this day shall atonement be made for you" etc. (ver. 30). To which the congregation replied: "Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom for ever and ever." The High-priest repeated his confession once more, including in it "the children of Aaron", God's "holy people" (*Mishn.* Yom. III. 8; IV. 2); and then he killed the bullock, "received the blood in the sprinkling bowl, which he handed over to a priest, to stir the blood, lest it coagulated while he performed the fumigation" (*Mishn.* Yom. IV. 3). He next took burning coals from the brazen Altar in the Court, and put them into a censer; and after having provided himself with two handfuls of the finest incense, he entered through the vail into the Holy of Holies, and advanced to the Ark, or, in the time of the second Temple, to the

*it* with his finger upon the front of the Mercy-seat eastward, and before the Mercy-seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times. — 15. Then he shall kill the goat of the sin-offering that *is* for the people, and bring its blood within the vail, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the Mercy-seat and before the Mercy-seat. — 16. And he shall make an atonement for the Sanctuary on account of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and on account of their transgressions, indeed on account of all their sins: and so shall he do for the Tent of Meeting,

stone (שתיה) which formed its substitute. Between the two staves of the Ark, or on the stone, he deposited the censer, and cast the incense upon the coals, so that the whole place was filled with a cloud of smoke, and that especially the Mercy-seat and the Cherubim were enveloped in the cloud: it was death to omit this ceremony. Then he left the Holy of Holies—according to the Mishnah walking backward, lest he turned his back upon the Ark—and, arriving in the Holy, he pronounced the following short prayer: "May it please Thee, O Lord, my God, that this year, if it was intended to be one of drought, be one of rain; let him who rules over the house of Judah not die; may Thy people not be in want, so that one Israelite may not be forced to beg his sustenance from another or from strangers; and do not accept the prayer of travellers" (who deprecate rain; *Mishn.* Yom. V. 1, 2). Then returning to the Court, he took the blood from the person who had meanwhile stirred it, entered with it into the Holy of Holies, and stopped at the same place as before. There, according to tradition, he sprinkled with the blood once upward, and seven times downwards, so that the eight aspersions formed on the ground "a continuous line (כמצליף)"; while performing these acts, he counted the numbers in a prescribed manner; and then he went out of the Holy of Holies, after having put the vessel on the golden stand placed there for the purpose (*Mishn.* Yom. V. 3). The Biblical text prescribes, besides a sevenfold aspersion on the ground, sprinkling on the eastern side of the Mercy-seat itself, which did not exist in the second Temple (vers. 13—15; see Summary).

Having thus expiated himself and the priesthood, he proceeded to expiate the whole community. Returning to the Court, he killed the goat which had by lot been destined for God, received its blood into a bowl, went again into the Holy of Holies, and standing on the same place as before, he sprinkled and counted as at first, and put down the vessel on another stand (*Mishn.* Yom. V. 4).

After the atonement of the High-priest and of the people, the holy edifice itself remained to be expiated (vers. 16—19). For both the structure in all its parts, and its sacred utensils and implements, were deemed to have been defiled by the transgressions of the Israelites throughout the year. But no separate animal was killed for the purpose, and the expiation was accomplished

that remains among them in the midst of their unclean-
ness. 17. And there shall be no man in the Tent of
Meeting, when he goes in to make an atonement in the
Sanctuary, until he comes out; and *thus* he shall make
an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for
all the congregation of Israel. 18. And he shall go out
to the altar that *is* before the Lord, and make an atone-
ment for it; and he shall take of the blood of the bullock
and of the blood of the goat, and put *it* upon the horns
of the altar round about. 19. And he shall sprinkle of
the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse

through the blood of the victims slaughtered for those who had caused the defilement — through the blood of the High-priest's bullock and the people's goat; the mingled blood of both was put partly round the horns of the brazen Altar in the Court, and partly, by a sevenfold aspersion, on its surface itself: this Altar, at which the daily holocausts, the distinctive feature of the national worship, were offered, and upon which a perpetual fire was burning, fitly represented the entire Tabernacle or Temple and all its service (see Phil. Rem.).

The Mishnah, holding that the golden Altar in the Holy is meant, thus describes the rites: In the Holy of Holies, the High-priest sprinkled the blood of the bullock upon the vail opposite the Ark once upwards and seven times downwards, proceeding and counting as before. Then he sprinkled with the blood of the goat also. He next thoroughly mixed the blood of the bullock with that of the goat; went out into the Holy, and expiated the golden Altar, beginning at the north-eastern corner, then advancing to the north-western, then to the south-western, and finally round to the south-eastern corner. He then sprinkled seven times upon the middle of the Altar; and the remainder of the blood, he poured out at the western and southern sides of the Altar, whence it flowed, through a canal, into the brook Kidron (*Mishn.* Yom. V. 4—6).

When all these rites had been performed, God, the Holy, could again dwell and manifest Himself in the purified Tabernacle.

Philological Remarks. — The High-priest took the "burning" coals from the brazen, not from the golden Altar (ver. 12); on the latter there were no such coals; the words מלפני יהוה must, therefore, be understood in a general sense (as in vers. 10, 18; I. 5). — The context favours the opinion of the Pharisees, who contended that the High-priest was to put the incense on the live coals in the Holy of Holies (לפני יהוה, ver. 13), and not, as the Sadducees believed, in the Court; the former view prevailed, and hence the elders of the priesthood made the High-priest swear on the eve of the Day of Atonement, that he would, while alone in the Sanctuary, make no change whatever in the traditional customs (*Mishn.* Yom. I. 5; see on vers. 1, 2). — The mode of sprinkling (vers. 14, 15), which differed from that observed with ordinary sin-offerings (Lev. IV. 7, 17), is sufficiently intelligible. The Sept. takes

**it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel.**

על פני הכפרת and לפני הכפרת as identical, and hence arbitrarily omits ו in ולפני (ἐπὶ τὸ ἱλαστήριον . . . κατὰ πρόςωπον τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου); the Vulg. even suppresses the words על פני הכפרת, and in ver. 15 merely renders, ut aspergat e regione oraculi; and some later translators have imitated these inaccuracies (Luther both in ver. 14 and 15, a. o.). The text is explicit and clear in ver. 16 — the blood was to be sprinkled "upon (על) the Mercy-seat, and before (ולפני) the Mercy-seat." Josephus (Ant. III. x. 3) declares, that the High-priest "sprinkled upon the ceiling (τὸν ὄροφον) with his finger seven times, also upon the pavement (τὸ ἔδαφος), and again as often upon the most holy shrine" (εἰς τὸν ναόν): but the sprinkling on the ceiling is at variance with the Scriptural ordinance. — The three main parts of the Tabernacle which were to be expiated, are — The Holy of Holies (מקדש הקדש ver. 33, or simply קדש vers. 16, 20); the Holy, also called "the Tent of Meeting" *par excellence* (אהל מועד), since it is the largest portion of the structure (vers. 16, 20, 33); and the Court, described by its chief implement, the Altar (vers. 18, 20, 33). The peculiar use of these terms is clear from ver. 17 — "And there shall be no man in the Holy (באהל מועד) when the High-priest goes to make an atonement in the Holy of Holies" (בקדש): during that time not even priests were to enter the Holy, to which they were usually admitted. It seems, therefore, clear that the 17th verse hardly stands in its right place; it interrupts the account of the expiation of the Sanctuary, which commences in the 16th and is continued in the 18th verse; and it alludes only to the atonement of the priests and the people; it would, therefore, more logically follow after ver. 15, and would then well conclude the expiatory rites as far as *persons* are concerned. — ל in לכל (ver. 16) summarises the details — "*even all* their sins" (so also ver. 21; see notes on XI. 26; comp. *August.* Quaest. in Levit. LIII). — The holy edifice "dwells" (שוכן) among the Hebrews (comp. Josh. XXII. 19; Ps. LXXXV. 10). — The Altar on which the acts of expiation are performed (vers. 18, 19), can only be that of the Court, not of the Holy; the verb ויצא "and he shall go out" is more suitable for the one than for the other; wherever the latter is meant, it is clearly described (comp. IV. 7, 18); and if *one* rite of atonement was to purify *all* the parts of the Tabernacle, the Altar which typified the active life and the daily struggles of the people was certainly more appropriate than that which symbolised prayer and devotion. — לפני יהוה is in ver. 18 to be taken as in vers. 10 and 12, where surely nothing else than the Court can be meant. Supposing the *golden* Altar were intended, the repeated enumeration of "Holy of Holies, Holy, and Altar" (vers. 20, 33), would be strangely illogical, as it would amount to "Holy of Holies, Holy, and Holy;" whereas the *brazen* Altar most fitly stands for the whole Court. Yet both Jewish tradition and many modern interpreters consider the Altar in this passage (vers. 18, 19) to be that of the Holy. Compiled at a time when a Temple no longer existed, the Mishnah frequently deviates from the Biblical rituals; but Josephus, who had witnessed the

20. And when he has finished making an atonement for the Sanctuary, and the Tent of Meeting, and the altar, the live goat is brought *to him*. 21. And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat,

service of the Temple, clearly names the "larger Altar (τὸν μείζω) in the open Court" (αἴθριον; Ant. III. x. 3). — Some manuscripts have in vers. 16 and 19 the singular טמאת instead of the more appropriate plural טמאות (*De Rossi*, Var. Lect. I. 98).

**20—22.** While the preceding ceremonies were performed, the goat appointed for Azazel had been standing in the Court "before the Lord"; it was now brought to Aaron, who imposed upon its head not, as was the case with victims intended for sacrifice, *one* hand, but *both* his hands, in order to convey in the strongest possible manner, that the animal most particularly concerned both himself and the community he represented. He then made a full confession of the people's sins — according to tradition, in the words above cited (p. 331.); "and the priests and the people who were in the Court, when they heard the holy name of God (שם המפורש) coming out of the High-priest's mouth, bent their knees, and worshipped, and fell upon their faces, and said, Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom for ever and ever." He put the sins of the people upon the head of the goat, which a trustworthy person then led away into the wilderness, to carry back to Azazel the offences into which he had enticed the Israelites, and to take them to a lonely and pathless region, just as pardoned sins are elsewhere said "to be thrown into the depths of the sea" (Mic. VII. 19). It was customary in later times, to employ for that purpose no Hebrew but a heathen, probably because the distance was considerably more than the legal "Sabbath-way," and because the Hebrew might besides be led to a desecration of the holy day: the author of our chapter evidently had no such scruples; for he states that the messenger, after having performed his task, "returned into the camp" (ver. 26). Again, he simply orders that the goat should be conducted into "the wilderness" or to "a lonely land", where it was to be left to its fate, whether it perished or not. But the later Jews were anxious that the animal should unfailingly suffer death, which was to them a pledge of the removal of their sins. Therefore, from the Temple up to within two miles of the appointed place in the wilderness — which was the steep mountain Zuk (צוק) — booths, ten in number, were erected at intervals of one mile; in each of them persons were in readiness to accompany the messenger to the next booth, and in each refreshments were offered to him. When the man had arrived within a mile of the mountain Zuk, he went on alone, but the occupants of the last booth watched his proceedings, and saw how he divided the crimson thread, half of which he fastened to the rock, while he tied the other half between the two horns of the goat; how he then thrust the animal from the height; and — observes the Mishnah — "in thus rolling down, the goat was dashed to pieces before it had reached the middle of the mountain." The man then returned, and remained in the last booth till dusk (*Mishn.* Yom. VI. 2—6). — On elevated places persons were stationed to observe the movements of the goat, and they signalled

**and confess over it all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, indeed all their sins, and put them upon the head of the goat, and shall send *it* away by the hand of an appointed man in to the wilderness;**

with handkerchiefs to the priests in the Court, when the animal had arrived in the wilderness; though, according to Rabbi Ishmael, signals were superfluous, since the fact was known when the crimson-thread tied to the Temple-gate was seen to turn white (comp. Isai. I. 18). Then the High-priest read from the Law the sections relating to the Day of Atonement (viz. our chapter, Lev. XXIII. 26—32, and Num. XXIX. 7—11), and concluded with eight benedictions on the Law and the public service, on confession and forgiveness of sins, on Jerusalem and the Temple, on Israel and the priesthood (*Mishn.* Yom. VI. 8; VII. 1).

Philological Remarks. — It needs hardly be repeated that the goat of Azazel was no victim meant for sacrifice; it did not cause pardon of sins, but merely carried away sins already pardoned, to symbolise that they were removed from God's holy presence, and that communion between Him and His people was restored. The goat was still less an offering intended to appease the anger of Azazel; for this demon was indeed believed to have the power of corrupting men, but not of punishing them (comp. XVII. 7). Therefore, the imposition of hands expresses neither substitution nor chastisement, "as if the goat suffered death for the guilty Israelites, or was itself considered as having committed the sins" (*Michael.* Typ. Gottesgel. p. 72, a. o.; comp. *Rosenm.* Morgenl. II. 197—200): according to our text, it was not essential that the animal should perish, only that it should be removed out of sight; and the later Rabbinical practice affords no proof to the contrary. Very curious interpretations have been ventured; for instance, the sending away of the goat denotes an "abnunciation" or "renunciation" of the devil, both distinct from each other, the one being total rejection of the evil demon, the other merely a message to him, "to let him know what has been done, and to show him that he has lost his power over Israel, owing to God's forgiveness and mercy" (*Kurtz*, Bib. und Astron., ed. 1865 p. 187); but as the ceremonial was regularly repeated every year, a complete and absolute deliverance from the tempter was evidently deemed hopeless. Untenable is the analogy between Azazel's goat and the bird which, in the purificatory rites of the leper and the leprous house, was sent alive into the open field (Lev. XIV. 7, 53): the released bird symbolised that the convalescent had recovered complete freedom to move about at pleasure, and even to join the holy community, and to enter the Sanctuary; whereas the goat was *led* away, could go nowhere else but into the wilderness, and was removed from the holy community and the Sanctuary (see *supra* p. 241). Equally precarious is the analogy with the Hindoo horse-sacrifice or Aswamedha, which was in reality a sacrifice; for although the horse was sent away to graze freely for twelve months, it was during this time anxiously watched, and then actually killed as an offering, not to an evil demon, but to the highest gods, as Brahmah, Vishnu, Shiva, and the ten tutelary deities of the earth. Nor is any other alleged

22. **And the goat shall bear upon it all their iniquities to a lonely land; and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness.**

23. **And Aaron shall come into the Tent of Meeting, and shall put off the linen garments, which he put on when he went into the Sanctuary, and shall leave them there;** 24. **And he shall bathe his body in water in the holy place, and put on his garments, and come**

parallel more plausible (comp. *Spencer*, l. c. p. 1052). — The Vulg., in rendering (ver. 21) quae *imprecans* capiti ejus, introduces a notion foreign to the context: the animal was not execrated, as among the Egyptians in certain cases (*Herod.* II. 39, κεφαλῇ δὲ κείνῃ πολλὰ καταρησάμενοι); it was merely made the instrument of carrying back the people's transgressions to him who had caused them. — It cannot be denied that the usual acceptation of the term אִישׁ עִתִּי (ver. 21), which occurs no where else, as "a man ready or at hand at the time" (comp. ὡραῖος tempestivus), is not very satisfactory whether the form or the sense be considered; derived from עֵת, the word עִתִּי would signify one belonging to a place or a family; and it seems rather superfluous to enjoin that the goat shall be led away by some one who is ready to do it (Sept. ἄνθρωπος ἕτοιμος, Vulg. homo paratus, Luth. ein Mann der vorhanden ist, etc.); some therefore have rendered "a *fit* man", for which meaning, however, there is no authority; and others have taken עִתִּי as a patronymic, understanding a man from the town עֵת, the inhabitants of which are said to have been familiar with the topography of the desert, near which that town is supposed to have been situated (comp. Josh. XIX. 13 עֵת קָצִין; so Loeb Frankfurt, comp. *Geiger's* Jüd. Zeitschr. IV. 49): but a town Eth would have been known at the time of the Mishnah, at least by the tradition kept up during the comparatively few generations that separated the compilation of the Mishnah from the date of our chapter. It is a questionable principle to seek a peculiar significance in every word of the Law; we must be content with the meaning "a ready or appointed man", which, though languid, is appropriate. — A codex of de Rossi has אתו after ושלח (ver. 21), but that accusative may well be omitted (Gramm. § 78. 7). — ארץ גְזֵרָה is literally "a land cut off" or separated from other lands (comp. Isai. LIII. 8; Ps. LXXXVIII. 6; 2 Chr. XXVI. 21; see also Hab. III. 17), that is, a lonely region from which there is no hope of return (Vulg. terra solitaria), untrodden by human feet (Sept. γῆ ἄβατος), and peopled by demons and malignant spirits (*Targ. Jon.* has אתר צדיא a desolate place; *Onk.* ארע לא מיתבא uninhabitable country; Syr. ארעא בגריא uncultivated land: but these renderings are less accurate; comp. *Deyling*, Observ. I. 88).

**23—28.** Then the High-priest, having bathed in one of the chambers of the Court, exchanged the linen garments, which he had worn during the preceding ceremonies, for his ordinary or "golden" vestments, and presented as holocausts a ram for himself and one for the people (vers. 3, 5); and these sacrifices, together with the burning of the fat of his own and the people's sin-offering — of the bullock and the goat —, completed the rites of expiation, and secured the atonement of the

forth, and offer his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people, and make an atonement for himself and for the people. 25. And the fat of the sin-offering he shall burn upon the altar. 26. And he that takes away the goat to Azazel shall wash his clothes, and bathe his body in water, and then he may come into the camp. 27. And the bullock for the sin-offering and the goat for the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atone-

penitent people. Only a few incidental acts remained now to be performed. The man who had led away the goat, had to wash his clothes and to bathe before he was allowed to return to the camp; for both his garments and his person were defiled by contact with the sin-laden animal, whether the defilement began from the moment he had passed beyond the walls of the holy town, or not before he had hurled the goat down the precipice (*Mishn.* Yom. VI. 6). All that was left of the two sin-offerings, the blood of which had been taken into the Holy and the Holy of Holies, was, in accordance with a general rule, burnt without the camp (comp. VI. 23 and notes in loc.); and the man who burnt it, was also unclean, and had to bathe and wash his garments. But the later practice of the Temple was by no means so simple. When all the sacrifices were finished, the High-priest bathed again, put on the linen garments a second time, washed his hands and his feet, and went into the Holy to bring back the bowl and the censer. After another ablution of his hands and feet, he bathed again. Then he put on his golden vestments, washed his hands and feet, and entered the Holy to do the service at the Altar of Incense and at the Candlestick; after having once more washed his hands and feet, he put on his own private garments, and was accompanied home by his friends, "to whom he gave a feast, if he had left the Sanctuary unharmed" (*Mishn.* Yom. VII. 4); for the terrible fate of Aaron's two eldest sons had proved how inexorably God visits any deviation from the holy rituals. The High-priest had, in fact, during the day to bathe five times, and to wash his hands and feet ten times, and for the latter ablutions he did not use the ordinary basin (כיור), but a golden bowl (cyathus קיתון; *Mishn.* Yom. III. 3).

The sacrifices described in this chapter are all expiatory, and the rites connected with them special and exceptional. But besides them were to be offered, first the usual or daily holocausts — a lamb in the morning and one towards the evening; and then extraordinary or additional sacrifices (מוסף) in honour of the sacred day — a bullock, a ram, and seven lambs as holocausts, and a kid of the goats as a sin-offering, of course together with their cereal oblations; so that seventeen animals, including all the species of sacrificial quadrupeds, were required on the Day of Atonement, sixteen for sacrifice, and one for Azazel (comp. Num. XXIX. 8—11). At what times of the day these victims were to be presented, was a matter of dispute at so early a date as that of the Mishnah; but the doctors decided in favour of Rabbi Akiva, who held, that the seven lambs were to be killed together with the morning sacrifice, and the additional bullock and ram together with

ment in the Sanctuary, shall be carried forth without the camp; and they shall burn with fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung. 28. And he that burns them shall wash his clothes, and bathe his body in water, and then he may come into the camp.

29. And *this* shall be a statute for ever to you: in the seventh month, on the tenth *day* of the month, you shall afflict yourselves, and do no work at all,

the evening sacrifice (*Mishn.* Yom. VII. 3).

The first Temple had no vail, and the second had no Ark (p. 267); yet the author, desirous of investing the ceremonial with the utmost possible solemnity, combined the features of both structures, reasonably expecting that his contemporaries would find some substitute for the missing Ark.

Philological Remarks. — The received reading ובעד העם (ver. 24) is preferable to that of some manuscr. ובעד ביתו (*De Rossi* l. c. p. 98); for the one holocaust expiated the High-priest and his house, the other the people. — The sing. הַחַטָּאת (ver. 25) must imply, in a collective sense, both the High-priest's and the people's sin-offering, since with respect to neither of them is the burning of the fat mentioned anywhere else. — On the construction הוּבָא אֶת־דָּמָם (ver. 27), that is, the passive followed by the accusative, see Gramm. § 76. 3 (comp. VI. 23, regularly, אשר יובא מדמה). — Josephus also (Ant. III. x. 3) counts seventeen animals, although his enumeration is peculiar and somewhat confused; but Jewish tradition limits the number to sixteen, for it unwarrantably supposes that the ram mentioned in our chapter as a holocaust for the people (vers. 5, 24) is identical with the ram named among the "additional sacrifices" (in Num. XXIX. 8): the ram of the people is as essential for the peculiar and preparatory rites of the day as that of the High-priest (ver. 24). If the Day of Atonement fell on a Sabbath, two additional lambs were of course presented (Num. XXVIII. 9).

**29—34.** The legislator finally desired to mark both the holiness of the day and its supreme religious importance. The former he did in a twofold manner — by making it a day of complete and solemn rest (שבת שבתון) for native and stranger, and by fixing it for the *tenth* of the *seventh* month, both which numbers familiarly recalled to the Hebrew mind the spiritual relation between man and God (p. 260). And he impressed the high importance of the day by ordaining, also for native and stranger, a rigorous fast "from evening to evening"; and not long afterwards, when the system of Hebrew festivals was fully worked out, the non-observance of this fast, the only one prescribed in the Pentateuch, and the profanation of the day by the performance of any labour whatsoever, were menaced with excision from the Hebrew community (XXIII. 27—32). Fasting, at all times deemed efficacious for appeasing the Deity, and often imposed even upon animals (Jon. III. 7, 8; comp. Judith IV. 10), became after the exile the most common form of devotion and contrition; it was held to be more powerful and more acceptable to God than vow and sacrifice; and it soon occupied a conspicuous place in the religious life of individuals and of the

*whether it be* one of your own country, or a stranger that sojourns among you. 30. For on that day shall atonement be made for you, to cleanse you; you shall be clean from all your sins before the Lord. 31. It *shall be* a great day of rest to you, and you shall afflict yourselves, *by* a statute for ever. 32. And the priest who shall be anointed, and who shall be consecrated to minister in the priest's office in his father's stead, shall make the atonement, and shall put on the

community (comp. p. 279). The Mishnah enjoins abstinence from "eating, drinking, washing, anointing, the wearing of shoes or sandals, and sexual intercourse"; and declares that whosoever eats as much as a date with a kernel, or drinks as much as fills one cheek (about one fourth of a log), brings upon himself excision if he does it purposely, and must present a sin-offering if he transgresses unintentionally; one Rabbi (R. Eliezer), who endeavoured to obtain permission for kings and for brides up to twenty days after marriage to wash their faces, and for women after child-birth to put on sandals, was overruled by the other teachers (*Mishn.* Yom. VIII. 1); yet exceptions were made in favour of pregnant women, sick persons, and invalids; and in general the principle was adopted, that "Everything which might possibly endanger life, annuls the Sabbath" (ספק נפשות דוחה את השבת, *Mishn.* Yom. VIII. 1—6). It is needless to add, how scrupulously the Talmudists and later Rabbins worked out and enforced these precepts: they took care that the Jews should indeed "afflict themselves" on the day set aside for their penitence and moral regeneration. They certainly did not mistake the high importance of the festival. They called it "the Day" *par excellence* (יומא); they declared, that "without the Day of Atonement the world could not possibly exist, as it expiates this life and the next; and that it will never cease, even if all other festivals should pass away"; that on that Day, the Hebrews resemble the angels, being without human wants, without sins, and linked together by love and peace; and that it is the only day in the year, on which the accuser Satan or Sammael is silenced before the throne of God, and even becomes the defender of Israel (comp. *Pirk. R. Eliez.* c. 46; *Midr. Rabb.* Lev. XXI. 1).

No other ancient nation had an institution approaching the Day of Atonement in religious depth; the expiatory sacrifices and festivals so frequent among the Greeks, and the supplications of the Romans in times of war, pestilence, and other public calamities, aimed at appeasing the wrath of the deities, rather than restoring purity of mind, and securing forgiveness of sins; they were therefore not celebrated at regular intervals, but only on exceptional occasions. Yet if we survey the precepts and the spirit of our chapter, we find that no more than a passive part was assigned to the people on this festival; they were simply enjoined to *keep rest* and *to fast*; no prayer, no confession of sins, was prescribed for them; they had no share in any of the rites; the High-priest and the priests acted for them throughout: the hierarchy had at last fully prevailed, and achieved its long coveted triumphs. And what had it to offer for cleansing the hearts

**linen garments, the holy garments; 33. And he shall make an atonement for the holy Sanctuary, and he shall make an atonement for the Tent of Meeting, and for the altar, and he shall make an atonement for the priests and for all the people of the congregation. 34. And this shall be an everlasting statute to you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year. — And he did as the Lord commanded Moses.**

and restoring peace of mind, for chasing away worldliness and securing nobleness of thought and feeling? Sprinkling of blood, burning of incense, and a sin-laden goat sent to the prince of fabled demons. Not even reading from the Law and spiritual instruction by public teachers were enforced (comp. Neh. IX. 1—3, 5 *sqq.*). But by a natural process of moral refinement, in later times, when the destruction of the Temple rendered the prescribed ceremonial impossible, the Day of Atonement was conceived in a different spirit, and the active co-operation of the penitent sinners themselves was insisted upon; the Mishnah already (Taan. II. 1) points out that, with reference to the people of Nineveh, the prophet Jonah (III. 10) did not say, "And God saw their sackcloth and their fasting", but "He saw their deeds that they returned from their evil ways;" and that the prophet Joel (II. 13) exclaimed, "Rend your hearts and not your garments," to which passages many prophetic utterances not less excellent might be easily added (comp. esp. Isai. LVIII. 3—7); and for further proofs it is only necessary to refer to the admirable section on Repentance in the great work *Yad Chazakah* of Maimonides. Yet an excessive formalism, encumbering and almost extinguishing the beautiful idea of the Day, remained, and must remain as long as the ordinances of an early Eastern civilisation are accepted as binding and unalterable.

Philological Remarks. — Ebn Ezra (on ver. 29) contends that the stranger was indeed bound to abstain from work, but not to fast; however, the most developed levitism permitted, in the chief obligations of religion, no difference between all the members of the community. Philo (De Septen. c. 7) considers the Day of Atonement under five aspects — (1.) as an exercise of temperance through fasting; (2.) as a proof of self-control, the Jews abstaining from food at the very season when they had just gathered in all their stores of fruit; (3.) as an act of gratitude, the people remembering in their abundance the privations of their ancestors; (4.) as a means of preserving the even flow of reason, which might by checked or disturbed by taking food constantly; and (5.) as a time of praying for forgiveness of sins, not on account of our own merits, but through the mercy of God who prefers pardon to punishment. The last point only is to the purpose. With regard to the typical acceptation of the Day of Atonement, which has been busily developed from the time of the Epistle to the Hebrews down to our day, we refer to our previous remarks on the subject (Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 158, 161; comp. *Spencer* l. c. 1059, 1065; *Deyling*, Observ. I. 96—98; *Michael.* Typ. Gottesgel. pp. 71—74, 165—169).

# CHAPTER XVII.

**Summary.** — Whenever the Hebrews desire to kill for food quadrupeds fit to be sacrificed, viz. oxen, lambs, and goats, they are invariably to offer them upon the common Altar with the usual sprinkling of blood and burning of fat, lest they continue to worship the demons of fields and deserts; disobedience to this law is declared equivalent to bloodshed, and menaced with excision (vers. 1—7). Both Hebrews and strangers are, under the same penalty, to present offerings at no other place but the national Sanctuary (vers. 8, 9), and to abstain from eating any blood whatever, and therefore also any נְבֵלָה and טְרֵפָה; since the blood, which is the life of the animal, is reserved for the Altar, to effect the expiation of sins; the blood of quadrupeds and birds killed in hunting, is to be covered with earth; and bathing and washing of garments are earnestly enjoined as lustrations after tasting נְבֵלָה or טְרֵפָה (vers. 10—16).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Speak to Aaron, and to his sons, and to all the children of Is-

**1—9.** It would be difficult to point out an organic connection between this chapter and the preceding sections. Beginning with a double code of sacrificial laws, the Book of Leviticus proceeds to detail the ordinances of purity, and then returns to the sacrificial laws, to which it joins other precepts on diet. However, the additions are not repetitions, but supplements; for they either enforce new commands, or they support old precepts by new reasons; in both respects they exhibit a decided advance in levitical rigour; and they seem indeed to belong to the very latest portions of the Pentateuch.

While the older legislation, as reflected in Deuteronomy (XII. 13—15, 21), merely demanded the slaughter of *sacrifices* at the common Sanctuary, our author boldly insists, besides, that *all* sacrificial animals, even those intended for *food*, must be treated as offerings, and be killed at the national Temple and under the supervision of the priests. Nor does he proclaim this law waveringly or timidly; for he delares its disregard as not less criminal than wanton bloodshed and the murder of a man; and he announces to the trespasser, in the name of God, the penalty of excision, that is, absolute exclusion from the holy community. And why this almost fierce severity? He can have had no mean motive or object — which was in fact no other than to prevent the Israelites "from offering any more their sacrifices to demons (לַשְּׂעִירִם), after whom they were going astray" (ver. 7). It seems indeed surprising that, even in his time, it should still have been necessary to adopt such coercive measures for weaning the people from the worst forms of idolatry; but we have proved in another place that the Hebrews clung to their superstitions in every period of their history, and long after the Babylonian exile; and in explaining the rites of the Day of Atonement, we have shown that, even after the age of Nehemiah, they attributed the pow-

rael, and say to them: This *is* the thing which the Lord has commanded, saying, 3. Any man of the house of Israel, who kills an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or who kills *it* out of the camp, 4. And does not bring it to the door of the Tent of Meeting, to offer an offer-

ers of temptation and seduction to the evil demon Azazel, to whom they annually sent a goat laden with the sins which they deemed his work (pp. 292—294; I. pp. 377—379).

Thus we are brought far into the Persian period, when the above command, burdensome under any circumstances, was at least not quite impracticable; for at that time the Jews lived together in a comparatively small circle round Jerusalem, from whence access to the Temple was easy. But not even the boldest or most ambitious priest could have ventured to frame such a law for the time when the whole land was inhabited from "Dan to Beersheba;" however, the writer, though as usual faithfully preserving the period and scenery of the Hebrew wanderings in introducing Aaron and his sons, the camp and the Tabernacle, really intended to legislate for Hebrew settlements in Canaan; this is evident from the words with which he concludes this ordinance: "This shall be a statute for ever to them throughout their generations" (ver. 7); and in order to mark its importance, he addresses it, under God's supreme authority, to every member of the community, both priests and Israelites, because all were directly concerned in its execution (vers. 1, 2). Yet Jewish tradition, shrinking from the exorbitant demands it imposes, declared, against the obvious tenour of the passage, that it is only meant to apply to real sacrifices (במוקדשים הכתוב מדבר), and forbids their *slaughtering*, whereas the following law (vers. 8, 9) and that of Deuteronomy interdict their *offering*, beyond the precincts of the Temple; and some Rabbins were of opinion that, even while the Temple existed, it was only operative in places *near* Jerusalem (and tradition taught which places were called near), whereas in more distant localities the clean animals were freely killed and eaten, a view which Karaite writers strongly opposed (comp. *Mishn.* Zevach. XIII. 1; *Talm.* Chull. 17[a]; *Siphra* in loc., fol. 83[b] ed. Schlossb.; *Rashi* and *Ebn Ezra* in loc.; *Maimon.* Maas. Hakkorb. XVIII. XIX, and in Seph. Hammits. שלא לשחוט קדשים בחוץ, the 90th negative precept; but on the other hand, *Aaron* II in כתר תורה on our passage).

It may be doubtful whether the priests received the portions which, in all proper thank-offerings, were allotted to them by the Law, since our command, while mentioning the sprinkling of the blood and the burning of the fat, is silent about the disposal of the breast and right shoulder; but the priests could not be left unrewarded, and at the meals that followed even thank-offerings in the wider sense, Levites were always among the invited guests. Certain it is that we have here no parallel to primitive usages, such as prevailed, for instance, in Homeric times: then the slaughtering of animals was indeed connected with a sacrifice, but it was presided over by the chief of the family himself, and performed in his own house; and the repast was strictly a domestic feast hallowed by pious gratitude towards the gods; whereas

**ing to the Lord before the Tent of the Lord; blood shall be imputed to that man; he has shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people: 5. In order that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices, which they offer in the open field, even that they**

the levitical regulation tended to deprive the Israelites of all personal authority in matters of religion, and to subject them entirely to priestly control: that these pretensions met with no large share of success, may be gathered from the constant struggles carried on between the hierarchical and the popular party down to the Roman time. Not more decisive are other apparent analogies: thus, whenever the Persians sacrificed, they took away the flesh of the victim, and ate it themselves (*Herod.* I. 132; *Strab.* XV. 732); but it does not follow, that whenever they desired to eat flesh, they sacrificed the animal to the gods. The Mohammedans regard no meat as lawful, unless the slaughtering of the beast is accompanied by a Divine invocation (see *supra* p. 22); but such expressions of submission and piety are widely different from a sanctification of the animal on the national Altar by means of the priests. Nearest akin to our law are the ordinances of the Hindoos, who are permitted to partake of meat mainly in connection with sacrifices and other acts of devotion (*Manu* V. 31 *sqq.*); but those ordinances are too wavering and uncertain to be reduced to well-defined principles (see *supra* pp. 41—43).

The second law (vers. 8, 9) is chiefly remarkable for its peremptoriness and its comprehensiveness; for it enjoins the offering of all sacrifices at the national Sanctuary under penalty of excision, and it expressly includes the strangers. The former point proves that the priesthood now felt themselves strong to oppose menace to popular disobedience; and the latter, that the organisation of the community had begun to be accomplished from a theocratic point of view; and both the one and the other are unerring criteria for the date of this section. On more than one occasion we have shown, that during long periods the chief Sanctuary was utterly disregarded as a religious centre, and that at all times heads of families and leaders, kings and prophets, offered sacrifices wherever they deemed fit or convenient; and our law appears to convey as much a remonstrance as an injunction (see Comm. on Gen. pp. 737—740; on Lev. I. pp. 27 *sqq.*; and espec. pp. 19—24).

It is not easy to determine the false deities after whom the Hebrews were going astray, and who in our text are described by a term meaning "he-goats" (שְׂעִירִם). Now it is well-known, that goats were, on account of their proverbial lasciviousness, regarded by the ancients as the types of prolific generation, and were honoured as such by many and peculiar rites of religion. The Egyptians inhabiting the Mendesian district, or worshipping in temples dedicated to Mendes, abstained from offering goats, and sacrificed sheep instead; and though it may be doubtful whether Mendes, whom Greek writers identify with Pan, or any other Egyptian deity, was, like Pan, represented with the face and legs of a goat, it is certain that in some provinces this animal, especially the male, was held sacred to Mendes, whom the Egyptians counted

**may bring them to the Lord, to the door of the Tent of Meeting, to the priest, and offer them *for* thank-offerings to the Lord. 6. And the priest shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the Lord *at* the door of the Tent of Meeting, and burn the fat for a sweet odour**

among the eight great or most ancient gods, preceding the twelve deities of the second order, and whom, almost like Khem, they considered as universal nature, as the god of vegetable as well as animal life, and in fact as presiding over everything generated. It is even related that in Mendes goats were allowed to have intercourse with women, as elsewhere goat-shaped demons were fabled to have and to satisfy similar propensities. Hence the Egyptians were said to venerate the goat for the same reason which prompted the Greeks to pay homage to Priapus; namely because they attributed to that animal the greatest desire and power of generation, which they supposed to manifest itself as early as seven days after its birth; and they chose the he-goat as the hieroglyphic sign for fruitfulness. These would indeed be intelligible reasons why the levitical legislator should express detestation against the worship of "he-goats", or against demons resembling them in appearance and attributes, because such worship clashes with the first principle of his creed — the absolute sovereignty of God over nature and all her powers. It seems that this form of idolatry prevailed at least in the northern kingdom, for Jeroboam is related to have set up for adoration not only calves but also he-goats (שְׂעִירִים), and to have appointed special priests for this service (2 Chr. XI. 15). But did it still linger among the Jews at the date of our chapter, that is, in the Persian period? There can be no doubt that, after their return from Babylon, the Jews of Palestine maintained an active intercourse with the Eastern empire and with Egypt, and were familiar with the institutions of both; thus notions borrowed from the Persian creed were combined with Egyptian conceptions; of this amalgamation we have a remarkable instance in the Book of Job, which was written about the same period, and which, on the one hand, introduces the Persian Satan and council of angels, and on the other describes the hippopotamus and the crocodile in a manner as they can only be described by one who personally observed them in their native Egypt. Therefore, while we believe that the "he-goats" of our text, like Azazel who periodically received a sin-laden goat, are chiefly meant for Persian demons or satyrs, wildly dancing and yelling in deserts and on ruins (Isai. XIII. 21; XXXIV. 14), they also include the goats which were held sacred among the Egyptians, and which were by the Hebrews understood as pagan symbols. Some sects of the Zabii likewise supposed that their deities frequently assumed the form of goats, and therefore simply called them goats: this belief may have sidereal significance, and may symbolise the fructifying power of the vernal sun (comp. *Herod.* II. 42, 46 — γυναικὶ τράγος ἐμίσγετο ἀναφανδόν —, 145, and *Wilkinson's* remarks in locc.; and Anc. Eg. I. 260; *Bunsen*, Eg. I. 374; *Strab.* XVII. I. 19, p. 802, ὡς δὲ Πίνδαρός φησιν, οἱ τράγοι ἐνταῦθα γυναιξὶ μίγνυνται; *Ael.* Nat. An. VII. 19; *Diod. Sic.* I.

**to the Lord. 7. And they shall no more offer their sacrifices to demons, after whom they are going astray. This shall be a statute for ever to them throughout their generations.**

18, 88; *Steph. Byz.* s. Πανὸς πόλις and Μένδης; *Suid.* s. Μένδην; *Horapoll.* I. 48; *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 46; *Boch.* Hieroz. I. 641 *sqq.*; II. 828, 829; *Jablonski*, Panth. I. 272—304; *Gesen.* on Isai. XIII. 21 and XXXIV. 14.).

Philological Remarks. — It has been vaguely contended, that "the service in the Sanctuary having been fixed, the author inserts here in its right place a law restricting all worship to that Sanctuary, which he appoints the centre of the nation" (*Ranke*, Untersuch. I. 104): however, the preceding chapter does not regulate the Temple service in general, but only the rites of one day of the year; and that chapter itself is separated from the main sacrificial code by elaborate ordinances on purification. Not more obvious is this alleged connection: "The great atonement offered, Israel is to enter upon a new life; .. it may not do after the abominations of the heathen; ... here consequently we find those laws which especially distinguish the nation of Israel from all other nations of the earth" (*Perowne* in Smith's Dict. of the Bible, II. 112): but our chapter contains no systematic survey of fundamental laws, among which, for instance, those on the Sabbath, Passover, and circumcision could not have been omitted, but a few supplementary injunctions on sacrifices and purity. Bertheau's usual search for "decalogues" of laws is in this section particularly unsuccessful; he confesses that he can find no more than six enactments; but in treating chapters XVII to XX as belonging together, he contrives to make out seven decalogues; and he proposes to place our chapter before the twentieth, in which he counts fourteen precepts which, with our six, would produce two decalogues (Gruppen, pp. 197 *sqq.*): these devices show sufficiently the frigid and mechanical character of his principles. The contents of the 17th to the 25th chapter have been characterised as "laws for the sanctification of the Israelites in their alliance with God" (Baumgarten, Keil); but this describes very imperfectly a large number of precepts which comprise among others the laws of matrimony and of charity towards the poor. To sum up, all attempts at proving a systematic arrangement have as yet been unavailing. — It is difficult to understand the assertion of a critical interpreter that the laws under discussion "may, as regards their matter, be Mosaic", though he admits that "with respect to vers. 8 and 9 this is not entirely the case" (*Knob.* Lev. p. 495); deceived by the successful representation of the Sinaitic age, he assumes, with many others, that the first law — that which commands the slaughtering of *all* animals at the Tabernacle — was meant to be valid for the time of Moses only, and he is thus compelled to put a strained construction upon the plain words, "this shall be a statute for ever (חֻקַּת עוֹלָם) to them throughout their generations" (ver. 7): if the growth of hierarchical principles among the Hebrews be well considered, all uncertainty disappears. Talmudical authorities supposed that contravention of our law was punished with excision if intentional; but that it was atoned for by a sin-offering if accidental. It is a matter of course that per-

8. And thou shalt say to them, Any man of the house of Israel, or of the strangers who sojourn among them, that offers a burnt-offering or thank-offering, 9. And does not bring it to the door of the Tent of

fect animals only, such as were duly qualified for the Altar, came within the scope of the precept (comp. *Talm.* Zevach. 106; Kerith. 2; *Maimon.* Maas. Hakk. XVIII). Some manuscripts read, in vers. 3, 8, 10, and 13, מִבְּנֵי ישראל instead of מִבֵּית י' (and thus the Sept. τῶν υἱῶν 'Ισραήλ, and other ancient versions); the difference is unessential, but the received reading seems preferable, because less common. The Sept. adds after מבית ישראל (ver. 3) ἢ τῶν προσηλύτων τῶν προσκειμένων ἐν ὑμῖν, thus including the stranger in the operation of the law; this addition, if genuine, would be important (see *infra*), but it is not confirmed by other ancient translations, nor by the manuscripts. Of no greater authority are the words inserted by the Sept. and the Samaritan text in ver. 4 after הביאו, namely, ὥστε ποιῆσαι αὐτὸ εἰς ὁλοκαύτωμα ἢ σωτήριον κυρίῳ δεκτὸν εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, καὶ ὃς ἂν σφάξῃ ἔξω, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου μὴ ἐνέγκῃ αὐτό. — The sense of the words דָּם יֵחָשֵׁב וכ' (ver. 4) is clear, and has been expressed by Rashi: "it is as if he sheds the blood of a man, and thus forfeits his life" (Luzzatto: "ciò verrà considerato a quell' uomo qual omicidio; egli ha versato sangue umano"). — The traditional explanation of the words וְנִכְרַת האיש וכ' (vers. 4, 9) is, "his progeny shall be destroyed, and his days shall be shortened" (so *Rashi* in loc.). — The construction in ver. 5 לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר יָבִיאוּ ··· וֶהֱבִיאֻם is rather loose; the first verb introduces the object, the second has, besides, other complements — "in order that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices . . ., and may bring them to the Lord to the door of the Tent of Meeting" etc. — The term פְּנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה *the open field* conveys the notion of perfect and unrestrained freedom (comp. XIV. 7, 53; Num. XIX. 16), which, in this case, rises to uncontrolled licentiousness; it implies, therefore, a double contrast to פתח אהל מועד אל הכהן — a circumscribed place standing under priestly supervision. — The accusative אותם (ver. 5) has an unusual and almost forlorn position at the end of the sentence (see Gramm. II. § LXXIV. 5). — שְׂעִירִם may simply be "goats", or goat-like creatures (i. e. the "hairy" or "shaggy", like hircus from hirtus or hirsutus, Aq. and Sym. τριχιῶνες, Saad. عنز برى wild goats, Dathe, Luzz. a. o. satyrs; some suggest "monkeys", *Saalsch.* Mos. R. I. 302), living in fields and deserts, in accordance with the explanation above given (Luther Feldteufel or Feldgeister; Gesen. Waldteufel); or it may be the "dreaded beings" (from שָׂעַר in the sense of holding in awe, Deut. XXXII. 17), and would thus coincide with שֵׁדִים lords or rulers, to whom boys and girls were sacrificed (Deut. l. c.; Ps. CVI. 37); the word is indeed rendered שֵׁדִים by Onk., Jonath., Syr., Rashi, Ebn Ezra, a. o. (Vulg. daemones, Engl. Vers. devils, Zunz Teufel; Philipps. Unholde). But it is, less probably, traceable to שָׂעַר in the sense of shuddering, so that it would be "creatures causing a shudder to those who behold them" (thus Ebn Ezra, Bechai, Spencer, a. o.). The Sept. has μάταια (i. e. אלילים), which term is too vague; still less can the שְׂעִירִם, to whom sacrifices were offered in the open field, and who are mentioned in contra-

**Meeting, to offer it to the Lord; that man shall be cut off from among his people.**

**10. And any man of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them, that eats any blood— I will set My face against that person that eats blood,**

distinction to חיות, be "beast-images of the deity, such as were common among the Egyptians" (*Hofmann*, Schriftbeweis, I. 433; comp. *Hoelemann*, Neue Bibelstudien, pp. 351—354). — Idolatry is consistently represented as "faithlessness" (זנות), since God and Israel have concluded a covenant, which is allegorically or poetically described as a matrimonial alliance (see Comm. on Exod. p. 333). — Some interpreters, as Ebn Ezra and Nachmanides, point out, that the word עוד (ver. 7) shows that the Hebrews had practised "goat-worship" in Egypt ("and they shall *no more* offer their sacrifices to demons"); that particle implies indeed that the abuse was still prevalent in the author's time; but this was not the age of Moses, but about a thousand years later. — The traditional text has בְּתוֹכָם in vers. 8 and 13, and בְּתוֹכְכֶם in ver. 12, but in all these passages the ancient versions and the manuscripts vary (see *De Rossi*, Var. Lect. I. 98, 99). — זֶבַח (ver. 8) is *thank-offering* (as in Exod. XVIII. 12; Lev. XIII. 37; Num. XV. 3, 8; etc.), for which the more usual term is זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים or שְׁלָמִים (see Comm. on Lev. I. 241).

**10—14.** Our author now forbids the eating of blood with a fulness as if the subject had never been treated of before, and with an earnestness, as if he were dwelling on the very essence and kernel of religion. And indeed he views the matter in a new light, and he blends it with the chief ideas of his creed. He prohibits blood mainly in connection with the laws of sacrifice, and he reserves it for the purposes of atonement. To him the Altar was the centre of national life, and to him the expiatory offerings were so decidedly the crowning stone of the sacrificial system, that he invested all classes of sacrifice, even holocausts and thank-offerings, with the force of atonement (comp. I. 4). These two points involve both the excellence and the weakness of levitism; the ends which it endeavoured to secure were admirable, but it strove to secure them by means which almost defeated their object; for it aimed at purity of the heart, humility, and unselfish devotion, but by extending formalism and especially the sphere of sacrifices, it fostered hypocrisy and self-righteousness. It rendered inward regeneration dependent upon a multitude of mechanical rites, which in an uncommon degree intensified the inherent dangers of ceremonialism.

But the author was by his theories placed in a perplexing difficulty. He commenced with the broad principle: "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the Altar to make an atonement for your lives, for it is the blood that makes an atonement by the life of the animal" (ver. 11). However, a few only of the clean beasts were lawful victims: should the blood of all the other animals be permitted? Such was indeed the natural consequence of that principle; and yet the eating of any blood whatever had from times immemorial been regarded with utter abhorrence, which the levitical author was certainly not inclined to abate. In this dilemma, he was com-

and will cut him off from among his people. 11. For the life of the flesh *is* in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your lives: for the blood makes an atonement by the life. 12. Therefore I say to the children of Israel, No soul

pelled to have recourse to the original principle which forbade blood simply because "the life of all flesh is its blood" (ver. 14); and thus he was enabled to bring within the range of his law the blood of the clean quadrupeds and birds not admitted on the Altar, and of those killed in the chase. His theory is, therefore, heterogeneous and wanting in unity: unwilling to acquiesce in a merely physical reason, he elevated it to the sphere of religion and atonement; yet, as, in doing so, he greatly narrowed the operation of the law, he returned to the physical reason, simply because it is more comprehensive. The subtlety of religious speculation did not wholly cover the popular practice. All these points, together with the successive stages of the law, have before been more fully dwelt upon (pp. 2—9; and I. pp. 121—126); nor need we here again explain why no blood, not even that shed in hunting, was to be left uncovered, since it would defile the earth, and, representing the spirit of life breathed into the animal by God, would "cry to heaven" (see Comm. on Gen. p. 218; comp. Job XVI. 18; Ezek. XXIV. 7).

The importance of this passage is evident; for it contains the plainest expression of the idea of vicariousness: the blood is the soul of the animal; and that soul is to be offered up to God on the Altar as an expiation for the worshipper's soul or life, which God might have demanded for his sins; and it is impossible to deny the great weight which that notion possesses in Hebrew theology (see Part I. pp. 291—302). Yet our passage can hardly be called "the key to the whole sacrificial theory" (so *Bähr*, Symbol. II. 199 *sqq.*); for it does not touch the large number of bloodless offerings (מִנְחָה), which were often presented alone, and even as sin-offerings (see I. pp. 220, 262); nor does it embrace the cases in which expiation was wrought by priestly fumigation or by money dedicated for the use of the Sanctuary (see I. p. 274); it merely dwells on the disposal and significance of the blood of victims for the purpose of expiation (see I. p. 125).

Philological Remarks. — "I will set My face (וְנָתַתִּי פָּנַי) against that person" (ver. 10), evidently means "I will make him feel My wrath"; hence Onkel. renders רוּגְזִי, and Zunz "meinen Zornblick". — The words כִּי הַדָּם הוּא בַּנֶּפֶשׁ יְכַפֵּר (ver. 11), which include the principal reason, from a levitical point of view, for the interdiction of blood, can, as regards language and context, only mean — "for it is the blood which makes atonement by the soul", that is, the blood of the victim expiates the worshipper's sins by the soul of the animal, which is identical with its blood: thus the words express clearly the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice, which is also implied in the antithesis of נפש and נפשותיכם (so Ebn Ezra — הדם בנפש שיש בו יכפר, — Abarban., Bähr, Winer, Kurtz — mittelst der Seele —, Delitzsch — vermöge oder kraft der Seele — Saalsch., Zunz, Philipps., Hofmann, Gerlach, Oehler, Knobel, Keil); others render "for the blood (of the animal) is an atonement instead of (the worshipper's) life" (so

of you shall eat blood, nor shall any stranger that sojourns among you eat blood. 13. And any man of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them, who hunts *and* catches any beast or fowl that may be eaten; he shall pour out its blood, and cover it with earth. 14. For the life of all flesh is its blood through

Sept. τὸ γὰρ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ ψυχῆς ἐξιλάσεται, Vulg. et sanguis pro animae piaculo sit, Jonath., Luther denn das Blut ist die Versöhnung für das Leben, Rashi תבא נפש ויכפר על הנפש, Nachman.); or simply "the blood atones the life" or the soul of the worshipper (so Onkel., Engl. Vers., Dathe, Gesen., De Wette, Hengstenb., Luzzatto, and many others): but the person or thing expiated, in connection with כפר, is never introduced by בְּ, but usually by עַל (as in this very verse לכפר על נפשתיכם), and sometimes by בְּעַד or מִן (see I. p. 476); and the phrase, instead of being explanatory, as we must expect from the particle כִּי, would be a feeble repetition of the idea that is to be explained. When the preposition בְּ with כִּפֶּר does not express the place (as Lev. VI. 23; XVI. 17, 27), it denotes always the means or instrument of expiation (Gen. XXXII. 21; comp. Lev. V. 16; VII. 7; XIX. 22; Ex. XXIX. 33; Num. V. 8; 1 Sam. III. 14; 2 Sam. XXI. 3; Isai. XXVII. 9; Ezek. XLIII. 22; Prov. XVI. 16; and so in our passage בַּנֶּפֶשׁ "by the soul"). Hofmann, Kliefoth, Bunsen, a. o., taking ב as ב essentiae, translate "das Blut sühnt als die Seele", or as Oehler gives it, "in der Eigenschaft der Seele". — Too subtle is the exposition of Bähr (Symbol. II. 209), who supposes that the human נֶפֶשׁ, being the medium of ἐπιθυμία, is the birthplace and home of sin, the source of all selfishness (— because נפש is in Hebrew used as a personal pronoun —), and must, therefore, be expiated. But the נפש of the animal is merely its principle of life or of physical existence, while the נפש of man, in the context of our passage, is the soul as organ of the moral functions (see Comm. on Gen. pp. 107, 218; and on Lev. I. p. 294). Not more plausibly observes Kurtz (Opferc. pp. 54—58), that the soul of the animal, which is guiltless because guided by a necessary instinct, is fitly chosen to expiate the soul of man, which is guilty because free and responsible: but according to Biblical notions the animals also are liable to depravity (see Comm. on Gen. p. 179). — In the fourteenth verse, the word בנפשו causes some difficulty: the phrase in which it occurs (כִּי־נֶפֶשׁ כָּל־בָּשָׂר דָּמוֹ בְנַפְשׁוֹ הוּא) seems to mean, "for the life of all flesh is its blood with, or through, its life" or animating power, that is, the blood is to be held sacred, not in itself or for its own sake, but in so far as it contains the elements or conditions of animal life; and those words may possibly be intended to prevent the superstitious awe with which pagan nations looked upon the blood, and which led to many irrational usages. Another translation is, "for the life of all flesh is its blood in or during its life", that is, as one interpreter explains it, "the life of all creatures consists in its blood, but only in as much and as long as this is allied with its נפש and encloses and contains it, lest coagulated or dried blood also, from which the נפש has passed away, be considered as the life" (Knob., similarly

its life: therefore I say to the children of Israel, You shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh; for the life of all flesh *is* its blood; whosoever eats it shall be cut off.

15. And any person that eats that which died of itself, or that which was torn *by beasts*, *whether it be* a native or a stranger, he shall wash his clothes, and

Luther "denn des Leibes Leben ist in diesem Blute, so lange es lebt", and probably De Wette, denn das Leben alles Fleisches ist sein Blut in seinem Leben"): but it is doubtful whether the suffix in בנפשו can be referred to the subordinate noun כל־בשר; and still more so, whether בנפשו can be paraphrased, "as long as it lives" or "during its life-time". Equally questionable seems Rashi's exposition, which, דמו בנפשו being rendered "instead of its life" (במקום הנפש), almost produces a tautology, "for the life of all flesh is its blood, which is instead of its life". Ebn Ezra explains, "its blood that is united with its life", which is neither quite distinct as regards the construction nor as regards the sense. Nachmanides and others render בנפשו "in its body" (Luzzatto: la vita d'ogni animale è il sangue ch'esso ha nel corpo), and Ewald (Alterth. p. 39), as doubtfully, "its blood itself", and so בנפש in ver. 11. The Chaldean translators literally reproduce the Hebrew text, and offer, therefore, no assistance; and the Septuagint and Vulgate entirely leave out the embarrassing word בנפשו (ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκὸς αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐστί, and anima enim omnis carnis in sanguine est). We might well adopt the translation "as regards the life of all flesh, its blood forms its soul" (בְּנַפְשׁוֹ, so Keil), if such a free application of 'בְּ essentiae were warranted by usage. Other versions are vague or mystical (f. i. *Delitzsch*, Bibl. Psych. p. 196, "sein in seiner Seele wesendes Blut"; *Baumgarten*, Comm. p. 198, "das Blut ist in der Seele, insofern das Blut als die Erscheinung in der Seele sein Wesen hat"; *Oehler* in Herz. Real-Encycl. X. 630, "sein beseeltes Blut", a. o.). — The legislator commands the covering of blood spilt in chasing animals, or in killing such as have been chased (ver. 13): but this does not prove that the Hebrews were, at the author's time, accustomed "to suck at once the warm blood of hunted animals" (*Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, p. 608); our passage implies merely what is elsewhere explicitly stated, that they ate the flesh "with the blood" (עַל־הַדָּם), and that they did so even in very late periods, as in the time of Ezekiel and afterwards (1 Sam. XIV. 32; Ezek. XXXIII. 25; etc.; see *supra* p. 3). — We must translate 'עַל־כֵּן אָמַרְתִּי וגו (ver. 12) "therefore I say to the children of Israel", not "I said"; for in no previous "Sinaitic" law is the prohibition of blood extended to the stranger as well as to the Hebrews (comp. III. 17; VII. 26, 27); our chapter bases that prohibition on entirely new grounds, and its unity and harmony with preceding sections cannot be upheld (see, f. i., the apologetic remarks of *Ranke*, Untersuch. II. 81).

**15, 16.** The transition from blood to the flesh of animals that have died of themselves (נְבֵלָה), or have been torn by wild beasts (טְרֵפָה) is natural and intelligible, as such flesh was partially, if not chiefly, interdicted, because it allowed but an imperfect removal of its blood (see pp. 15, 20). And this law also tends

**bathe himself in water, and shall be unclean until the evening; then he shall be clean. 16. But if he does not**

to prove the advanced date of our chapter. The strangers living among the Hebrews are included in nearly all the enactments — in the command permitting sacrifices at the common Sanctuary only, in the prohibition of blood, and in the ordinances concerning נְבֵלָה and טְרֵפָה; the idea of a holy and united community, protected against all dangers of idolatry, had at last been deeply rooted, and was striving after complete realisation. In the first law only—that which converts the slaughter of every beast into a sacrifice — the stranger is not mentioned; for though non-Hebrews, forming part of Hebrew settlements, could be compelled to abstain from pagan worship, they could not be compelled to revere the God of the Hebrews; therefore, whenever they were inclined to offer a sacrifice to Jehovah, they were commanded, like the Israelites, to offer it at the national Sanctuary; but whenever they simply desired to kill an animal for food, they were free to do so at any place they chose. As regards נְבֵלָה, the earlier Deuteronomist, less strict in ritual matters, expressly allows it as food to the stranger (Deut. XIV. 21); and even a preceding portion of our Book (XI. 40) prescribes, in cases of transgression, only washing of garments and uncleanness till the evening; but our section adds, besides, bathing in water, which it enjoins whenever נְבֵלָה has been *eaten*; and another law ordains the same lustration for priests who have merely *touched* such flesh (XXII. 5, 6; see *supra* p. 181). If we, moreover, consider that our author treats טְרֵפָה, which had long been more leniently viewed, with exactly the same rigour as נבלה, and that, with respect to both, he warns trespassers to dread the consequences of their "iniquity": it will be admitted that this section breathes the most thorough and most developed levitism.

We must, however, in conclusion, allude with a few words to a remarkable discrepancy. A previous law enforces a sin-offering for the *inadvertent touch* of נְבֵלָה (V. 2, 5, 6); while our verses demand merely bathing and washing of garments for the *intentional eating* of נְבֵלָה. It is not impossible that the former passage treats of the carcass of unclean, ours of clean animals (like XI. 39, 40), though there is nothing in the wording of our verses which claims, or even favours, this restriction; but it is more probable to suppose that at the date of this chapter the principle had fully prevailed that sin-offerings should only be presented for undesigned trespasses, and not, as had before been usual, for intentional offences also; therefore, the legislator could treat the voluntary eating of נְבֵלָה only as an ordinary defilement, but he took care to brand this defilement with unusual severity. Thus the gradual growth of the levitical system inevitably engendered many incongruities.

Philological Remarks. — The Karaite Aaron, in his Commentary, distinctly refers this law to cases of inadvertency (הוא על השוגג), and thus confirms the disagreement with V. 2 *sqq*. The same writer considers the stranger here mentioned to be "the stranger of righteousness" (גר צדק), who shared all religious duties and privileges with the Hebrews, whereas he supposes that in Deuteronomy (XIV. 21) the "stranger of the gate" (גר שער) is meant, who was required

**wash *his clothes*, nor bathe his flesh, then he shall bear his iniquity.**

to observe no more than the seven Noachic laws, but was merely a tolerated citizen, and no member of the religious community (see Comm. on Exod. p. 433). As the interdiction of blood was presumed to be one of those primitive laws (p. 9), the stranger mentioned in ver. 10 is "the stranger of the gate". — Jewish interpreters give this explanation — he who eats נבלה or טרפה is guilty if, without previous lustration, he enters the Temple or eats of holy things (so Herxheimer, Johlson, Salomon, Luzzatto, a. o.): but the operation of the laws of purity is not confined to matters connected with the Sanctuary (p. 193). — The term "he shall bear his iniquity" (וְנָשָׂא עֲוֹנוֹ) does not mean "he shall suffer death"; both expressions are clearly distinguished from each other (comp. XX. 17, 19).

IV.

# MORAL AND MISCELLANEOUS LAWS.

CHAPTERS XVIII TO XX.

## INTRODUCTORY ESSAY.

## THE MATRIMONIAL LAWS OF THE BIBLE AND THEIR LATER DEVELOPMENT.

It seems expedient to begin with an historical sketch of the matrimonial laws and customs which prevailed among the Hebrews from the earliest times down to the completion of the levitical code.

For many centuries, marriages with non-Hebrews were freely contracted, without calling forth either censure or comment. Joseph took to wife the daughter of an Egyptian priest[1], and Moses married first the daughter of a Midianite chief, and then an Ethiopian woman; against this latter alliance Aaron and Miriam indeed murmured, but, we are told, God punished them severely for their presumption[2]. The sons of Elimelech of Bethlehem took Moabite wives, and one of these, Ruth, was, after her husband's death, married to Boaz in the land of Judah, not only with the knowledge, but with the full approval of his fellow-townsmen[3]. During the period of the Judges, "the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, the Hittites, and Amorites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and Jebusites; and they took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons"[4]: the displeasure pronounced by the historian at

[1] Gen. XLI. 45.
[2] Exod. II. 21; Num. XII. 1 *sqq.*
[3] Ruth I. 4; IV. 9—14.
[4] Judg. III. 5, 6.

this conduct only shows how it was viewed in his own much later time. Hiram, the famous artist, was the son of a Hebrew woman and a Phœnician workman; and he was employed by King Solomon for the adornment of the holy Temple[5]. Bathsheba, the mother of Solomon, was first the wife of "Uriah the Hittite"[6]. It is uncertain whether she was likewise of Canaanitish descent: if she was not, a Hebrew woman took a heathen husband; and if she was, a Hebrew king took a heathen woman. Solomon married the daughter of the Egyptian Pharaoh; and the historian, having recorded this fact, added, "And Solomon loved the Lord, and walked in the statutes of David his father"[7]. It was only when the king had taken, besides, numerous foreign wives, who in his old age tempted him to idolatry, that the author, who wrote after the Babylonian exile, expressed his strong indignation[8]. The Deuteronomist does not object to the marriage of Hebrews with captive women of the heathen[9]. And even Esther, living in the Persian period, is related to have married a heathen king, without any effort being made by her pious relative Mordecai to prevent or to dissolve the union[10].

When, however, in the course of time, the nationality of the Hebrews became more marked and more distinct, they showed a growing disinclination to matrimonial alliances with other tribes; and proud of their race, they were anxious to preserve it pure and unmixed. The author of the patriarchal history in Genesis attributes to Abraham an injunction given to his steward not to take a wife for his son Isaac from the daughters of Canaan, but to select one in his Mesopotamian home[11]; and he relates that Isaac and Rebekah were deeply grieved because their son Esau had intermarried with Hittite families, and that they sent Jacob away to seek a wife beyond the Euphrates[12]. When Samson was desirous of marrying a Philistine maiden of Thimnathah, his parents earnestly dissuaded him, saying—"Is there no woman among the daughters of thy brethren, or among all thy people, that thou goest to take a wife of the uncir-

5 1 Ki. VII. 13, 14. Josephus (Antiq. VIII. III. 4), taking offence at this statement, converts the Phoenician father of Hiram into an Israelite, and calls him Uriah (πατρὸς δὲ Οὐρίου, γένος Ἰσραηλιτῶν).

6 2 Sam. XI. 3; XXIII. 39.

7 1 Kings III. 3.

8 1 Kings XI. 1 *sqq.*

9 Deut. XXI. 10—14; comp. *Selden*, De Jur. Nat. et Gent. lib. V. c. 13, pp. 617 *sqq.*

10 Sometimes circumcision seems to have been required from non-Hebrews who wished to marry Hebrew women; comp. Gen. XXXIV. 14—17.

11 Gen. XXIV. 3, 4.

12 Gen. XXVI. 34, 35; XXVII. 46;

cumcised Philistines?" Yet the writer observes that Samson acted by a Divine impulse, that he might find means to humble the Philistines[1].

In a succeeding stage of Hebrew history, religious objections were added to national antipathies, and rendered marriages with foreigners doubly hateful in the eyes of Jewish patriots. They denounced such marriages as a snare to their faith, as a fatal inducement to idolatry[2]; in order to remove the temptation and the danger, they forbade any treaty or alliance of whatever kind to be concluded with non-Hebrews[3]; and at last they did not even allow idolaters to dwell within the Hebrew settlements[4]. The Law enjoined that the offspring of an Edomite or of an Egyptian should be excluded from the Hebrew community down to the third generation; and that no descendant of an Ammonite or a Moabite should ever be admitted as a member of the chosen people[5]. But these principles were very tardily adopted. Long after the Babylonian exile, Ezra saw with sorrow and dismay that people and priests alike had intermarried with the heathen tribes in and around Palestine, and that thus "the holy seed had been mingled with the people of strange lands." He made the most determined efforts to purge the commonwealth from these obnoxious elements; yet not long afterwards Nehemiah and Malachi found heathen alliances again so prevalent that the children almost ceased to understand Hebrew[6]. However, mainly owing to the zeal of these reformers, marriages with strangers were from that time scrupulously shunned as criminal[7]; and hence the Samaritans or Cutheans, the progeny of Israelites and Assyrians, were regarded with a fierce enmity which has hardly a parallel in history[8].

From these facts we may draw some significant inferences throwing light upon the date and composition of the Pentateuch. Moses

---

XXVIII. 1, 2, 6—9; XXIX. 19; XXXVI. 2, 3. Lot, however, selected Canaanite husbands for his daughters (Gen. XIX. 14). Comp. *Augustin.* De Civit. Dei XV. 16.

[1] Judg. XIV. 1—4; comp. also XVI. 1, 4.

[2] Exod. XXXIV. 16; Deut. VII. 3; comp. *Talm.* Yevam. 76[b]; Kiddush. 68.

[3] Exod. XXIII. 32; XXXIV. 12, 15; Deut. VII. 2.

[4] Exod. XXXIV. 33; Deut. VII. 2; comp., however, Judg. I. 19, 21, 27—35; II. 21—23; III. 1—5, etc.

[5] Deut. XXIII. 5—9; comp. 1 Ki. XI. 2.

[6] Ezra IX. 1 *sqq.*; X. 1 *sqq.*; Neh. X. 31; XIII. 23—27; Mal. II. 11.

[7] Comp. *Tacit.* Hist. V. 5, projectissima ad libidinem gens, alienarum concubitu abstinent.

[8] Comp. *Joseph.* Ant. XI. IV. 9; XX. VI. 1, etc.; comp. *Selden* loc. cit. lib. V. c. 12, pp. 612 *sqq.*

took for his second wife a woman from the detested race of the Hamites[9], and this he is said to have done after the promulgation of the Sinaitic laws, which rigorously proscribe such a marriage.[10] These laws can, therefore, not have been promulgated by Moses.—The Book of Ruth was evidently written at a time when marriages with the heathen were frequent and were still looked upon as unobjectionable; for it sets forth the descent of the great King David from a Moabitish woman; and the author, so far from condemning the marriage of Boaz and Ruth, represents it as a pious and praiseworthy act on the part of both. And yet such an alliance is in the Pentateuch declared an abomination; the offspring issuing from it were for ever banished from the community; they were illegitimate outcasts with regard to whom the Hebrew was enjoined—"Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days for ever"[11]. Can these commands of the Pentateuch have been in force at the time when the Book of Ruth was composed — that is, at the earliest, in the reign of David or Solomon? And as David was the descendant of a Moabitess, so was Rehoboam the son of an Ammonite woman Naamah[12], and yet no objection was raised to their occupying the throne of Israel as theocratic kings.

Turning to marriages of affinity and consanguinity, we find that, for a long time, the customs of the Hebrews closely resembled those of other ancient nations. Like the Egyptians, the Persians, and others, the Israelites do not seem to have shunned marriages with sisters[13]. According to the cosmogony in Genesis, all human families are derived from one primitive couple; the author must, therefore, have deemed conjugal connection between brothers and sisters blameless[14]. Abraham, the son of Terah, married his half-sister Sarah, Terah's daughter[15]. The wife of Amram was Jochebed, his aunt, the

---

[9] Num. XII, 1, see *supra*.

[10] Exod. XXXIV. 16.

[11] Deut. XXIII. 7; comp. ver. 4.

[12] 1 Ki. XIV. 21, 31.

[13] Comp. *infra* on XVIII. 6.

[14] Comp. *Talm*. Sanhed. $58^b$, where the words עֹלָם חֶסֶד יִבָּנֶה (Ps. LXXXIX. 3) are explained, "An act of חֶסֶד (i. e. marriage with the sister, comp. XX. 17) has built up the world"; *Targ. Jon*. on XX. 17; *August*. De Civit. Dei XV. 16, viri sorores suas conjuges acceperunt; *Selden* loc. cit. lib. V. c. 8, pp. 576 *sqq*.

[15] Gen. XX. 12. Later Jews, assuming that the ordinances on incest (גלוי עריות) were enjoined upon all men at the time of Noah (see *supra* p. 10), and anxious to free Abraham from the stain of having married his sister, asserted that Sarah was the daughter of his brother Haran (*Joseph*. Ant. I. vi. 5; *Michael*. Ehegesetze § 23; comp. *Rashi* on Gen. XX. 12, "grand-

mother of Aaron and Moses [1]. More noteworthy is the instance of Amnon and Tamar, David's children. When Amnon was bent upon doing violence to his sister, she thus implored him, "Now speak, I pray thee, to the king, he will not withhold me from thee"; and when, after the commission of the outrage, Amnon bade her leave him, she remonstrated—"This evil in sending me away is greater than the other that thou didst to me" [2]. However, the Deuteronomist already set a curse upon marriage with a half-sister [3]. Jacob had simultaneously two sisters for wives. This double marriage, which indeed the patriarch did not originally contemplate, was not stigmatised by the historian, though it was afterwards by the legislator [4].

Gradually, however, principles were adopted which resulted in a distinctive system of matrimonial laws. Purity of race and purity of creed were no longer the only objects kept in view. Matrimony was not merely regarded in its social, but in its moral bearings; it was estimated less by the influence it exercises upon the community than by its effects upon the families; and it was designed not only to cement the nation but to improve the individuals. It was almost raised into a sacrament. There was, on this point, no antagonism between Church and State. Neither of them disputed to the other the right of sanctioning marriages, for both alike endeavoured to promote the moral education of every Hebrew. Husband and wife were now regarded as "one flesh" (בָּשָׂר אֶחָד). The beautiful narrative of the creation of the first woman was framed to show that "a man must leave his father and his mother, and cling to his wife" [5];

---

children are like children, and in this way Sarah was Terah's daughter"; and similarly other Jewish writers); the same view is also entertained by the Arabs (comp. *Abulfed.* Hist. Anteislam. p. 20 ed. Fleischer; *Clericus* on Genes. XX. 12, and on Lev. XVIII. 9).

[1] Exod. VI. 20.

[2] Comp. 2 Sam. XIII. 13, 16, 20. Ancient Jewish expositors assumed that David was not the father of Tamar, but that he merely reared her up in his house, after he had married her mother (comp. *Ebn Ezra* on XVIII. 11). Michaelis (Ehegesetze, p.12) observes, that it might have been expected that David would in this individual case "have granted a dispensation": but no one had the power of suspending the statutes of the Law, which professed to emanate from an authority higher than even that of a Hebrew king.

[3] Deut. XXVII. 22.

[4] Comp. Lev. XVIII. 18. The narrative, prompted by national hatred, of the alleged crime of Lot's daughters, and Absalom's connection, for political reasons, with his father's concubines, afford no proof with regard to Hebrew customs (comp. Gen. XIX. 33—36; 2 Sam. XVI. 21, 22; XX. 3; also Gen. XXXV. 22; 1 Ki. II. 13—22).

[5] Gen. II. 24; comp. Matth. XIX. 5;

and conjugal infidelity was deemed an offence so heinous that it was forbidden in the fundamental Commandments by the side of theft and bloodshed, and was punished with implacable severity[6]. The Deuteronomist attempted no complete enumeration of forbidden degrees; he mentioned only three instances of affinity, the step-mother, the half-sister, and the mother-in-law[7]; and it may be concluded that he considered consanguinity as an insuperable barrier to a matrimonial alliance. Fuller lists were subsequently furnished by levitical writers in two different sections. In one of them (ch. xx.) are proscribed, in addition to the cases specified by the Deuteronomist, marriages with the daughter-in-law, with the brother's wife, and with the aunt—whether the father's or the mother's sister, or the wife of the father's brother[8]. The other and still more elaborate list (ch. xviii.) begins with the general prohibition, "None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him"[9]; and interdicts, besides, the marriage with the mother, the grand-daughter, and with the wife's sister during the lifetime of the former[10]. But even this last list is incomplete. It omits the mother-in-law, who is named in the two other passages[11]; and, like these, it does not make mention of the daughter: if it be urged that the legislator considered marriage with the daughter an enormity too unnatural to be ever committed, why did he specify the mother[12]?

It is important to keep these facts in mind in order to arrive at a just and rational estimate of the levitical marriage ordinances. The thirteen cases actually set down do not exhaust the prohibitions; they are merely the chief instances, which must be supplemented in accordance with the two principles above referred to, namely, that husband and wife are one flesh, and that it is unlawful to marry a blood-relation. The same reasons which militate against the marriage between nephew and aunt, militate against the marriage between niece and uncle; for if a man must avoid living in matrimony with his father's or his mother's sister, why should a woman be permitted to live in matrimony with her father's or her mother's brother?[13]

---

Mark X. 7, 8; Ephes. V. 31; see *Selden*, De Jur. Nat. et Gent. lib. V. cap. 2, pp. 541—544.

6 See Comm. on Exod. pp. 369, 422—425.

7 Comp. Deut. XXVII. 20—23.

8 Comp. Lev. XX. 11—21.

9 Lev. XVIII. 6, שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ.

10 Comp. Lev. XVIII. 6—18.

11 Lev. XX. 14; Deut. XXVII. 23.

12 The Koran (IV. 27) expressly includes the daughter (وبناتكم).

13 The assertion that "Orientals regard the niece as a more distant relation than the aunt" (*Michael.* Mos. R. § 117), may be well-founded or not;

And again, there is no reason why, if marriage with the wife of the *father's* brother is forbidden[1], marriage with the wife of the *mother's* brother should be allowed[2]. In the former case the degree of consanguinity, in the latter the degree of affinity, is identical in the one direction and in the other. Yet Jewish tradition, though including in the interdictions the wife of the mother's brother, not only permitted but encouraged marriages between niece and uncle, since Sarah was supposed to have been Abraham's niece[3]. In pronouncing this decision, the Rabbins unquestionably misconceived the spirit of our laws. The silence of the Bible affords no proof, or else the marriage of a father with his daughter might be legalised, since it is not expressly forbidden. The levitical author argued that, as a son is not allowed to marry his mother, so, as a matter of course, a daughter must not marry her father; and as a man is forbidden to wed his aunt, so, by parity of reasoning, must a woman not become the wife of her uncle. The Hebrew legislators ordinarily addressed their commands to the men, and they might well have expected that the precepts on matrimony would be fairly and rationally applied to women. The matter appears to be plain beyond a doubt, and the marriage between uncle and niece was indeed rejected by most of the sects which derived their laws from the Bible[4], as it was

---

but it can in no case be used for the explanation of the Hebrew law which determines relationship by the degree of consanguinity, not of presumable familiarity of social intercourse. In earlier times, the marriage between uncle and niece seems indeed to have been common. Nahor is said to have married Milcah, the daughter of his brother Haran (Gen. XI. 29). Again, in Josh. XV. 17 and Judg. I. 13, we read עָתְנִיאֵל בֶּן־קְנַז אֲחִי כָּלֵב: if we translate these words, "Othniel, the son of Kenaz, the brother of Caleb", then Achsah, Caleb's daughter, who married Othniel, would be the niece of the latter; and so the passages were understood by the Masorites, who provided קְנַז with a distinctive accent. However, if we translate, "Othniel the son of Kenaz, of the brother of Caleb", Achsah and Othniel would be cousins. Michaelis (Ehegesetze § 8) renders, "Othniel, the *grand-son* of Kenaz, a *relative* of Caleb", which is against the genius of Hebrew.

[1] Or of the patruus.

[2] Or of the avunculus.

[3] See *supra* p. 357 note 15. Many have argued thus: — "the nephew is frequently in his uncle's house and constantly meets his uncle's wife; but the uncle is not so frequently in his nephew's house, and seldom meets the wife of the latter" (so *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 49, and others): not such external considerations, but the regard of שְׁאֵר בָּשָׂר determined the laws of matrimony.

[4] As by the Karaites and their followers (comp. *Fürst*, Karäerthum, I. 84; *Grätz*, Gesch. der Juden, V. 202), and the Mohammedans (*Koran* IV. 27, وبنات الاخ وبنات الاخت).

also disapproved by the Romans. When the Emperor Claudius desired to marry Agrippina, the daughter of his brother Germanicus, he attained his object only by prevailing upon the Senate, with much pressure and persuasion, to sanction a new law which permitted the marriage with the niece to all Roman citizens[5]; yet later authorities repealed this law, and returned to the old and deeprooted usage[6]. The apostolic constitutions and the earliest Christian Canons, supplementing the Biblical and the Roman laws of matrimony, prescribed, that "whosoever marries his niece can fill no clerical office." St. Ambrose declared against Paternus, a man of great distinction, that "such a marriage was forbidden by the law of nature and by an inborn feeling"; and Cranmer included the niece (filia fratris) in the list of forbidden relations[7].

There are connected with this subject two points which are of peculiar interest because they permit us a deep insight into the origin and economy of the Law.

In the lists of Leviticus, the marriage with a brother's wife is twice clearly forbidden, and once it is denounced as a defilement and an abomination[8], sure to be visited with the penalty of childlessness[9]. But, on the other hand, in Deuteronomy, such a marriage is, under certain circumstances, as clearly and as emphatically enjoined as a sacred duty—namely, if a man had died without leaving a son, his brother was obliged to marry his widow, and the first son born of this matrimony took the name of the deceased. If the brother refused to marry the widow, he was branded with public disgrace as a traitor to his family[10]. How is this manifest contradiction to be *accounted for*? For all attempts at *harmonising* it are necessarily unavailing. St. Augustine, and many others after him, supposed that the prohibition was confined to the case of the deceased brother leaving children, or that it restrained a man from marrying the *divorced* wife of his brother during the lifetime of the latter[11]. These qualifications, it need hardly be remarked, are mere hazards devoid of the slightest Biblical support. It is usually asserted that, in Deuteronomy, "a concession

---

[5] Thus Domitian married Julia, the daughter of Titus.

[6] Comp. *Tacit.* Annal. XII. 5—7; *Sueton.* Claud. 26.

[7] Reformatio Legum Eccles. p. 48 ed. Cardwell.

[8] נִדָּה, see *supra* p. 212.

[9] Lev. XVIII. 16; XX. 21.

[10] Deut. XXV. 5—10; comp. Matth. XXII. 23—28.

[11] Quaest. in Lev. LXI, non licere cuiquam defuncti fratris ducere uxorem, si defunctus posteros dereliquit; aut etiam illud esse prohibitum, ne liceret ducere fratris uxorem, etiamsi a fratre vivo per repudium recessisset.

was made to the old and widespread institution of the *levirat*," or "an exception was granted in favour of a special case"[1]. But if the custom of leviration existed, and was to be preserved, the marriage with the brother's wife could not be unconditionally forbidden. If, on the other hand, such a marriage was described as uniformly detestable, the custom of leviration could not be upheld; the prohibition and the custom cannot have existed simultaneously; they must belong to different periods. This appears, in fact, to be the case, and it involves the only rational explanation of the difficulty. Let it be remembered that the law concerning the levirat occurs only in Deuteronomy, and not in Leviticus, and that the interdiction of the marriage with a sister-in-law occurs only in Leviticus, and not in Deuteronomy. Now the levirat, which prevailed among the Hebrews from primitive times[2], as it obtained, and still obtains, among many eastern nations[3], was intended to protect the agrarian rights of Hebrew families, and to prevent the extinction of representatives of Hebrew households, as is so well illustrated by the transactions related in the Book of Ruth. Therefore, the Deuteronomist, writing at a time when the old tribal and agrarian division was still in force, at least in a portion of the Hebrew territories, confirmed the old practice of leviration, and refrained from including in his matrimonial ordinances a prohibition against the marriage with a sister-in-law. But the levitical author, living in the post-Babylonian period, when that agrarian division was not carried out in the poor and scattered settlements, had neither a political nor a social reason for maintaining the levirat. He had, on the contrary, every inducement to suppress it, if possible; for to him the principle that "husband and wife are one flesh" had become a reality. He regarded, therefore, the husband's brother also as his wife's brother; a marriage with a sister-in-law was to him like a marriage with a sister,

---

[1] Comp. *H. W. J. Thiersch*, Das Verbot der Ehe innerhalb der nahen Verwandtschaft etc., 1869, pp. 31, 32; see also *Michaelis*, Mos. R. § 101; Eheges. Mos. § 71; *Baumgarten*, Theolog. Comment. p. 206 ("der Fall der Leviratsehe ist billig eine Ausnahme, weil dann der lebende Bruder in die Stelle des verstorbenen eingeht"); and some recent Commentators.

[2] Comp. Gen. XXXVIII. 6—11; Ruth IV.

[3] As the tribes of Siam, Pegu, and Afghanistan, the Circassians, Tartars, and the Gallas in Abyssinia; see Comm. on Gen. p. 620. According to Hindoo law, funeral ceremonies for the peace of the soul might be performed by the children of the deceased, or by the children born by his widow to his brother or some other near relative or Sapinda (compare *Goldstücker*, Mahâbhârata, pp. 14, 38).

and therefore incestuous; and should he who forbade a man to marry the wife of his *father's* brother, have allowed him to marry the wife of his *own* brother[4]? These facts afford, besides, one of the strongest proofs of the later date of Leviticus as compared with Deuteronomy. We can well understand a progress from the primitive institution of the levirat to the rigorous interdiction of a marriage with so near a relation as a sister-in-law; but a retrograde step from such an interdiction to the levirat appears historically impossible. Later Judaism so strongly abhorred the alliance with a brother's wife that it expressly prohibited the levirat, in flagrant opposition to a clear law of the Pentateuch, and, by a strange and contradictory device[5], forced the bridegroom's unmarried brothers to renounce beforehand all claims upon his wife, in case she should become a widow, and yet made them appear as if blamably evading a sacred duty imposed upon them by the Law. In some eastern communities, however, as among the Sefardim in Zafet, the levirat is still adhered to[6].

The second point relates to a question which has been long and warmly discussed — the marriage with the deceased wife's sister[7]. It appears to us that the matter may be decided by a few simple considerations. If the marriage with the deceased brother's wife is rejected as an iniquity, the marriage with the deceased wife's sister must be regarded in the same light; for, according to levitical principles, the latter alliance also is virtually one between brother and sister. And yet, looking at the command as it stands in our received text, we must admit that such an alliance is plainly allowed: "Thou shalt not take a wife to her sister, to cause enmity, to uncover her nakedness, beside her, in her lifetime"[8]—that is, a man is forbidden to have simultaneously two sisters for wives, but he may marry the second sister after the death of the first[9]. Here we are again in a perplexing dilemma: analogy demands the absolute condemnation of the marriage with a sister-in-law, and yet the clear wording of the ordinance condemns it only under certain circumstances. Are we to attach greater weight to the spirit of these statutes, or to the apparent distinctness of the language? We confess that we would fain uphold the consistency of the levitical marriage laws, which seem to be thoughtfully framed; but then we should be obliged to

---

[4] Comp. Lev. XVIII. 14; XX. 20.

[5] The so-called חֲלִיצָה; comp. Deut. XXV. 10; Ruth IV.

[6] Comp. *Lewysohn*, Klänge aus dem Morgenlande, p. 5.

[7] Lev. XVIII. 18.

[8] *Ibid.* לִצְרֹר לְגַלּוֹת עֶרְוָתָהּ עָלֶיהָ בְּחַיֶּיהָ.

[9] See notes on XVIII. 18.

regard a few words of the text as an interpolation [1], so that the command would run thus: "Thou shalt not take a wife to her sister, to uncover her nakedness"; and we appeal to everyone familiar with the Hebrew idiom whether the term "in her lifetime" (בְּחַיֶּיהָ), which chiefly causes the difficulty, does not read like an addition hardly standing in its right place. In the Koran the corresponding command is simply, "You are also forbidden to take to wife two sisters" [2]. In comparatively early times marriages with the deceased wife's sister were not only deemed unobjectionable, but most commendable, since it was believed that a sister would treat her sister's children with greater care and affection than could be expected from a stranger [3]; and when this view gained ground, the word בְּחַיֶּיהָ might have been added to effect the desired change in the sense of the command. It need not be remarked that this suggestion is no more than a conjecture; but if the received reading is considered authentic, unity of principle and harmony of detail are destroyed in the levitical lists of forbidden degrees. It is impossible to accede to the rule that, "whereas the wife becomes incorporated into the family of the husband, the husband is not incorporated into the family of the wife; his relations become her relations, but her relations do not become his relations" [4]. This may be true from the social and civil, but it is not true from the ethical and religious points of view, and it is the latter which mainly underlie the levitical laws of matrimony. Therefore, to sum up, those who cling to the literal accuracy of the traditional text are free to permit the marriage with the deceased wife's sister, but in doing so they disregard the leading ideas of the Hebrew laws of matrimony, and sanction an alliance which, according to their spirit, the legislator unquestionably considered as objectionable and unlawful.

We believe that the table of prohibited degrees, which was prepared in the reign of Queen Elizabeth (in 1563), and which since then has been acted upon in the Anglican Church, fully harmonises with the levitical precepts. It interdicts thirty alliances to men, and the same number to women, some of which are expressly for-

---

[1] Viz. the words עליה בחייה, perhaps also לצרר.

[2] *Koran* IV. 27.

[3] Comp. also *Mishn.* Yevam. IV. 13; X. 4.

[4] *M'Caul*, The ancient Interpretation of Lev. XVIII. 18 etc. pp. 36—38; comp. also *Baumgarten*, Theolog. Comment. p. 204, "im Alten Testament ist das Weib noch nicht zu der gleichen Persönlichkeit mit dem Manne gekommen."

bidden in the Law, while others are deduced from them by analogy [5]. Exactly the same conclusions were arrived at by Melanchthon [6], and by the learned Johannes Gerhard, whose sound arguments and lucid deductions almost exhaust the subject [7]. However, Luther was of opinion that those prohibitions only are binding which are expressly set forth in the Bible [8], and his authority could not fail to have a strong effect upon Protestant Churches. Thus Frederick the Great, at the beginning of his reign (1740), permitted marriage in ten cases which had till then been forbidden because they seemed to be proscribed by the spirit of the Law [9]. Some Protestant theologians not only supported this decree by historic and philosophical arguments, but went farther in the same direction. Joh. Dav. Michaelis, reducing the laws of marriage, as he reduced nearly all Biblical laws, to the level of social and political expediency, contended that there was not a single marriage which, if once concluded, needed be dissolved as being incestuous. For instance, if a man had married his sister or his daughter, all that was required was to keep the matter secret; and holding of no account the *respectus parentelæ*, as he disavowed the *horror* and *pudor naturalis*, he believed that "a Christian ruler would not sin" in permitting, by special license, such alliances as those with the father's and mother's sister [10]. These principles were indeed not adopted in modern legislations, but they exercised no mean influence upon some of them; and in the Prussian code the following three categories only are prohibited:—(1.) Marriages between blood-relations in ascending and descending line; (2.) Marriages between brothers and sisters, or half-brothers and half-sisters, whether born in wedlock or not; and (3.) Marriages between step-parents and step-children, and between father or mother-in-law and son or daughter-in-law [11]. Alliances with the aunt and the uncle, the deceased wife's sister, and with the brother's widow, are not interdicted.

With the exceptions referred to, the choice of the Hebrews was unrestricted. No one was obliged to marry within his own tribe or

---

[5] Compare *Richard Burn*, Ecclesiastical Law, ed. Tyrwhitt, II. 438—450.

[6] De Conjugio, 1551.

[7] Loci theologici, Locus XXVI; §§ 239 *sqq.* De Gradibus prohibitis.

[8] Vom ehelichen Leben, 1522.

[9] Viz. with the deceased wife's sister; with the brother's daughter and the sister's daughter; with the widow of the mother's brother, with the widow of the brother's and the sister's son; with the half-brother's widow; with the father's and the mother's step-sister; and with the widow of the father's half-brother. See notes on XVIII. 1—5.

[10] *Michaelis*, Von den Ehegesetzen Mosis, §§ 91—104.

[11] Preuss. Landr., Th. II. Tit. I. § 3.

class[1], not even the priests and the High-priest; only women who, because they had no brothers, came into possession of the paternal fields, were bound to marry from their own tribe, lest its territorial extent be impaired[2]. In some points, however, the sacerdotal order was subjected to greater strictness: all its members were forbidden to marry divorced or dishonourable women; and the High-priest was, moreover, to take no widow, but a Hebrew virgin, "lest he profaned his seed among his people"[3].

Other legislations were, in many respects, much more burdensome. The Hindoo law prescribed that a regenerated man must refrain from marrying a woman who, from the father's or the mother's side, is related to him in the sixth degree, or whose family name in any way seems to bespeak kinship with his own family[4]. Talmudists extended the Biblical prohibitions to the ascending and descending lines of whatever degree[5], though the practical effect was very slight on account of the great disparity of years between the parties. For instance, as the mother is forbidden, so is the grandmother and great-grandmother; as the step-mother, so the grandfather's wife; as the daughter-in-law, so the grandson's wife; as the granddaughter, so the son's or the daughter's granddaughter[6]. The same rules were laid down by the Canonical decrees, and also by the Roman law, which was framed upon the principle that "matrimony is not allowed between persons who occupy the mutual position of parents and children"[7]. The Biblical prohibitions were, moreover, applied to additional degrees in lateral lines: as the father's and the mother's

---

[1] It was different among other ancient nations: "Men of the regenerated classes are recommended to take as their first wives from their own class; and those who are inclined to marry again, must give the preference to women of their own or to the next lower class" (*Manu* III. 13); "A Brahmin who marries a Sudra woman as his first wife, sinks into the sphere of agony, and if he begets a child with her, he loses his rank as priest, ... for he commits a crime which the laws declare to be beyond the possibility of atonement" (cc. 17, 19); comp. in general, *Manu* III. 5 *sqq.*; XI. 171, 176; *Yâjnav.* I. 56, 57; *Diod. Sic.* I. 73, 74.

[2] Comp. Num. XXVII. XXXVI.

[3] See Lev. XXI. 7, 13, 14 and notes *in loc.*; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 22; Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 563, 576.

[4] *Manu* III. 5.

[5] They were called שניות secondary or subordinate, viz. לעריות; comp. *Mishn.* Yevam. II. 4, אסור מצוה שניות מדברי סופרים.

[6] Comp. *Talm.* Yevam. 21, 22[a]; *Talm. Jer.* Yevam. II. 4, Part III. fol. 3[a] ed. Krotosh. (ואילו הן השניות אם אביו וכ׳); *Maimon.* Hilch. Ishuth I. 6.

[7] Qui parentum liberorumve locum inter se obtinent; see *Gaji* Instit. ed. Göschen et Lachm., Bonn 1841, pp. 15 *sqq.* (lib. I §§ 58—67; Digest. lib. XXIII. tit. 2, de ritu nuptiarum).

sister are forbidden, so are the grandfather's and the grandmother's sisters.

Persons of very remote affinity, or even of no actual affinity whatever, were not allowed to intermarry for various extraneous reasons. According to the Talmud of Jerusalem and the Roman law, a man may not marry the widow of his step-son, nor the step-mother of his deceased wife, for in the former case the widow must respect her husband's step-father like her own father, and in the latter, the widower must look upon his wife's step-mother as upon his own mother. Some, as the Karaites[8], even proscribed the marriage between persons who are step-brothers and step-sisters from both sides[9], and who can, therefore, in no sense be called blood-relations[10]. The Mohammedans extended the interdiction to foster-mothers and foster-sisters[11].

Marriages between cousins were deemed objectionable by the Karaites, who were most scrupulous in the application of the Biblical principles[12]; by the Hindoos, who held that "a cousin is almost like a sister"[13]; and by the early Romans, who, in conformity with their strict family organisation, regarded the children of brothers and sisters as growing up under the authority of the same grandfather, and therefore occupying, in some manner, the relative position of brothers and sisters; and though such marriages were from the time of the second Punic war not unfrequently contracted, and that without reproach[14], they were prohibited by Theodosius under the threat of death by fire, and disapproved by St. Augustine[15], who observed that though not unlawful in themselves, they were condemned by custom, because they bordered closely upon the unlawful, and cousins were almost like brothers and sisters[16]; yet Theodosius' son Arcadius repealed his father's interdict, and Justinian adhered to this more lenient view. In the Byzantine Church, the Trullian Council (680) forbade such marriages under ecclesiastical penalties extending over

---

[8] See *Grätz*, Geschichte, V. 202.

[9] That is, between the children of a widow and of a widower who enter into matrimony.

[10] Justinian, however, expressly permitted such alliances.

[11] Comp. *Koran* IV. 27.

[12] Comp. *Grätz*, Geschichte, V. 241, 244, 504.

[13] *Manu* XI. 172, 173.

[14] *Tacit.* XII. 6, sobrinarum conjugia diu ignorata tempore addito percrebruisse; *Plut.* Quaest. Rom. 6.

[15] De Civit. Dei XV. 16.

[16] Verum tamen factum etiam licitum propter vicinitatem horrebatur illiciti, ... et pene germani sunt (sc. consobrini). They are shunned by some savage tribes of Africa, as the Fertyt, south of Wadai and Darfur; see *Thiersch* l. c. p. 145.

seven years. The early Protestants condemned them with equal severity; but the Anglican Church, which disregarded both the Roman and Canonical law, and was mainly guided by the Scriptures and by national custom, interposed no obstacles to marriages between cousins, which are countenanced by the Biblical precedents of Isaac and Rebekah, and of Jacob and Leah and Rachel[1]. The Eastern fathers, under the Isaurian emperors Leo and Constantinus, interdicted alliances even between the grandchildren of brothers and sisters, whom they counted as standing in the sixth degree of relationship. The next or seventh degree was not long afterwards also forbidden[2], but the eighth was declared lawful. True to this rule, the Greek Church still considers marriages between lateral relations within seven degrees ungodly[3]. No less stringent was the Greek Church with respect to affinity (ἀγχιστεία). Not satisfied with the old Latin "affinity of the first class"[4], according to which either party has to regard the blood-relations of the other as his or her own blood-relations, that Church extended the same rigorous principle to the "affinity of the second class," or the relations by marriage. For instance, as a man is forbidden to marry his wife's sister, so also is his brother; a woman is forbidden to marry the brother of her sister-in-law; and finally, the Trullian Council pronounced the broad principle, that two families which have once intermarried must not intermarry again down to the sixth degree. These restrictions, for which neither the Biblical nor the Roman law affords any foundation, were adopted chiefly to prevent "confusion" (σύγχυσις) in the degrees of relationship. For instance, if two brothers marry two sisters who are their cousins, they become at the same time brothers-in-law; and their children would be cousins on their father's side, and second cousins on their mother's side[5].

The Roman Church passed even beyond these boundaries with regard to consanguinity; for, adopting the old Teutonic computation of kinship, according to which brothers and sisters form the first degree, cousins the second, and so on, it interdicted marriages within

---

[1] The same practice prevails among the Arabs of Egypt and other countries (*Lane*, Mod. Egypt. I, 209).

[2] By Sisinnius and Caerularius, patriarchs of Constantinopel, about 1000.

[3] Comp. *Zhishmann*, Eherecht der oriental. Kirche, Wien 1864.

[4] Affinitas primi generis.

[5] For similar reasons were forbidden the marriages between two sisters and two cousins, of uncle and nephew with two sisters, of two brothers with niece and aunt, etc.; compare *Zhishmann* l. c. pp. 243 *sqq.*, 319 *sqq.*

seven such parallel generations; it thus extended the prohibitions at least as far again as the Greek Church, and, in fact, annulled all alliances between persons of common descent, however remote their consanguinity[6]. But this excessive rigour could not long be maintained; it rendered marriage to royal personages and to people in small towns all but impossible; unions were entered into with an uneasy conscience, and were fraught with fatal results for their offspring, or they were forcibly and abruptly dissolved. Therefore, the Popes Gregory the Great and Gregory II. deemed it expedient to grant more lenient statutes to the converted Angles and Anglo-Saxons[7], and to limit the prohibition to four degrees; the same principle was, under Innocence III., confirmed in behalf of the western Church in general[8], which was thus placed nearly on the same footing as the Greek Church[9]. But even these barriers, far extending beyond those set down in the Scriptures, were found oppressive; for not even the great-grand-children of two brothers or two sisters, being related in the fourth degree, were allowed to marry one another. Therefore *dispensations* became often necessary. They were at first merely designed to secure equity in cases when the meaning of the law would have been perverted, and cruel wrong inflicted by an unbending adherence to the letter. But they soon degenerated into a most flagrant abuse; they were often claimed and granted, in defiance of the Biblical precepts, from selfish or sordid motives. The Popes believed that they were invested with "plenitude of power" to sus-

---

[6] Comp. Decretum Gratiani, P. II, causa 35, Nulli Christiano liceat de propria consanguinitate seu cognatione uxorem accipere, usque dum generatio recordatur, cognoscitur aut in memoria retinetur; comp. *Thiersch* l. c. p. 82. In India, a Brahman may not marry a wife whose clan-name or *gotra* is the same as his own, whereby marriage among relatives is prohibited in the male line indefinitely; the same is the law of China; among the Tartars in Asia and Europe, among the Lapps and Samoieds, intermarriage in the same family or tribe is deemed impious, and the people in Sumatra "punish such delinquents after their ordinary manner by cutting them up alive, and eating them grilled or raw with salt and red pepper"; and analogous laws prevail among other barbarous races; see *E. P. Tylor*, Researches into the early History of Mankind, pp. 277—284.

[7] In 601 and 726.

[8] In 1215, in the fourth Lateran Council.

[9] The *fourth* degree was adopted as a limit, because there are four elements in the human body, comp. *Thom. Aquin.* Suppl. tertiae partis summae quaest. 54 art. 4: in prima commixtione evanescit sanguinis identitas quantum ad primum elementum, quod est subtilissimum; in secunda ad secundum; etc.

pend, not only the old Canons, but even the Scriptural ordinances, and in favour of certain persons to sanction acts illicit in themselves. They advanced on this dangerous path cautiously, and step by step. At first they gave dispensations when objectionable marriages had been entered into "from ignorance of the fact" of mutual relationship, or "from ignorance of the law." But in the course of time, they authorised such marriages even before they were concluded. Again, at first they acted so only for the promotion and in the interest of the public weal and of peace between rival princes; but ere long, they sold their dispensations and turned them into a most lucrative traffic. There were hardly any obstacles to the rich. Marriages were allowed between uncle and niece,[1] and between aunt and nephew,[2] or between brother-in-law and sister-in-law,[3] till at last the Roman Cardinal Cajetan, the famous contemporary of Luther, boldly promulgated the principle, that "the Pope may give dispensation of marriage with all relatives, except only with father and mother," since these alone are moral offences, while the rest are merely judicial prohibitions.[4] These and similar excesses, giving rise to the reproach that in Rome everything could be purchased with money, accelerated, if they did not call forth, the great schism of the Church. The Council of Trent anxious to avert still greater dangers, adopted indeed more prudent and more judicious views: with respect to marriages already concluded, dispensation was rendered more difficult; and as regards intended alliances, it was only to be granted in rare and urgent cases, and always gratuitously. Yet exceptions were permitted "in favour of illustrious rulers, and from considerations of national safety;" they were allowed "in the second degree," which includes not only cousins, but also uncle and niece, and nephew and aunt, although marriage between the two last named relatives is plainly interdicted in the levitical law; in fact, the Council threatened with anathema anyone who dared to deny the power of the Church to sanction alliances prohibited in the Bible. Thus, in the question of dispensations, no practical progress was made by the Synod of Trent; and since then the principles of

[1] The Archduke Charles married his sister's daughter, by whom he became the father of Ferdinand II.

[2] Ferdinand the younger, king of Naples, married his father's sister Ioan, by permission of Pope Alexander VI.

[3] Henry VIII and Catherin of Aragon; see notes on XVIII. 16.

[4] Potest papa dispensare cum omnibus personis conjunctis, nisi cum matre et patre, ut matrimonium contrahant; *Cajetanus*, Thom. Aquin. secunda secundae cum comment. Lugd. 1558, p. 537.

Cajetan have virtually prevailed among Catholic theologians[5]. Neither the Romans, nor the Jews, nor the Greek Christians, nor the old Protestants ever granted dispensations[6]: not even the Emperor Claudius, though living in a most depraved age, was able to obtain exemption from the laws which were binding upon all (see *supra* p. 361).

It is well known that the Roman laws of marriage were based upon two principles—natural decorum (pudor naturalis)[7] and respect of parental dignity (respectus parentelæ). The latter principle invalidated marriages between persons connected by adoption or by guardianship (tutela); for in both cases such persons were regarded as standing in the relationship of parent and child. Marriage was unlawful even after the adoption had been dissolved by emancipation, though in the latter contingency the union with an adoptive sister was permitted; and not only was the guardian himself forbidden to marry his ward, but he was restrained from marrying her to his son or grand-son, unless she had been betrothed to the one or the other by the deceased father, or had been assigned to him by testament.[8]

From the sixth century, a new obstacle of a peculiar nature, entirely unknown in the early Christian Church, became very prominent, and gradually assumed most serious proportions, namely, "the spiritual kinship" (cognatio spiritualis). Such a relation, idealising the Roman adoption, but questionably confounding the spheres of nature and religion, was, in the first instance, supposed to exist between a godfather and his goddaughter, for the former was considered as the spiritual parent of the latter, and was held responsible for her religious education; or, as Justinian explained it, "Nothing is so much calculated to create a truly paternal affection and, therefore, a valid obstacle to matrimony, than that bond by which, under

[5] Comp. *Kopp*, Kathol. Eherecht, I. 250, "Von den Moraltheologen und Kirchenrechtslehrern wird einstimmig nur das Eheverbot zwischen Ascendenten und Descendenten im ersten Grade als *in jure naturali* und *in jure divino* begründet und daher absolut indispensabel gehalten".

[6] Comp. *Aem. L. Richter*, Evangelische Kirchenordnungen des 16ten Jahrhunderts, Weimar 1846, I. 125, "und was bisher mit Dispensiren und am Geld erlangt worden ist, soll alles aus sein und nicht mehr irren"; *Zhishmann* l. c. pp. 713—715.

[7] "Semper in conjunctionibus non solum quid liceat considerandum est, sed et quid honestum sit"; Digest.

[8] It is probable that this law, besides being prompted by *respectus parentelae*, was designed to protect the liberty and the fortune of the ward. Comp. De Gradibus Cognationum expositio (fortasse Ulpiani), in *Huschke*, Jurisprud. Anteiustin. pp. 511—517.

Divine mediation, the souls of the two are united"[1]. Therefore, the sponsor being regarded as the "second father" (compater) of the child, he was also forbidden to marry the mother of the latter if she became a widow[2]; yet some, as Boniface, deemed such a marriage unobjectionable, declaring that else no Christian man would be permitted to marry a Christian woman, since baptism engendered religious relationship between all the members of the community. The Greek Church went in the matter to an extraordinary length; spiritual affinity was by the Trullian Council pronounced to be more important than physical relationship; and the Synod held under the patriarch Nicolaus III.[3] declared that it precluded marriage within seven degrees, exactly like consanguinity: and this decision has ever since been adhered to. The Roman Church not only adopted the same strict rules of spiritual relationship, but extended them to the "confirmation sponsors," who are unknown in the Greek Church. The consistent application of these principles led to the preposterous conclusion that if either of the parents assists at the baptism or the confirmation of his or her own child, a spiritual relation is created with the other parent which prevents the continuance of the union[4]! However, the Council of Trent ordered that spiritual relationship existed only between the godfather and the officiating priest on the one hand, and the child and the parents on the other; and that it does not extend to the sponsor's children, so that "spiritual brothers" and "sisters" were no longer acknowledged. It is remarkable that, in some countries, the early Protestants, clinging to the old "imperial law"[5], and recognising the Roman principle of *respectus parentelæ*, counted adoption, guardianship, and sponsorship among the obstacles of marriage[6].

If, after this survey of later additions and expansions, we glance once more at the Biblical ordinances, it will be admitted that they appear thoughtful in principle and little burdensome in detail. This is not the place to examine, how far they coincide with reason and the laws of nature, and whether just these are indispensable to secure a healthful offspring and a pure intercourse between

---

[1] Cod. Just. lib. V, tit. 4, § 26.

[2] Concil. Trull. can. 53.

[3] A. C. 1084—1111.

[4] In this manner it is said that Chilperich, the king of the Franks, divorced his wife Andovera, who, induced by the wicked Fredegunde, had held her own son over the baptismal font.

[5] That is, the Corpus juris civilis and the law of the Pentateuch.

[6] This was, f. i., the law of Würtemberg according to the statutes of 1553; see *Richter* l. c. II. 130.

near relations[7]. "Natural abhorrence" and "natural decorum" are fluctuating sentiments. Caution in pronouncing judgment on these points is imposed by the fact that, with the exception of father and mother, there is not a single degree of consanguinity and of affinity which, with respect to matrimony, more or less civilised nations have not held unobjectionable[8]. It is diffcult to draw the line of demarcation: is the "oneness of flesh" to end with the cousin or to include him; is it to end with the niece or to include her? Different religious sects in the same country have answered these questions differently. The matter rests essentially on legal and social conventionality.

We will now briefly refer to some other points connected with the matrimonial laws and customs.

It would be idle to deny that polygamy, supposed to be a physical necessity in the East[9], was lawful among the Hebrews. It even formed the basis of some of the ordinances of the Pentateuch, such as the institution of the levirat, which required that a surviving brother, though married, should take his brother's widow; or the law of inheritance in cases when "a man had two wives, one beloved, and another hated, and both had born to him children"[10]. But it must be admitted that, even in the Biblical times, the Hebrews showed a growing tendency towards monogamy, which, as a matter of fact, prevailed in later times[11]; till an authoritative decree issued in the eleventh Christian century made it compulsory under the threat of excom-

[7] Comp. *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 49 ("those relations being constantly together with the man in the same house, they will yield easily to his desires, etc."); *Thom. Aquin.* Secunda secundae quaest. 154 art. 9, quia personas sanguine junctas necesse est invicem conversari, sicque continuo haberent occasionem luxuriae nimisque emollescerent; *Michael.* Mos. R. § 108; Ehegesetze Mosis § 52; a. o.

[8] Comp. *Hugo Grotius*, De Jure Belli et Pacis, lib. II. cap. V, sect. 13; *Michaelis*, Ehegesetze Mosis, §§ 91 *sqq.*

[9] Comp. *Montesquieu*, Esprit des Lois, XVI. 2—7.

[10] Deut. XXI. 15—17; XXV. 5—10. The command that a man must not have two sisters as wives at the same time (Lev. XVIII. 18) implies that he may have two wives who are not sisters; comp. also Exod. XXI. 10; Judg. VIII. 39 (Gideon); X. 4 (Jair); XII. 9 (Ibzan), 14 (Abdon); 1 Sam. I. 2 (Elkanah); XXV. 42, 43 (David); 1 Ki. XI. 3 (Solomon); 2 Chr. XXIV. 3 (Jehoiada); etc. etc.

[11] Comp., however, *Talm.* Succ. 27ª (אני שיש לי שתי נשים); Kethuv. 80ᵇ; Kiddush. 50ᵇ; Yevam. 65ª, כל הנושא אשה על אשתו וכ׳, and נושא אדם כמה נשים לאשתו וכ׳; *Even Haëzer* § 1. 9 ("the Jewish sages judiciously advised that a man should not take more than four wives, so that he might be able to give to each her conjugal right once a month").

munication, and has since been adopted by all western Jews[1]. Nor did concubinage, which in earlier periods was certainly not unusual among the Hebrews[2], assume a character dangerous to public morality; for it never supplanted matrimony, and in the course of time disappeared completely; its status is not fixed in the Law, but it does not seem to have been degrading or oppressive; the offspring of concubines enjoyed the rights of legitimate children, and shared their father's inheritance; thus the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah were in every respect treated as the equals of the sons of Leah and Rachel, and were considered as founders of Hebrew tribes[3]. A primitive custom of associating with the wife's "maid-servant"[4], and of treating the children of the latter as if born by the former[5], fell soon into disuse[6].

To secure his wife, the man, besides giving presents (מַתָּן) to herself and her relatives, was obliged to pay a "price" (מֹהַר) to her parents in proportion to his means[7], or he paid them by his services, as

---

1 See Comm. on Exod. p. 370; comp. *Selden*, De Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. V. c. 6, pp. 561—567. However, instances of legal bigamy occurred in Castile even in the fourteenth century (comp. *Rabb. Nissim*, ארץ קשטיליה מקום שנהגו לישא שתי נשים, *Frankel*, Monatsschrift, 1865, pp. 390, 391). In the East, Jews still have occasionally two wives; some congregations, especially of the Sefardim, permit bigamy in two cases — if the first wife is childless, or if she bears only girls. Many communities, however, adhere to the decree of Rabbi Gershom. Comp. *Niebuhr*, Reise nach Arabien, p. 70; *Lewysohn*, Klänge aus dem Morgenl. pp. 5, 35. Among the Falashas in Abyssinia bigamy is not legally forbidden, but it is looked upon as reproachful. The Jews in China acknowledge only one lawful wife, though they often have other wives of an inferior rank, whose children are not considered legitimate (comp. *Frankel*, l. c. 1858, p. 464; 1864, p. 276; 1868, p. 408). "Polygamy" observes Niebuhr, "is not so general in the eastern countries as Europeans usually suppose" (l. c. pp. 73, 74). — "Polygamy is, at least at present, not the rule among the Parsees"; if the first wife has no children, the husband may take another wife, yet not without the consent of the former (*Spiegel*, Avesta, II. p. xxxi). For fuller explanations we refer to our Commentary on Genes. p. 375; on Exod. p. 370; on Levit. I. 576.

2 Gen. XXII. 24; XXV. 6; XXXV. 22; Judg. VIII. 31; IX. 18; XIX. 1 *sqq.*; 2 Sam. XV. 16; XVI. 21, 22; XX. 3; 1 Ki. XI. 3; 1 Chr. I. 32; II. 46, 48; 2 Chr. XI. 27; *etc.* Concubines (פלגשים) are occasionally called נשים *wives*, Gen. XXV. 1 (comp. 1 Chr. I. 32); XXXVII. 2.

3 *Talm. Jerus.* Kethuv. V. 2 (Part III. fol. 29[b]); *Talm.* Sanh. 19[b]; *Maimon.* De Regib. IV. 4; *Selden*, De Jure Nat. et Gent. pp. 570 *sqq.*

4 שִׁפְחָה or אָמָה.

5 Gen. XVI. 2; XXX. 3, 4, 9.

6 Comp. Comm. on Gen. pp. 375, 376.

7 Comp. Gen. XXIV. 53 (מגדנות); XXXIV. 12. The legal sum seems to have been fifty shekels (comp. Deut. XXII. 29).

Jacob did to Laban, Othniel to Caleb, and David to Saul[8]. However, among other nations, as the Parsees and Arabs, it is not deemed proper for the bride to enter her husband's house emptyhanded, and the amount of the dowry of virgins and widows has been fixed by custom[9]; in conformity with this usage, Jewish brides also were, in later times, furnished with a dowry or "gift"[10].

A betrothal generally preceded the marriage[11], and the betrothed woman was regarded exactly as if she were married, faithlessness on her part being punished with death[12]. In later periods, betrothals were concluded in three different ways — "by money, by contract (שְׁטָר), and by connection" (בִּיאָה); though the latter mode was looked upon as indecent[13]. The bride met her bridegroom closely veiled. The wedding was accompanied by festivities usually extending over seven days[14]. At present, the marriage ceremony (חֻפָּה)[15] is, as a rule, performed by a minister or by any competent Israelite, in the presence of at least ten men, and is thereby stamped as a public transaction[16]; several benedictions are recited, and the bridegroom puts a golden ring on the finger of the bride with the words, "Thou shalt be consecrated (מְקֻדֶּשֶׁת) to me according to the law of Moses and Israel". These simple acts are usually accompanied by symbolical rites, though in this respect the customs vary[17].

Matrimony was looked upon not only as the normal condition of both men and women[18], but as a religious duty[19]; and it was

---

[8] Gen. XXIX. 18, 27, 30; Josh. XV. 16; 1 Sam. XVIII. 25; see Comm. on Gen. pp. 469, 529; on Exod. p. 425.

[9] Comp. *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. p. xxx.; *Lane*, Mod. Egypt, I. 211, "the giving of a dowry is indispensable".

[10] נדוניא, which term occurs already in Ezekiel XVI. 33, where it means a present given to a courtesan. Comp. also Job XV. 19; Judg. I. 15.

[11] In later times, twelve months generally intervened between betrothal and marriage, if the bride was a virgin; thirty days, if she was a widow (*Talm.* Kethuv. 57).

[12] Comp. Gen. XXXVIII. 24; Deut. XXII. 23 *sqq.*; see Comm. on Exod. p. 422.

[13] *Talm.* Kiddush. 12[b]; *Maimon.* Issure Biah XXI. 14; *Even Haëzer* 26, 4, חכמים אסרו לקדש בביאה משום פריצות וכ'.

[14] Gen. XXIX. 22—28; Judg. XIV. 10, 12, 17.

[15] Either meaning the introduction of the bride into the house or under the *roof* of her husband; or the retirement of the couple into the bridal *chamber* (Isai. IV. 5; Joel II. 16; Ps. XIX. 6); *Talm.* Kethuv. 7. and R. Nissim in loc.; *Maim.* Ish. X. 1; etc.

[16] Comp. Ruth IV. 2; *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 49, "there is only one way of securing lawful intercourse, and that is, to take one wife, and to marry her publicly."

[17] Comp. *Talm.* Kiddush. 5, 6, 13.

[18] Comp. *Talm.* Yevam. 63[a], כל יהודי שאין לו אשה אינו אדם.

[19] It is by the Rabbins counted as the first of the 613 commands of

encouraged by a strong desire of offspring, since Orientals, it need not be remarked, regard the extinction of their family as the direst curse[1]. Barrenness was, for long periods, looked upon not only as a misfortune, but as a disgrace, and childless men and women were not pitied but despised, because they were held to have deserved the displeasure of God; it was only very gradually that more rational views prevailed, and that wise teachers succeeded in diffusing the doctrine, that children are granted and withheld by God for His own inscrutable reasons and purposes[2]. With such notions rooted in the public mind, celibacy could not spread among the Hebrews; and though it was, in later times, advocated by some teachers, as Christ and St. Paul, and adopted by some sects, as the Essenes, as being more conducive to "attending upon the Lord without distraction"[3], these sects themselves soon vanished, and with them their

---

the Pentateuch, and is derived from Gen. I. 28 (פרו ורבו); a man having begotten one boy and one girl is deemed to have fulfilled the law, though his duty does not cease as long as he remains in vigour; the injunction, however, is not obligatory on women; compare *Mishn.* Yevam. VI. 6, האיש מצווה על פריה ורביה אבל לא האשה; *Talm.* Yevam. 61[b], 63[b], כל יהודי שאין עוסק בפריה וריביה כאילו שופך דמים; *Even Haëz.* § 1. 1; *Heilpern*, Mitsv. Hash. p. 1. "To abstain from marrying when a man has attained a sufficient age, and when there is no impediment, is esteemed by the Egyptians improper, and even disreputable" (*Lane*, Mod. Eg. I. 207).

[1] Talmudical laws forbid men to marry women known or likely to be barren (*Talm.* Yevam. 64; comp. *Maim.* Issur. Biah XXI. 26). The Romans married professedly "liberorum quaerendorum causâ", and considered a numerous progeny as meritorious, and deserving of praise and reward (comp. *Gaj.* Inst. I. 29; *Gell.* IV. III, 2, jurare a censoribus coactus erat, uxorem se liberum quaerundum gratia habiturum; *Plat.* Sympos c. XVI. p. 192[a], πρὸς γάμους καὶ παιδοποιΐας...ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἀναγκάζονται; *Arist.* Pol. II. 9; *Val. Max.* II. IX. 1, natura vobis quemadmodum nascendi, ita gignendi legem scribit; etc.). Plato, as is well known, went so far as to advocate community of wives and children, because he deemed procreation of offspring the first duty which the citizen owes to the state (comp. *Plato*, Respubl. V. 7 *sqq.*; *Arist.* Pol. II. 4; whereas Aristotle believed that overpopulation ought to be guarded against, if necessary, by efficient laws (*Aristot.* Polit. VII. 14); comp. *Selden*, De Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. V. cap. III., pp. 545—549. The Persians deem even matchmaking highly creditable (*Vendid.* XIV.; comp. *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. p. XXVI.); and so do the modern Jews.

[2] Comp. 1 Sam. I. 5, 8; 2 Sam. III. 14; VI. 23; etc.; see Comm. on Genes. pp. 374, 375.

[3] Matth. XIX. 10—12 ("there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake: he that is able to receive it, let him receive it"); 1 Cor. VII. 1 ("it is good for a man not to touch a woman"), 7 ("I would that all men were even as myself"), 8, 27 ("art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a

unpopular principles; and Talmudical authorities declared that "he who has no wife, lives without comfort, without help, without joy, without blessing, and without atonement"[4].

We have no statement as to the age at which girls and young men usually married in the Biblical times; but it may be assumed that, as a rule, it nearly coincided with that of puberty[5], which Jewish tradition fixed at twelve years and one day for girls, and thirteen years and one day for young men[6]. The Mishnah recommended men to marry at eighteen; Talmudical doctors considered twenty years the latest term, except for eager students of the Law, afraid of being disturbed by household duties and cares; and Eastern Jews still adhere to these rules[7]. The Rabbins distinctly forbade parents and guardians to marry or even to betrothe their daughters and wards during their minority[8]; yet in the middle ages, the latter injunction was frequently disregarded by parents anxious to secure protectors for their young daughters during the constant persecutions of the Jews[9]. In Egypt and some parts of Arabia, marriages are occasionally concluded with girls nine or ten years old; mothers at thirteen or fourteen are not rare; and few remain unmarried after sixteen years of age[10]. In India and Persia, girls are mostly betrothed at nine years, and married between thirteen and fifteen[11]. The

---

wife"), 28, 33—35 ("he that is unmarried cares for the things that belong to the Lord; but he that is married cares for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife"), 37, 38; *Joseph.* Ant. XVIII. I. 5, the Essenes did not marry because they believed that matrimony "gives rise to domestic quarrels" (στάσεως ἐνδιδόναι ποίησιν).

[4] *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. sect. XVII. init. כל שאין לו אשה שרוי בלא טובה בלא עזר בלא שמחה בלא ברכה בלא כפרה; comp. *Talm.* Yevam. 62^b; *Yalk. Shim.* § 316, fol. 66^b.

[5] Comp. Gen. XXXVIII. 11; Ruth I. 13, etc.; see also *Talm.* Yevam. 62; Kiddush. 29^b.

[6] See Comm. on Levit. I. 576 note 3; *Talm.* Yevam. 80; *Even Haëzer* § 155; Mitzv. Hash. p. 106 rule 14.

[7] Comp. *Mishn.* Avoth V. 21; *Talm.* Kiddush. 29^b; Yevam. 62^b, 63^b; Sanh. 76^b; *Even Haëzer* § I. 2, "Every Israelite is bound to take a wife when he is eighteen years old, and the sooner a man marries after his thirteenth year, the greater piety he shows; but no one ought to marry before he is thirteen, for that would be like fornication: on no account should the twentieth year be exceeded, in which case the ecclesiastical authorities should compel the man to marry": but, adds the glossator, R. Isserels (see p. 39), "the usage of our time is not to compel any one in this respect".

[8] *Talm.* Kethuv. 57; Kiddush. 41^a, אסור לאדם שיקדש את בתו כשהיא קטנה עד שתגדל ותאמר בפלוני אני רוצה; comp. *Maim.* Ish. III. 19.

[9] Comp. Tosafoth ad Kiddush. l. c.

[10] Comp. *Niebuhr*, Beschr. von Arab. pp. 71, 72; *Lane*, Mod. Eg. I. 208.

[11] *Vendid.* XIV. 65; comp. *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. pp. XXIX. XXX.

Roman law fixed the ages of twelve and fourteen for girls and young men respectively, as the earliest periods for legally entering into wedlock.

Marriage being regarded as making man and wife one flesh, it was meant to be indissoluble; and its nature is no doubt rightly expressed in the words attributed to Christ, "What God has joined together, let not man put assunder"[1]. Thus only could God's eternal covenant with Israel be compared with a matrimonial alliance[2]. In the early history of the Hebrews — as in the earlier annals of the Roman Republic[3] — we read of no instance of dismissal, except that Abraham was induced to send away Hagar, his wife's handmaid. However, so abstract a theory could not be upheld in practical life; a concession was to be made to the people's "hardness of heart"[4]; and the Deuteronomist was compelled to give an explicit law of divorce[5]. He granted the right of initiative exclusively to the husband, but he seems to have restricted his power to cases of flagrant infidelity on the part of the wife[6]; and he permitted no one to dismiss a wife whom he had been compelled to marry on account of seduction by violence, or one whom he had defamed by falsely asserting that he had not found her a virgin[7]. Yet, after the Babylonian exile, divorces appear to have become so numerous, that prophets deemed it their duty strongly to oppose the prevailing levity. Thus Malachi declared: "And again you do this, that you cover the Altar of the Lord with tears, with weeping, and with crying. . . . Yet you say, Wherefore? Because the Lord is witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously, although she is thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant". And when the people pointed, in excuse, to the example of Abraham, who dismissed Hagar without thereby forfeiting the Divine Spirit[8], the prophet replied, that the patriarch's position was exceptional, and

---

[1] Matth. XIX. 6; Mark X. 9; comp. 1 Cor. VI. 16; VII. 11—14, 27.

[2] See supra p. 348, and Comm. on Levit. I. 398; comp. also Eph. V. 31, 32. The Persians look upon it as a compact or Mithra which can never be annulled, nor can a betrothed pair be separated, not even if they are still children (comp. *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. pp. xxvi. xxx.) The Council of Trent confirmed the permanency and the sacramental nature of matrimony, but the Greek Church abandoned this view.

[3] Comp. *Gell.* IV. 3, quingentis fere annis p. R. c. etc.; *Val. Max.* II. ix. 2.

[4] Matth. XIX. 8; Mark X. 5.

[5] Deut. XXIV. 1; comp. Jer. III. 1.

[6] Deut. l. c. כי מצא בה ערות דבר, where ערות דבר seems to be equivalent to דבר ערוה; comp. *Mich.* Mos. R. §§ 119, 120.

[7] Deut. XXII. 19, 22.

[8] Mal. II. 15, ולא אחד עשה ושאר רוח לו.

that he acted as he did because he was seeking the Divinely promised seed[9]; and he continued, "Therefore take heed for your souls, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth; for the Lord, the God of Israel, says, I hate dismissal"[10]. The prophet did not repeal the law of divorce enacted by the Deuteronomist, but he protested against the heartlessness which palliated a separation by the most frivolous pretexts, and which Christ, no doubt, had also in view when, in the Sermon on the Mount, he declared, "I say to you that whoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causes her to commit adultery"[11]. The Sadducees and earlier Karaites unconditionally condemned divorce[12], and this opinion seems also to be expressed in some passages of the New Testament[13]. But while the Roman Church adhered to the same principles, Protestantism legalised divorce, at first only in extreme cases of faithlessness and desertion, but then for many other reasons, including "unconquerable dislike"[14]. The Mohammedan law permits divorce after a warning of four months on the part of the husband, except in cases of unchastity, when he may dismiss his wife instantly[15]. Among the Parsees valid reasons for divorcing a wife are: — if she leads a reproachful life; if she conceals from her husband the time of her menstruation; if she practises witchcraft; and if she is barren. In the latter case, the Talmud not only permits but prescribes a divorce, which must take place if the wife bears no child within ten years after marriage[16]. However, this Talmudical command has never been enforced[17].

---

[9] מבקש זרע אלהים.

[10] Mal. II. 13—16.

[11] Matth. V. 32; XIX. 9; see *supra* p. 118. The same view was taken by Shammai and his school, whereas Hillel and his followers permitted divorce for any cause that might disturb domestic peace. Comp. *Talm.* Gittin 90[b], כל המגרש אשתו ראשונה אפילו מזבח מוריד עליו דמעות.

[12] *Fürst*, Karäerthum, I. 30.

[13] Mark X. 11, 12, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, commits adultery against her; and if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she commits adultery"; comp. Luke XVI. 18; see *Selden* l. c. pp. 567 *sqq.*

[14] This is one of the sixteen causes fixed by the Prussian law. Some even advocated dissolution of marriage without the statement of any reason, merely by mutual consent (ex bona gratia; so *Jörg* and *Tschirner*, Die Ehe aus dem Gesichtspunkte der Natur, der Moral und der Religion betrachtet, 1819, pp. 175, 260, 261).

[15] See *Koran* II. 226—233; LXV. 1—6.

[16] *Talm.* Yevam. 64.[a]

[17] Comp. *Talm.* Gittin 90; *Yalk. Shim.* Malach. § 589, fol. 87[b]; *Even Haëz.* § 154, 10 (בזמן הזה אין נוהגין לכוף כלל); *Frankel* l. c. pp. XLII—XLVIII. If a non-Jewish couple embrace Judaism, they are not separated, even

A divorced woman was, according to the Law, permitted to marry again; yet, as she had "contaminated" herself by her faithlessness to her first husband, she was on no account to re-marry him, should her second husband divorce her or die; if she did so, she was considered to commit an "abomination", and to cause a sinful defilement of the holy land[1]. High-priests and common priests, however, were forbidden to marry divorced women, because they were "holy to their God"[2]; and later and more rigorous moralists seem to have held marriage with such women altogether objectionable, if not criminal. Christ said, "Whoever shall marry her that is divorced commits adultery"[3]; and St. Paul, "If the wife depart from her husband, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband"[4]. Among the Hindoos, the husband of a woman who had been married before, was excluded from various religious privileges, and though the burning of widows is not mentioned in the laws of Manu, re-marriage on the part of widows was regarded as contemptible[5]. Uncompromising monogamists rejected all second marriages as unbecoming and sinful; Athenagoras, living in the middle of the second century, declared that good Christians either live in celibacy or marry only once, since "a second marriage is a sort of decent adultery"[6]; and similar views were, about the same time, expressed by Theophilus of Antioch and Tertullian. Origen was of opinion that a second marriage disqualified a man for the offices of bishop, dean, and priest, and was sure to cause his exclusion from the kingdom of heaven. The Council of Neo-Caesarea (314) forbade priests to be present at a second marriage, and the Council of Valence (374) formally prohibited the ordination of those who had married twice. St. Basil thought it expedient to punish them with excommunication for one year, and he

---

if they are so closely related that they fall within the forbidden degrees specified in the Pentateuch, because by baptism they are deemed to be regenerated, and to have renounced all their natural ties (comp. *Talm.* Yevam. 98; *Yor. Deah* § 269): this may be regarded as a Jewish counterpart of the "spiritual relationship" (*supra* p. 371).

[1] Deut. XXIV. 2-4; comp. Jer. III. 1. The Koran permits a woman to re-marry her husband twice unconditionally, but a third time only if, after the divorce, she had been the wife of another; comp. *Koran* II. l. c.; *Lane*, Mod. Egypt, I. 136, 137, 237—239, and in general pp. 133—140, 207—241.

[2] Lev. XXI. 7, 14.

[3] Matth. V. 32; XIX. 9; Luke XVI. 18.

[4] 1 Cor. VII. 11.

[5] *Manu* III. 196; comp. Comm. on Levit. I. 335.

[6] Ὁ γὰρ δεύτερος γάμος εὐπρεπής ἐστι μοιχεία.

characterised third marriages as "beastlike" (κτηνώδη), inhuman, and worse than fornication, and proposed to visit the offenders with excommunication for five years. Almost identical opinions were pronounced by Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome, by many subsequent Councils[7], and by later authorities.

A widow was free to marry again any Israelite except a High-priest[8], though she was in the New Testament declared "more blessed" (μακαριωτέρα) if she remained single[9]. Talmudical doctors enjoined that a woman who had lost two husbands must not marry again[10], though this decision was set aside by later Rabbins[11].

A wife was entitled to claim from her husband "her food, her raiment, and her conjugal right"[12]; and she could expect affection and considerate treatment[13]; but as "the weaker vessel", she stood under the "rule", "obedience", or "subjection" of her husband, who was her "head", and whom she was bound to "reverence" and to love[14]. According to a Talmudical principle, "the wife rises with her husband, but does not go down with him[15]", that is, she enjoys all the advantages of her husband's station if it be superior to her's, and she retains all the privileges to which she has been accustomed in

---

[7] As those of Toledo (400), of Orange (441), of Angers (453), of Agde (506), and of Orleans (541).

[8] Levit. XXI. 14.

[9] Rom. VII. 3; 1 Cor. VII. 39, 40; comp. 1 Tim. V. 3, 5, 11, 16.

[10] *Talm.* Yevam. 64[b].

[11] Comp. *Maim.* Respons. 146.

[12] Exod. XXI. 10, שְׁאֵרָהּ כְּסוּתָהּ וְעֹנָתָהּ; comp. 1 Cor. VII. 3, τῇ γυναικὶ δ' ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἀποδιδότω; Gen. XXX. 15, 16. On these three points, especially the last, the Talmud has laid down very precise rules (comp. *Mishn.* Kethuv. V. 6, הטיילין בכל יום, הפועלים שתים בשבת וכו'; *Talm.* Kethuv. 61—64, 77[a], 103, etc.). "In Arabia", observes Niebuhr, "men are legally bound to maintain their wives comfortably, and to visit each of them once a week" (*Nieb.* Beschreib. von Arab. p. 74; comp. *Selden*, Uxor Hebraica, lib. III. c. 6; *Mich.* Mos. R. § 118).

[13] 1 Pet. III. 7, ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν ὡς καὶ συγκληρονόμοι χάριτος ζωῆς; Ephes. V. 25, 28 ("men ought to love their wives as their own bodies"; comp. *Talm.* Yevam. 62[b], האוהב את אשתו כגופו והמכבדה יותר מגופו וכו'), 33; Col. III. 19; *Talm.* Bab. Mets. 59[a], "Let a man be careful to honour his wife, for all the blessings of his house come only through her". — In the Jewish marriage contract or כתובה, the bridegroom promises to his bride: "I shall work for thee, and honour and support thee" (אנא אפלח ואוקיר ואיזון ויתכי).

[14] Gen. III. 16; 1 Cor. XI. 3; XIV. 34; Ephes. V. 22 ("wives submit yourselves unto your husbands as unto the Lord"), 23 ("the husband is the head of the wife"), 24, 33; Col. III. 18; 1 Tim. II. 11, 12; Tit. II. 5; 1 Pet. III. 1, 5—7; *Maimon.* Hilch. Ishuth c. XV.

[15] *Talm. Jer.* Kethuv. V. 6 (Part III. fol. 30[a]); *Talm. Bab.* Kethuv. 48[a], 61[a], אשתו עולה עמו אבל לא יורדת עמו.

her own family. That Hebrew wives occupied an honoured, if not an independent, position in their households, is evident from the history of the patriarchs[1], of David[2], and of many other prominent men[3]. A civil code might hardly be expected to include a law like the following: — "When a man has taken a new wife, he shall not go out to war, nor shall he be charged with any business, but he shall be free at home for one year, that he may cheer his wife whom he has taken"[4].

It is not too much to contend that, however flagrantly the laws of chastity were violated by the Hebrews in earlier periods[5], they were, after the promulgation of the levitical code, observed with a scrupulousness that has hardly ever been equalled. In the time of Hadrian's relentless persecutions, the Jewish authorities enjoined upon the people to suffer death rather than to be guilty of "idolatry, incest, or bloodshed"; whereas they deemed the transgression of all the other precepts of the Law excusable if necessary for the preservation of life[6]; and at all subsequent periods the domestic life of the Jews has been recognised as exemplary.

---

1 Comp. Gen. XVI. 5, 6; XXI. 10—12; etc.

2 1 Sam. XXV. 18, 19; Abigail, without the knowledge of her husband Nabal, sent to David a very liberal present of bread and corn, wine, meat, and fruit.

3 See Comm. on Exod. pp. 370, 371.

4 Deut. XXIV. 5.

5 Comp. 1 Ki. III. 16; Hos. IV. 2, 13, 14; VII. 4; Am. II. 7; Isai. LVII. 3; Jer. IX. 1; XXIII. 10, 14; XXIX. 23; Ezek. XVI. 38; XXII. 10, 11; XXIII. 37, 45; Mal. III. 5; etc.

6 Comp. *Talm.* Sanh. 74$^a$, כל עבירות שבתורה אם אומרים לאדם עבור ואל תהרג יעבור ואל יהרג חוץ מעבודת אלילים וגילוי עריות ושפיכות דמים; *Maimon.* Yesod. Hatt. V. 9.

# TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

**Summary.** — The Israelites are warned against the vices and evil practices of the Egyptians and the Canaanites (vers. 1—5). They are especially enjoined to shun marriages with the following relations:—1. The mother; 2. the step-mother; 3. the half-sister; 4. the grand-daughter; 5. the sister; 6—8. the aunt, whether the father's sister or the mother's sister, or the wife of the father's brother; 9. the daughter-in-law; 10. the sister-in-law; 11, 12. the step-daughter and step-grand-daughter; and 13. the wife's sister during the life-time of the former (vers. 6—18). They are, moreover, cautioned against sexual intercourse with menstruating women, against adultery, the sacrifice of children in honour of Moloch, sodomy, and coition with beasts (vers. 19—23). These were the crimes on account of which the Canaanites forfeited their land, and from them the Israelites must scrupulously abstain, if they desire to escape a similar fate (vers. 24—30).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Speak to the children of Israel and say to them, I *am* the

**1—5.** With this chapter the Book of Leviticus enters upon a new and, according to our modern views, a higher phase. It was hitherto exclusively devoted to ceremonialism — to sacrifices and the functions of the priesthood, to precepts on diet and external cleanness. But now follow those moral laws which, unlike the rituals, are not the means and instruments of piety, but concern the very essence of a righteous life and of inward purity. Their nature, therefore, is not national, but human; not special, but universal; and they show the aims for which the Hebrews were to be trained by the Law. This arrangement is quite appropriate; for it appears like a progress from the husk to the kernel, from religious emblems to religion, from the "shadow" to the spirit of the Law. Our chapter especially is remarkable for unity of design and execution; it is complete in itself, and almost exhausts the subject of which it treats. That subject is the purity of man in his sexual relations; and it is brought into connection with the very centre of the historical teaching of the Pentateuch, which, in briefest outline, is as follows.

Lord your God. 3. Like the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein you dwelt, shall you not do; and like

When the nations, after the building of the Tower of Babel, were dispersed, God assigned to each of them its proper abodes (Deut. II. 5; XXXII. 8); then the Hamitic Amorites and their kindred tribes received for their inheritance the districts of Canaan; but their wickedness soon rendered them unworthy of that beautiful and fertile land, on which "the eyes of the Lord are always from the beginning of the year to the end of the year"; and their degeneracy was apparent in nothing more than in their unchastity and licentiousness. God, however, longsufferingly delayed their expulsion for many centuries, until at last "their iniquity was full" (Gen. XV. 16). Then, and not before, the Israelites were permitted to conquer Canaan; but they were promised prosperity in their new territories only on condition that they would keep aloof from the trespasses which had called down the chastisement of the Amorites; and if a native, or a stranger that sojourned among them, committed any of these abominations, then the land, which they defiled, would vomit them out also, as it had vomited out the nations that had dwelt in it before them (vers. 26—28; comp. XX. 22, 23). Thus the invasion and occupation of Canaan were by refined writers of a later age justified on high principles of retribution: though the Israelites were the chosen people, and could, therefore, never cease to stand under God's spiritual protection, they were to enjoy material prosperity only in so far as they deserved it by a virtuous and God-fearing life; in this respect, they could hope for no favour and no privilege, but were subject to the universal laws of Divine government (comp. Comm. on Gen. pp. 369—371). Thus understood, the statutes of this chapter assume a higher importance; thus they reveal to us the "philosophy of history" as read by the best and most gifted of the Hebrews. But for this very reason they prove the very late date of this singular composition, and point to a time when the annals of the people could be surveyed from the vantage-ground of a long and chequered experience, and when the words, "Let not the land vomit you out when you defile it", had a direct and melancholy significance, because the sad fate foreshadowed in them had really happened when it was announced as a warning to the small and humble community which had settled in Palestine after the Babylonian exile: as their forefathers once, in the time of Moses and Joshua, had been the arm of God for punishing the misdeeds of the Amorites, so had, within their own memory, the Assyrians and Babylonians been the Divine rod for chastising the rebellion and idolatry of the Israelites, and so would God again raise up instruments of His anger, if they provoked it by their disobedience (comp. Isai. X. 5, etc.). —Those who weigh the last verses of our chapter carefully, must admit that they cannot apply to the Mosaic age: "And the land was defiled (וַתִּטְמָא), and I visited (וָאֶפְקֹד) its iniquity upon it, and the land vomited out (וַתָּקִא) its inhabitants" (ver. 25). In these and some of the following terms, the scenery in the desert of Sinai and the time at the beginning of the Hebrew wanderings, usually adhered to with so much fidelity, is changed; the veil thrown over the laws and events of a much later period

**the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall you not do; nor shall you walk in their ordinances.**

is here almost transparent, and historical analysis enables us to lift it.

The introductory verses sufficiently prove that the matrimonial laws were conceived in a purely ethical spirit. They were not political statutes designed to prevent a dangerous ascendency of individual families; they were not ceremonial ordinances, nor solely precautionary measures for obviating seduction and too great familiarity in the domestic circle; and still less were they meant as devices for limiting, or for rendering distasteful, sexual intercourse (*Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 35, 49). Matrimony was regarded, not merely as a physical union, nor merely as a social covenant which might, at any time, be annulled by mutual consent. It was in some respects to mirror the holiness of God Himself, and unlawful alliances were considered as a fatal defilement of the land and its inhabitants. The conclusion of a marriage partook indeed of the character of a contract, since it required the full agreement of both parties; but as soon as the marriage was concluded, it was withdrawn from the arbitrary will of both husband and wife, and was removed to the higher spheres of duty and conscience. The levitical laws of matrimony were binding alike upon the Hebrew and the heathen stranger (ver. 26); and like all moral precepts, they were intended to be unalterable in all times. This is certainly the view maintained in the New Testament. John the Baptist said to the tetrarch Herod Antipater, who had married Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, "It is not lawful for thee to have her" (Matth. XIV. 4; comp. *Joseph.* Ant. XVIII. v. 4); he said so with evident reference to our precepts; for among the Romans the marriage with the brother's wife and with the wife's sister was not forbidden, because among them a matrimonial alliance did not effect so close an approach between the two families as among the Hebrews. And Paul vehemently demanded that the Corinthians should expel from their community a man who had married his step-mother, "a fornication which is not so much as named among the Gentiles", and that they should "deliver him up to Satan for the destruction of the flesh" (1 Cor. V. 1—5). So decided is the New Testament even in cases of affinity; it is, of course, unyielding in all cases of consanguinity; and in many points, as the inseparable unity of wedded couples and the re-marriage of widows, it is even more rigorous than the Old Testament (see pp. 380; comp. Acts XV. 20, 29, where πορνεία perhaps includes our laws; comp. *Selden*, De Jure Nat. et Gent. cap. XII.; *Spencer*, De Legg. Ritt. Dissert. II. I. 2; III. 4; vol. I. pp. 591 *sqq.*). The error of regarding the matrimonial laws of the Pentateuch, at least partially, as judicial enactments, and therefore as having been repealed after the extinction of the Jewish commonwealth, favoured the obnoxious "dispensations", which, by substituting ecclesiastical caprice or covetousness for the inviolable power and impartiality of the Law, helped to undermine the foundations of society. It is true the Hebrew legislators visited transgression of the matrimonial ordinances with death (ver. 29; XX. 11, 12, 14, 17); but this does not prove that they regarded them merely as penal laws; they earnestly considered the presence of

**4. You shall do My judgments, and keep My statutes, to walk therein: I *am* the Lord your God. 5. And you**

certain criminals as contaminating, and therefore insisted upon their death; in some instances, they fixed no punishment, but simply declared that the trespassers should "bear their iniquity" (XX. 19), or pronounced against them a curse (Deut. XXVII. 20—23); in others, they used the strongest terms expressive of moral abhorrence, as "pollution" (תֶּבֶל) and "wickedness" (זִמָּה), "ungodliness" (חֶסֶד) and "defilement" (נִדָּה); or they threatened that the guilty should remain childless (עֲרִירִים). Hence offences of incest were evidently not believed to be amenable to the worldly tribunals only. In the Pentateuch, the boundary lines between the moral and the judicial spheres are not clearly marked; filial disobedience is punished with death, and the impulses of charity are regulated by precise laws.

It is well known that the Koran allows Mohammedan women to appear in the presence of certain relations unveiled, and that, with one exception, just these relations are in the Pentateuch forbidden to intermarry (comp. *Koran* XXIV. 31; XXXII. 55; *Michael.* Mos. R. § 109; Eheges. § 69; *Lane*, Mod. Egypt, I. 231, 232; etc.). However, these coincidences do not help us to explain the principle underlying the Biblical marriage precepts, for they are evidently themselves contingent results of the latter: as the prevailing laws preclude all hope of a union between near relatives, a freer social intercourse between the sexes and a relaxation of a rigid Eastern custom have been deemed justified. The one exception alluded to is a brother's wife, whom according to the Pentateuch a man must not marry, unless it be as a levir, and whom yet according to the Koran he is not permitted to see unveiled.

Philological Remarks. — Most critics agree that the chapters XVIII to XX belong together, and form a distinct section of the Book of Leviticus (see Comm. on Lev. I. p. xxvi.); they contain not a few words which occur hardly anywhere else in the Old Testament or in the Pentateuch (e.g. תֶּבֶל *pollution* XVIII. 23; XX. 12; רָכִיל *slander* XIX. 16; חֶסֶד *ungodliness* XX. 17; comp. Prov. XIV. 34; זִמָּה *wickedness* XVIII. 17; XIX. 29; XX. 14; שַׁעַטְנֵז *mixture of linen and wool* XIX. 19, comp. Deut. XXII. 11; הִקִּיף *to cut round* XIX. 27; נֶחֱרֶפֶת *betrothed* XIX. 20; חֻפְשָׁה *liberty*, ibid.; בִּקֹּרֶת *punishment*, ibid.; כְּתֹבֶת קַעֲקַע *branding with marks* XIX. 28; etc.). Nor could the fact that these chapters bear, in many points, a striking resemblance to the writings of *Ezekiel*, escape the notice of students; it has, therefore, been conjectured, on the one hand, that Ezekiel is himself the author of these sections (XVIII—XXII); and on the other hand, that, having eagerly read, he largely reproduced them; the former hypothesis was proposed by Graf (Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testamentes, pp. 81—83), the latter by Nöldeke (Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testamentes, pp. 67—71). We can agree with neither of these theories. The resemblance referred to lies neither in the style nor in the spirit: for the style of Ezekiel is full and rhetorical, that of our portion of Leviticus precise and condensed; and the spirit of the one is prophetic and ideal, of the other essentially legal and positive. The analogy is limited to the identity of a certain number of words and phrases, which the

**shall keep My statutes and My judgments, which if a man do, he shall live through them: I *am* the Lord.**

legislator might as well have borrowed from the prophet as the prophet from the legislator, or which both alike may have derived from some older work. Deuteronomy has many laws and subjects in common with Leviticus, and the former Book which was diffused when Ezekiel was a child, and which could not fail to interest and attract him, might well have been his source or guide. The codes of Leviticus are proved to be the very latest of the whole Pentateuch by their systematic order, their comprehensiveness, and their advanced and minute ceremonialism. It is, therefore, utterly inadmissible to suppose that our sections are attributable to the early Elohist, and that he compiled them with the aid of anterior documents, some Jehovistic interpolations having merely been added at a later time (so f. i. *Knobel*, Lev. 500, 501; *Nöldeke* l. c. 64).

The unity of the eighteenth chapter is only marred by the twenty-first verse, which introduces a heterogeneous subject, "And thou shalt not give any of thy seed to let him pass to Moloch, and thou shalt not profane the name of thy God: I am the Lord". It is hardly probable that this verse was placed where we find it by the original compiler of the chapter. It seems to have been inserted by a later and less attentive or less logical reviser; but it would be idle to speculate on his motives; nor is it possible to decide whether to the same hand is due the even more irregular addition at the end of this division of Leviticus (XX. 27), where after an elaborate and general conclusion, a specific prohibition against soothsaying was appended, the more uncalled for as the same command is enjoined in that very chapter and in the preceding one (ver. 6; XIX. 31; comp. ver. 26).

It is of no avail to attempt the proof that the laws and menaces of this chapter (espec. vers. 24 *sqq.*) originated in the age of Moses (see, f. i., *Ranke*, Untersuchungen, I. 105; II. 88; *Hävernick*, Einleit. in den Pentat., ed. Keil, p. 416): in some of the statements the time of the Sinaitic wanderings is indeed studiously delineated, and distinctly in ver. 3, "Like the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein you dwelt, shall you not do; and like the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall you not do"; but many of the laws were unknown even in the period of the monarchy (see p. 354), and the menaces refer to the Israelites as being in actual possession of Canaan (comp. also vers. 27, 28).—In this and the following sections, the phrase אני יהוה and אני יהוה אלהיכם occur very frequently, and are possibly characteristic of a particular author (see Comm. on Lev. I. p. XXVIII).—The relative אֲשֶׁר in ver. 5 may either refer to the preceding nouns (את חקתי וכ') or to the following subject (הָאָדָם): both constructions are in accordance with Hebrew usage, and with the force of the principal verb וָחַי (comp. Neh. IX. 29; *Zunz* "die der Mensch thue, dass er durch sie lebe"; the Sept., converting the relative into an independent sentence, ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς). Onkel., Jonath., Rashi, a. o. understand וחי בהם as the future life; Luzz. explains "life" by "well-being" (benessere); Rosenm. "is ducet vitam tranquillam, ei nulla poena a magistratu timenda est"; but all these interpretations are against the spirit of the Pentateuch

6. None of you shall approach to any that is near

and its notions of happiness; life simply is meant, which was in itself regarded as the highest boon and the greatest reward; whereas sudden or early death was, as a rule, looked upon as the dire punishment of sin.

**6.** "None of you shall approach to any (אֶל כָּל־) that is near of kin to him." Thus, after a general introduction warning the Hebrews not to follow the practices of neighbouring nations, the laws of marriage are preceded by a broad principle, which would be superfluous if it did not comprise more cases than those mentioned immediately afterwards; it is so comprehensive in form and scope that it might have rendered any special enumeration unnecessary, had not the legislator preferred explicitness in a subject of such paramount importance. Moreover, that principle was, as the context seems to suggest, the direct reverse of that acted upon by the Egyptians and the Canaanites; and it was even more decidedly opposed to the usage of the Persians. Among the latter, marriages with near relations (called qaetvô-datha) — with mothers, sisters, and daughters — were expressly recommended as meritorious and as most pleasing to the gods; and they were unanimously advocated both by older and later teachers, who considered the offspring of such marriages "the most noble of all men, and worthy of the highest honour and authority", probably because the Iranic nations, conspicuous for family pride, deemed it to be their highest duty to preserve the purity of their blood and the strict division of their tribes (*Vispered* III. 18; *Philo*, Specc. Legg. III. 3; comp. *Khorda-Avesta* XLV. 18; *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. pp. XXVIII, CXIV, CXV, and 11, 12; see also *Herod.* III. 31; *Diod. Sic.* I. 27; *Strabo* XV. III. 20; *Lucian*, De Sacrif. c. 5; *Diog. Laert.* Prooem. VI; *Minuc. Fel.* c. 31; *Clem. Alex.* Strom. III. p. 431; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. VI. 10, § 8; *Phot.* Bibl. p. 132 ed. Becker; *Selden*, De Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. V. c. 11, pp. 601—611). The common Egyptians declared that, in sanctioning marriages with sisters, they only imitated the example of the happy couple Osiris and Isis, and of Typhon and Nephthys; and their history records many examples of such unions among their kings, as Ptolemy Philadelphus and his sister Arsinoë, and Ptolemy Euergetes and Berenice; whereas the initiated explained the mythological instances as symbols of the fertilising Nile and the fertile land (comp. *Diod. Sic.* l. c.; *Pausan.* I. 7; *Lucian* l. c.; *Philo*, Specc. Legg. III. 4; *Joseph.* Ant. XII. II. 6; XX. II. 1; *Minuc. Fel.* l. c.; *Jablonski*, Pantheon, lib. V. cap. 3; *Wilkinson*, Anc. Eg. II. 63). Herodotus (l. c.) maintains that such marriages were not legalised in Egypt before the time of Cambyses; and in support of this view we might adduce that Abraham, when he arrived in Egypt, and desired to avoid the suspicion that Sarah was his wife, alleged that she was his sister (Gen. XII. 13; comp. XX. 2; XXVI. 7). Though the Greeks shunned the marriage with the germane sister as "unholy" (γάμος ἀνόσιος), neither the Athenians nor the Spartans saw an objection in marrying the half-sister, the former if she had the same father as her husband, the latter if she had the same mother (comp. *Aristoph.* Ranae 850; *Plat.* Respub. V. 9; *Eurip.* Androm. 174 *sqq.*; *Plut.* Cim. 4; Themist. 32; *Corn. Nep.* Cim. 1; *Philo* l. c.). Such were the usages, not of barbarous and reckless tribes unused

of kin to him, to uncover *their* nakedness: I *am* the

to moral restrictions, but of nations that had attained a very high degree of civilisation. — It is, therefore, obvious how important it was to insist upon the principle laid down in this verse at a time, when the Hebrews were constantly exposed to the influence of their Persian masters, and came into perpetual contact with their Egyptian neighbours. As to the Canaanites, their fearful depravity is, by writers of all periods, dwelt upon in the strongest terms of rebuke and abhorrence (comp. Gen. XV. 16; XIX. 5; Exod. XXIII. 24; Deut. XX. 17, 18; etc.).

The specified list of prohibitions which follows, does not directly include the marriage with the mother-in-law (חֹתֶנֶת), which is interdicted not only in another portion of Leviticus, but already in Deuteronomy, and which was detested as impious by the Romans and other nations (Lev. XX. 14; Deut. XXVII. 23; comp. *Cic.* pro Cluent. c. 6; *Koran* IV. 27; see *infra* on ver. 17); but this omission does not involve an alteration of the law; if the step-mother was forbidden (ver. 8), it is not likely that it should have been deemed lawful to marry the mother-in-law; our list does not attempt completeness, for it does not even mention the daughter; it discloses the principles of the prohibitions, but does not attempt an exhaustive enumeration (see p. 359).

Philological Remarks. — Ebn Ezra points out that our text enjoins generally, "None of you (איש איש) shall approach", without adding "of the house of Israel", and he deduces therefrom the rule that the stranger also must be prevented from committing any of the crimes referred to, lest he defile the land (see p. 335, and vers. 24-30). — The not very usual word שְׁאֵר is coupled with its synonym בָּשָׂר *flesh*, to express the notion of consanguinity with greater force, and the term שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ means "his flesh and blood", or "his flesh and bone" (Gen. XXIX. 14; Judg. IX. 2; etc.), literally "the flesh of his flesh" (Sept. πρὸς πάντα οἰκεῖον σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, Vulg. ad proximam sanguinis sui; Onk. and Jon. קריב בשריה); and so שִׂמְחַת גִּילִי (Ps. XLIII. 4) "my jubilant joy", etc.; but the *same* noun is more frequently repeated after a construct state to intensify the notion, as רָעַת רָעַתְכֶם (Hos. X. 15) "your fearful wickedness", שְׁמֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם (1 Ki. VIII. 27) "the highest heavens" (see Gram. § 75.7.b). Some take בשרו merely as a periphrase for "his own" or "of himself" (so Vater a. o.); but בשר never occurs in this sense. שְׁאֵר is joined with בשר elsewhere also (XXV. 49), and it is used alone in the meaning of "near of kin" (vers. 12, 13, and XX. 19; XXI. 2; Num. XXVII. 11, where it is kinsman in general; comp. the abstract noun שַׁאֲרָה "near relationship", ver. 17), or in the sense of "body" (Ps. LXXIII. 26; Jer. LI. 35), and of "food" (Exod. XXI. 10; etc.). The fact that שְׁאֵר "flesh" is employed also with reference to mere affinity (comp. ver. 17), goes far to prove that man and wife are regarded as "one flesh", and that the relations of one become the relations of the other; בָּשָׂר also denotes both near and distant kinsmen (comp. Gen. XXIX. 14; XXXVII. 27; Judg. IX. 2; 2 Sam. V. 1; etc.). Some old and modern interpreters render שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ "the remainder of his flesh" (so Bonfrère, Michael., Bush, Herxheim., a. o., and so also the marginal reading of the Author. Vers.): though the word שְׁאֵר has hardly this meaning, and the phrase loses in emphasis, the general

Lord. 7. The nakedness of thy father and the nakedness of thy mother shalt thou not uncover; she *is* thy

sense is the same as that of the usual translation — "none of you shall approach any one else who is of the same flesh". — The phrase גִּלָּה עֶרְוָה (Sept. ἀποκαλύψαι ἀσχημοσύνην, Vulg. revelare turpitudinem), a euphemism for having carnal intercourse, is commonly used with reference to men, but once also with respect to women (XX. 17); comp. אֶת־שְׁאֵרוֹ הֶעֱרָה (XX. 19). — Bertheau (Gruppen, pp. 198—200) assumes in this chapter, from ver. 6 to ver. 23, twice *ten* commands, reckoning vers. 17 and 23 as two commands each.—It has been strangely supposed that the laws enacted in the following verses (6-18) do not relate to marriage but to *stuprum* (so f. i. Rosenmüller, following older authors, see Schol. in loc.): if this were the case, why were men just forbidden to approach their "near relations", as if they might have unrestricted intercourse with other women; and how could, among others, the 17th and the 18th verses be explained? The phrase גִּלָּה עֶרְוָה means, generally, to have carnal connection, whether in wedlock or not; it seems to be employed in these laws in order to point more strikingly to the moral hideousness of their transgression; and in a parallel passage (XX. 14) marriage is plainly and unmistakably expressed (ואיש אשר יקח את אשה וכ').

**7.** The arrangement of our list is clear and systematic. It begins with the cases of consanguinity both direct and collateral — mother, sister, grand-daughter, father's sister, and mother's sister (vers. 7 — 13); then follow the cases of affinity in two subdivisions, first the wives of the blood-relations — the father's brother's wife, the daughter-in-law, and the brother's wife (vers. 14—16); and next the wife's blood relations — wife's daughter and mother, wife's grand-daughter, and wife's sister (vers. 17, 18).

The horror felt in the ancient world at maternal incest, even if unconsciously committed, is powerfully described in the Greek legends which cluster round the name of Oedipus, who, cursed by the gods and shunned by men, inflicts fearful punishment upon himself, till he dies a forlorn exile, to bequeathe to his family fratricide and domestic feuds, and to his country civil war and sad desolation. Even Plato, who in his ideal republic recommends that "whenever either the women or the men are past the age of procreation, the men should be allowed to cohabit with any women they like", yet bids his citizens keep aloof from their mothers and daughters, their grand-mothers and grand-daughters (Respub. V. 9); Aristotle clings to the time-honoured view that the alliance with the mother clashes with a primary law of nature to which even irrational beasts submit; and the Roman code repeats the same axiom (*Justin*. Instit. nov. XII. c. 1; Lex Dei, Tit. VI. 2, "inter parentes et liberos connubium non est"). Among the Hebrews contravention was no doubt punished with the death of both offenders, since even marriage with a step-mother was a capital crime (XX. 11; comp. Deut. XXIII. 1; XXVII. 20; *Philo*, Legg. Spec. III. 3, Op. II. 301).

Philological Remarks. — The particle וְ in וְעֶרְוַת אִמְּךָ (ver. 7) means *and*, not *or* (Engl. Vers. a. o.), nor *that is* (Brentano, Vater a. o.): the commands are addressed to the men only, and father and mother are here

mother, thou shalt not uncover her nakedness. 8. The nakedness of thy father's wife shalt thou not uncover; it *is* thy father's nakedness. 9. The nakedness of thy sister, the daughter of thy father or the daughter of thy mother, *whether she be* born at home or born abroad

joined, as in marrying the latter, the son commits an offence against the former also; the subsequent words אִמְּךָ הִוא, and the conclusion of ver. 8 (ערות אביך הוא) remove every doubt (comp. also vers. 8, 14, 16; XX. 11; Ezek. XXII. 10; *Talm.* Sanh. 54[a]). Therefore the explanation of ערות אביך given by Rosenmüller and others, "eam quam nudavit aut nudare potestatem habet pater tuus", is as uncalled for as it is grammatically questionable. Those words certainly do not refer to disgraceful conduct like that of Ham (Gen. IX. 22, 23). — תְגַלֵּה in pausa instead of תְגַלֶּה (comp. XX. 19; see Gramm. § LXVII. 14.[a]).

**8.** As according to Biblical notions, husband and wife became "one flesh", a step-mother was regarded as a blood-relation almost as near as father and mother themselves; and hence St. Paul implacably branded marriage with a step-mother as "fornication" so heinous that heathens recoiled from its very name, and insisted upon the excommunication of a convert who had violated that rule (see *supra* p. 385).—It is a well-known practice of Eastern usurpers to marry the wives and concubines of their predecessors, all whose rights and prerogatives they are deemed to have secured by that act. Thus David married the wives of Saul, his father-in-law, and he did so with the approval of the best of his contemporaries and of a much later age (2 Sam. XII. 8). Similar was the object of Absalom in openly dishonouring his own father's concubines, and of Adonijah in demanding Abishag, his father's wife, in marriage (2 Sam. XVI. 20—23; 1 Ki. II. 17). Absalom acted as he did on the advice of Ahitophel, whose wisdom was in his time deemed oracular, and who was certain that the usurper's authority would be strengthened by a deed which in the age of our legislator was held incestuous, and which already in the last address of Jacob is condemned with indignation (Gen. XXXV. 22; XLIX. 4). — Marriages with step-mothers seem to have been common among the ancient Arabs, but were interdicted by Mohammed (*Koran* IV. 27). — With respect to the African Kytch tribe a recent traveller relates that "when a man becomes too old to pay sufficient attention to his numerous young wives, the eldest son takes the place of his father, and becomes his substitute" (*Baker*, Albert Nyanza, p. 74).

**9.** Marriage with a half-sister was indeed, in remoter periods, not unusual among the Hebrews (p. 357), as it was, with certain restrictions, permitted among the Spartans and Athenians (p. 388); but it was by the levitical authors stamped as an "accursed" and "ungodly" crime (חֶסֶד), inexorably to be visited with public execution, whether the half-sister be born in wedlock or out of it (חוץ, comp. XX. 17; Deut. XXVII. 22). It is difficult to decide when this severer view was adopted; certain it is, that it was still unheeded in the earlier times of the monarchy, as is proved by the narrative of Genesis

— their nakedness thou shalt not uncover. 10. The nakedness of thy son's daughter or of thy daughter's daughter — their nakedness thou shalt not uncover; for theirs *is* thy *own* nakedness. 11. The nakedness of thy

with respect to Abraham and Sarah, and of the Book of kings in reference to Amnon and Tamar (see *supra* p. 358); but it was already in force in the Assyrian period, since it is embodied in Deuteronomy (l.c.; comp. notes on ver. 11). According to the Canons of St. Basil (about 370), a man who had married his half-sister was forbidden to enter any place of worship; if he continued the offence, he was, for three years, compelled to stand at the portals of his church, and to implore the faithful to intercede for him by their supplications; for the next three years he was permitted to listen to the sermons and the readings from Scripture, but not to take part in the public prayers; during an equal period he was only allowed to do so while kneeling; and then at last, he was re-admitted into the community, after a public penance of eleven years (comp. *Rhallis* and *Potlis*, Σύνταγμα τῶν ἱερῶν κανόνων, Athens 1854, IV. 88 *sqq.*).

**10.** A man's grand-daughter is his own flesh and blood (עֶרְוָה); how much more then his daughter; the prohibition of marrying the latter is, therefore, *a fortiori* implied in that of marrying the former, though it is nowhere expressly stated (p. 359; comp. *Talm.* Sanh. 76[a]).

**11.** If the received Hebrew text be correct, this verse must relate to the full sister, though it is surprising that she should be mentioned after the half-sister (ver. 9), and that the law concerning the grand-daughter should have been inserted between the one and the other (see Philol. Rem.). According to the Canons of St. Basil, the Church looked upon incest with a sister in exactly the same light as upon murder (comp. also *Manu* XI. 171).

Philological Remarks. — The 9th and the 11th verses, taken in conjunction, present no inconsiderable difficulty: if interpreted by the ordinary usage of Hebrew, they seem to be identical in sense, both of them interdicting the marriage with the half-sister, so that either one verse or the other would be superfluous. For in ver. 9, אחותך בת־אביך או בת־אמך "thy sister, the daughter of thy father or (אוֹ) the daughter of thy mother", can only be half-sister; and in ver. 11, the words בת־אשת אביך מולדת אביך "the daughter of thy father's wife, begotten of thy father", appear to mean the same, since אֵשֶׁת אָב, wherever it occurs, signifies the *step-mother* (comp. ver. 8; XX. 11; Deut. XXIII. 1; XXVII. 20). This strange repetition may, however, be removed by the following alternative —either by reading in ver. 9 וְ instead of אוֹ; or by taking in ver. 11 אֵשֶׁת אָב as *mother*; understood in this manner, either of the two verses would prohibit the marriage with the *full sister*, while the other might be taken to refer to the *half-sister*. The former expedient would in itself be decidedly preferable; for it would give the natural precedence to the germane sister, and it would allow us to take אֵשֶׁה אָב in ver. 11 in its usual sense of step-mother. However, if the reading וּבת־אמך, instead of אוֹ בת־אמך, which is indeed not countenanced by the ancient versions, be objected to, nothing remains but to translate

father's wife's daughter, begotten of thy father, she *is* thy sister, thou shalt not uncover her nakedness. 12. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's sister; she *is* thy father's near kinswoman. 13. Thou shalt not

אשת אב by *mother*; so that in ver. 9 the half-sister and in ver. 11 the full sister would be interdicted. Some interpreters, by assuming the most unusual elliptical constructions, suppose the meaning of the two commands to be almost the reverse of that just stated; Luzzatto, f. i., renders ver. 5 le vergogne di tua sorella, figlia (anche) di tuo padre, o figlia (soltanto) di tua madre; and ver. 11 le vergogne della figlia della moglie di tuo padre, generata da tuo padre (ma da altra madre) etc. Some again understand ver. 9 of the half-sister, and ver. 11 of the step-sister (Gerlach); and others consider that both verses apply to the half-sister, ver. 9 to one born in a first marriage of the father or mother, and ver. 11 to one born in a second marriage of the father (so Clericus, Pfeiffer, De Dieu, Keil, a.o.): but such a distinction can hardly be intended, nor can it easily be deduced from the words of the text. Lengerke (Kenaan, p. 229) renders ver. 11, "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of the daughter of thy father's wife, if the latter bears a child to thy father" (מולדת אביך), whereas if she bears him no child, her daughter of a former marriage is allowed to marry the son of her second husband: but the words מולדת אביך bear no such construction, and the explanation introduces a novel and questionable principle: matrimony in itself, not its fruitfulness, constitutes relationship. — The signification of *step-sister* is, in ver. 11, excluded by the qualification מולדת אביך "begotten of thy father" (lit. "the offspring of thy father"; comp. Gen. XLVIII. 6; the words cannot mean "reared up by thy father" שגדלה אביך, as they were understood by some interpreters, see *Ebn Ezra* in loc.). — Nor can step-sister be intended, in ver. 9, by the words או מולדת חוץ (so St. Augustine a. o.), since she is *neither* of the same father *nor* of the same mother with her step-brother (comp. *Augustin.* Quaest. LIX in Levit.; *Michael.* Mos. R. §§ 114, 115). The words מולדת בית או מולדת חוץ are translated by Onkelos, "one who is born of thy father with another wife, or of thy mother with another husband"; which is no doubt the correct meaning of the terms. Targum Jonathan seems to go too far in including both the half-sister and the full sister, "one that thy father begets with another wife or with thy mother, or one that thy mother brings forth with thy father or with another husband" (and so Rosenmüller a.o.); while Ebn Ezra explains, without probability, "one who is born by parents married according to the statutes of Israel, after betrothal and marriage rites, and one who is born in a marriage concluded contrary to established customs". — מֹלֶדֶת is prop. *birth*, then the concrete *offspring*, *child*; or if taken in its original and verbal force, it stands for the Hophal מוּלֶּדֶת, though it is by no means necessary to adopt this reading (as some propose; comp. also *Ewald*, Lehrbuch, p. 297); the rendering of Rosenm. "*cum nulla prole*, quae a patre tuo descenderit, congrediaris", is too wide, for מולדת is evidently meant to explain the preceding בת.

**12—14.** Not only does the Hebrew law forbid the alliance with the father's and mother's sister, or

uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister; for she *is* thy mother's near kinswoman. — 14. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's brother, thou shalt not approach to his wife; she *is* thy aunt. 15. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy daughter-in-law; she *is* thy son's wife, thou shalt not uncover her nakedness. 16. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy

the real aunt, but also with the uncle's wife, who is properly no blood-relation of her nephew, but becomes his near kinsman by her becoming one with his uncle; in the former case, the law threatens that the offenders "shall bear their iniquity" (XX. 19), which probably implies punishment, and even death, at the discretion of the worldly tribunals, and in the latter case, that they shall remain "childless" (עֲרִירִים) to the end of their lives (XX. 20), which heavenly visitation proves that their conduct was deemed a moral offence against the Divine order of things: so consistently was the chief principle which underlies all these statutes carried out. Is it, then, probable that the author should have meant to legalise the marriage between uncle and niece, who stand in the same near relation of consanguinity as the nephew and his real aunt? (see *supra* p. 359).

**15.** The cases of consanguinity being completed, those of affinity follow. Marriage with a daughter-in-law is described as detestable "pollution" (תֶּבֶל) meriting death, since according to the strictest levitical view, it is almost like marriage with a daughter (comp. XX. 12). It was by many other nations regarded with similar abhorrence (comp. *Manu* XI. 171; *Koran* IV. 27).

**16.** In this and another passage of Leviticus, the marriage with a deceased brother's wife is forbidden as incestuous "defilement" (נִדָּה), and menaced with the curse of childlessness (XX. 21), whereas in Deuteronomy, it is in certain cases enjoined as a moral and civil duty (comp. XX. 21; Deut. XXV. 5—10; *Targ. Jon.* in loc.): we have above attempted, if not to reconcile, at least historically to account for, this contradiction (see pp. 361—363). Such an alliance was abominated by the first Christian teachers (comp. Matth. XIV. 3, 4); the Council of Nicaea decreed that a woman who married successively two brothers should be excommunicated until her death; and Protestant legislations punished the same offence with public disgrace and expulsion from the country (Corpus Juris Saxonici, Dresd. 1673, p. 124; *Richter*, Evangelische Kirchenordnungen, I. p. 125). Never during the first fourteen centuries were dispensations granted for such alliances; the Pope Martin V (1417—1431) was the first who ventured to break through the old barriers; the third dispensation given was that fatal one which Pope Julius II accorded to king Henry VIII for marrying Catharine of Aragon, the widow of his elder brother Arthur; and from the middle of the eighteenth century such marriages were frequently permitted (comp. *N. Knopp*, Katholisches Eherecht, I. 350). The Roman law did not expressly forbid them, but the early Romans regarded them as indecorous.

brother's wife; it *is* thy brother's nakedness. — 17. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of a woman and her daughter, nor shalt thou take her son's daughter or her daughter's daughter, to uncover her nakedness; *for* they *are her* near kinswomen; it *is* wickedness. 18. And

**17.** A man was not to marry "a woman and her daughter"; for if both were his wives at the same time, or if he took the mother after the death of her daughter, he would marry his mother-in-law, which was considered an execrable offence (see *supra* on ver. 6); and if he took the daughter after the death of her mother, he would marry his step-daughter, and this marriage was considered almost as a marriage with his own daughter, since he and his former wife were virtually one; it was denounced as "wickedness" (זִמָּה), and punished with death by fire (XX. 14). For similar reasons the alliance with the wife's grand-daughter was objectionable, for, as a rule, the matrimonial laws were fully applicable in the ascending and descending line.

**18.** We have before expressed our opinion on the much vexed question of the marriage with the wife's sister (*supra* p. 363): by the wording of the Hebrew text, a man is permitted to marry his *deceased* wife's sister, but not to have two sisters for wives at the same time, or one after the other while both are living — this is the logical inference to be drawn from the qualifying addition "in her lifetime" (בְּחַיֶּיהָ); and yet by the spirit of the levitical law, the former alliance also is like an alliance with a sister, and therefore no less objectionable. Such scruples were indeed unknown to the Hebrews of earlier times, since even in Genesis Jacob is represented as the husband of the sisters Rachel and Leah; but they followed with necessity from the severe theory of marriage gradually worked out and adopted. Philo, in the oldest explanation of our law that has come down to us, observes that it is impious (οὐχ ὅσιον) for one sister to usurp the place of the other, and to make the misfortune of the latter a stepping-stone of her own happiness; thus bitter jealousies and implacable enmities must be engendered; and it would be as if the different members of the body, abandoning their natural harmony and fellowship, were to quarrel with one another, thus inevitably causing incurable diseases and endless mischief (*Philo*, Specc. Legg. III. 5). In this sense the prohibition has commonly been understood, and if the words of our verse alone are weighed, it can hardly be understood otherwise: and yet the matrimonial laws, taken as a whole, were not prompted by considerations of mere expediency, such as the prevention of unsisterly rivalry, since their main object was to warn against alliances between near relations (ver. 6). From whatever side we weigh the question, we cannot help being struck by the incongruity of a code which permits a woman to marry, at least under certain conditions, her sister's husband, but expressly forbids a man to marry his brother's wife. If the wife dies, her husband does not cease to be the brother of that wife's sister; yet practical life seemed to demand some relief from the rigour of abstract logic, and the prohibition was limited to the lifetime of both sisters. It

thou shalt not take a wife to her sister, to cause en-

has been contended that this was a concession analogous to the levirat and the permission of divorce; but the cases are not quite parallel: the levitical legislators are entirely silent with regard to the levirat and divorce; for in their own time the former was unnecessary, and the latter was strongly opposed by contemporaries, such as Malachi (see p. 378); a direct repeal of the two statutes, known to the people as a part of Deuteronomy or "the Book of the Law", was unfeasible; and silence on these subjects was sufficiently significant.

We need hardly add that these remarks are merely designed to elucidate the meaning and intention of the command, without attempting to decide upon its value or its binding force; the latter points must be left to individual judgment and feeling, which in no other sphere claim greater respect and freedom. The prevailing laws of matrimony may possibly, in the course of time, call for revision; and progress and liberty of action should not be checked by a misconception of Biblical authority. The very verse under consideration affords the strongest proof that the ordinances of the levitical code are not final and unalterable; for this verse involves the sanction of polygamy, which, not even abrogated by Christ and the apostles, is now regarded by western Jews and Christians not merely as inexpedient, but as immoral.

It is well known that from comparatively early times, many chiefs of the Christian Church indeed translated the words of our verse literally, yet weighing the spirit of the law, were strongly opposed to the marriage with the deceased wife's sister. By the Apostolic Canons (about 300) persons contracting such an alliance were for ever incapacitated for clerical functions. The Council of Illiberis (about 305) excluded them from holy communion for five years; St. Basil (375) imposed upon them for seven years the ecclesiastical penalties fixed for adultery; his celebrated letter on the subject proves that, in the Church "a custom equivalent to a law, and handed down by holy men" had been established against such marriages; it was in his time probably that the Septuagint (in Deut. XXVII. 23) received the interpolation found in the Vatican copy of that version, "Cursed be he who lies with his wife's sister" (ἐπικατάρατος ὁ κοιμώμενος μετὰ ἀδελφῆς τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ); and similar views were enforced by the emperors Constantius and Theodosius, Honorius, Theodosius II, and Justinian, and by all the leaders of the Greek and Latin Church: the only notable exception is Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus; but he was indignantly opposed by his contemporary St. Basil, who declared that such marriages are indeed permitted to the Jews because they are under the Law and all its ceremonial enactments, but not to the free Christians, and asked how the offspring of the two sisters would be related to each other, whether they should be called cousins or brothers, since by a deplorable "confusion" (σύγχυσις) they could claim both names. In England, those marriages were forbidden in 1603 by the Convocation of the province of Canterbury in a Canon which has never been formally ratified by Parliament. Dispensations were, however, readily granted in the Roman Church; and since the last century many Protestant theo-

**mity, to uncover her nakedness, beside her, in her life *time*.**

logians and jurists, and among the first those of the pietistic schools, as Philip Jacob Spener, declared marriage with the deceased wife's sister unobjectionable, since the prohibition is not unequivocally enjoined in the Bible. It was disapproved of by the Karaites; but among the bulk of the Jews it has at all times not only been tolerated but encouraged (comp. *Mishn.* Yevam. IV. 13, אשתו שמתה מותר באחותה יכ'; comp. III. 7, 9; X. 4; *Maimon.* Hilch. Issur. Biah II. 7, 9).

Philological Remarks. — From the sixteenth century down to our time many interpreters have supposed that this verse enforces the prohibition of polygamy, and have rendered the words וְאִשָּׁה אֶל־אֲחֹתָהּ לֹא תִקָּח, "Thou shalt not take one wife to another". This translation was first proposed by Junius and Tremellius in 1575, and it is also given in the margin of the Authorised English version. But polygamy was not, and could not be, interdicted in the Pentateuch, which often refers to it as to an established and lawful institution (see *supra* p. 373). The words אשה אל אחותה, like the corresponding masculines, are indeed occasionally "one to or with another" (Exod. XXVI. 3, 5, 6, 17; Ezek. I. 9, 23; III. 13), but in all such passages they have reciprocal or distributive force, a plural noun with a plural verb invariably preceding (f. i. כַּנְפֵיהֶם יְשָׁרוֹת אִשָּׁה אֶל־אֲחוֹתָהּ "their wings were straight one toward the other", Ezek. I. 23), whereas no such mutual relation exists in our passage; moreover, אָחוֹת occurs here repeatedly in its usual signification of sister (vers. 9, 11—13), and can in our context not be understood differently. Onk. renders ואיתתא עם אחתה, whereas he translates the same words in Exodus חדא עם חדא or חד לקבל חד, evidently taking those words in our passage literally, but in Exodus figuratively (comp. also *Targ. Jon.* in Ezek. I. 23 and III. 13); Sept. γυναῖκα ἐπ' ἀδελφῇ αὐτῆς; and so Syr., Ital., Vulg. (sororem uxoris tuae), Theodor., etc., etc.; Philo l. c. δύο ἀδελφαί; and St. Augustine already (Quaest. LXIII. in Lev.) distinctly observes, "Hic non prohibuit superducere, quod licebat antiquis propter abundantiam propagationis". Indeed symmetry and completeness seem to require that the list should include the prohibition of marriage with the wife's sister (see *supra* on ver. 7).—In 1 Sam. I. 6 the word צָרָה is plainly used for rival wife; it is, therefore, probable that לִצְרֹר in our verse means "to be hostile", that is, to cause jealousy or enmity (comp. Arab. ضرّ III to be jealous, IV to take a second wife); and not "to bind or tie together" (comp. Exod. XII. 34; 1 Sam. XXV. 29; Isai. VIII. 16; etc.). Onkel. and Jonath. have לְאַעָקָא לַהּ "to afflict her"; Rashi לשון צרה לעשות את זו צרה לזו, similarly Rashb. and others (Nicol. de Lyra "ad anxiandum", Pagninus and Leo de Juda "ad lacessendum", Luther "ihr zuwider", Vatablus "ut affligas eam", Cranmer "to vex her", Luke Osiander "ad affligendum", Clericus "ut dolorem huic crees"). The Sept. has ἀντίζηλον (a rival, Zunz als Nebenbuhlerin; comp. Sir. XXVI. 6; XXXVII. 11), and Ital. in zelum; and so Hesych., Seb. Munster (in aemulationem sive tribulationem), Seb. Schmidt (ad aemulandum), Le Maistre de Sacy and Calmet (pour la rendre sa rivale), Dathe (ad aemulationem ejus excitandam), Michaelis

19. And thou shalt not approach to a woman to uncover her nakedness during the uncleanness of her *monthly* impurity. 20. And thou shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbour's wife, to defile thyself with her. —

(dass sie ihr Eifersucht verursache), De Wette (zur Erregung der Eifersucht), Gesenius (ita ut zelotypae fiant, una alterius aemula sit); but Vulg. in pellicatum illius (i. e. ut sit pellex sororis). The quarrels of *durrahs* or fellow-wives are proverbial in Egypt and elsewhere (comp. *Lane* Mod. Eg. I. 240). —עָלֶיהָ is "beside her", not "upon her", as the Bishops' Bible and others render; for the phrase גלה ערוה is complete in itself, without requiring the complement of עליה or עליהן.—The word בְּחַיֶּיהָ has indeed a rather anomalous position at the end of the verse (comp. Gramm. II. § LXXIV. 5), for it evidently relates to the first part of the injunction — "thou shalt not take a woman besides her sister ... in her life-time"; some, however, as Calvin and Patrick, anxious to proscribe the marriage with a deceased wife's sister unconditionally, connect בחייה with the nearer verb לצרר; but this would yield the very feeble sense — "thou shalt not take a woman besides her sister, to vex her ... in her life-time". Others again, as Dr. Pusey, refer the suffix in בְּחַיֶּיהָ not to אחותה, but to אשה, that is, the second sister, and translate — "thou thalt not take a woman besides her sister ... as long as she (the former) lives", so that the verse would simply contain an emphatic command *never* to marry a second sister (comp. Ps. CIV. 33, אשירה ליהוה בְּחַיָּי, "I will sing to the Lord as long as I live", that is, always; LXIII. 5; CXLVI. 2): but so poetical an expression would not harmonise with the simple style of these legal enactments; and the word was never so understood by those to whom Hebrew was a living or a familiar tongue.

**19.** The matrimonial laws are followed by a few ordinances concerning sexual intercourse which throw a strange light upon the moral condition of the age in which they were promulgated.

Our verse simply forbids connection with a menstruating woman, without alluding either to the ritual consequences or the punishment of such intercourse; this omission is supplied in two other laws, the one enjoining that the man shall be unclean for seven days, the other, that both the man and the woman shall suffer death (XV. 24; XX. 18): whether these commands imply a contradiction or not, and if they do, how it may be historically explained, has been pointed out before (p. 264; see also p. 262; comp. Manu XI. 174).

**20.** Nor does the author mention, with respect to adultery, the punishment of death, which among the Hebrews as among other Eastern nations, was inexorably inflicted upon both criminals, but he intimates the heinousness of the offence by branding it as a "deflement" (לְטָמְאָה בָהּ). The laws of *stuprum* and *adulterium* were fixed among the Hebrews on intelligible and judicious principles contrasting favourably with the doubtful and wavering practice of other Eastern nations. A betrothed woman was regarded as if she were married (see, in general, Comm. on Exod. pp. 422—425; comp. also *Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 8; *Lane,* Mod. Egypt, I. 147, 148; II. 129 *sqq.*).

Philological Remarks. — The

**21. And thou shalt not give *any* of thy seed to let *him* pass to Molech, and thou shalt not profane the name**

words לֹא תִתֵּן שְׁכָבְתְּךָ לְזָרַע are literally, "thou shalt not give thy discharge, as regards semen", i.e., thy discharge of semen (Sept. κοίτην σπέρματός σου), or thou shalt have no sexual intercourse; for שְׁכֹבֶת is, like שִׁכְבָה (XV. 16, etc.), effusion (see p. 258), and is, like it, used with or without זֶרַע (comp. ver. 23; XX. 15; Num. V. 20). The Vulg. renders the whole verse freely, cum uxore proximi tui non coibis, nec seminis commistione maculaberis.—לְטָמְאָה בָהּ, lit. *to become unclean by her*, that is, to commit with her an act of defilement. On the infin. טָמְאָה with ה, in the manner of a *nomen verbale*, see Gramm. § XXXIX. 1.

**21.** The denunciation of the atrocious worship of Moloch, though interrupting the tenour of these laws, harmonises well with the spirit of our chapter; it is solemn and impressive, and points at once to God the Holy one, and to God the Judge, who is sure to punish the heathen practice with personal and national calamity. Children were by the Hebrews burnt to Moloch at all periods, down to the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and later; and therefore, the public teachers who legislated for the new commonwealth organised after the Babylonian exile, still found it necessary to forbid and to inveigh against that iniquity. A subsequent part of this section is even more explicit, and ordains: "Anyone of the children of Israel, and of the strangers that sojourn in Israel, that gives of his seed to Moloch, shall surely be put to death; the people of the land shall stone him with stones; and I will set My face against that man, and will cut him off from among his people; because he has given of his seed to Moloch, to defile My Sanctuary, and to profane My holy name" (XX. 2, 3). We have discussed this subject, and human sacrifices generally, in a former volume, to which we refer the reader (Comm. on Lev. I. 365—367, 381—396, 401, 402). To the opinions there reviewed, we may add the recent suggestion, that "in the time of Moses" the rites of Moloch "belonged to the region rather of magic than of definite idolatrous worship, and that it may have been practised as a lustral charm, or fire-baptism, for the children of incest and adultery" (*Cook's* Holy Bible on Lev. XX. 2—5). The only argument advanced in support of this view is the circumstance that the prohibition of the service of Moloch is, in this and in a later chapter (the 20th), introduced together with laws of incest and magic; but such an inference can hardly be drawn from disconnected ordinances; and a lustral charm cannot fitly be called "giving one's seed to Moloch".

Philological Remarks. — "If matrimony is not held sacred, it easily happens that children are sacrificed"; in this manner Jewish commentators endeavour to establish a connection between this and the preceding verse; similarly Baumgarten (Comment. p. 205), a. o., and Salomon observes: "This verse forbids, as it were, spiritual adultery, revolt and faithlessness against God" (comp. XVII. 7).—The term לְהַעֲבִיר לַמֹּלֶךְ is elliptical, and means to make the boy pass through the hands of the figure of Moloch, and then to let him fall into the fire within that statue, for the "passing through" the idol's arms was the proper act of dedication (Vulg. aptly, ut consecretur; see Comm. on Lev.

of thy God: I *am* the Lord. — 22. Thou shalt not lie with a man as with a woman; it *is* abomination. 23. And thou shalt not lie carnally with any beast to defile thy-

I. p. 381 note 19). It is unnecessary and unwarranted to consider להעביר in this and analogous passages as a later and intentional corruption instead of להבעיר *to burn* (comp. 2 Ki. XVI. 3, and 2 Chron. XXVIII. 3), as the term העביר is quite appropriate if understood in the sense indicated (comp. *Geiger*, Urschr. pp. 303—305; Jüd. Zeitschr. IV. 55). Some ancient translators, anxious to remove, or at least to veil, the abominable offence of child-murder in honour of Moloch, either read להעבד "to serve" or to worship, instead of להעביר (so the Samaritan and the Septuag. καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματός σου οὐ δώσεις λατρεύειν ἄρχοντι), or they understand העביר in the sense of עִבֵּר, "to fructify, to cause to be with child" (comp. Job XXI. 10), so that the sense would be, "thou shalt not give thy seed to beget children for idolatry", that is, thou shalt not intermarry with the heathen (so the Targ. Jonath. ומן זרעך לא תתן בתשמישתה לציד בת עממין למעברא לפולחנא אוחרא, the Syriac ומן זרעך לא תרמא למבטני ניכריתא), and the same is the meaning of an old explanation of our passage quoted but rejected in the Mishnah (Megill. IV. 9), "thou shalt not give any of thy seed to beget a child for Aramaism" (לאעברא בארמיותא), the latter term being commonly used to denote idolatry in general (comp. *Siphre*, III. 171, p. 107ª ed. Friedmann, הבועל ארמית וכ'). The "profanation" of God caused by the worship of Moloch, is self-evident; and we need not search for recondite explanations, which cannot be otherwise than artificial; f.i. "Idolatrous nations will say, the Israelites, well aware of the inferiority of their own God, sacrifice to Him animals, but to another deity their own sons" (Luzzatto). Michaelis (Suppl. p. 774) unnecessarily takes חִלֵּל in the sense of "*renouncing* or *deserting*"; and others, not more happily, suppose that it involves "some particular form of profane swearing", with which the service of Moloch is asserted to have been associated (*Cook's* Holy Bible on Lev. XX. 2—5).

**22, 23.** The code concludes with two ordinances which, even more than any of the preceding commands, disclose the abyss of depravity into which the Hebrews had sunk, or were apt to sink. The two unnatural crimes emphatically stigmatised as an "abomination" (תּוֹעֵבָה) and "a pollution" (תֶּבֶל), prevailed in the ancient world to an incredible extent; the first flourished among the Canaanites and the Hebrews (Gen. XIX. 5; Judg. XIX. 22; 1 Ki. XIV. 24), among the Greeks and Romans (Rom. I. 27; 1 Cor. VI. 9), among the Egyptians and Arabs, the Hindoos and Parsees (*Manu* XI. 175; *Vendid.* VIII. 98—106), but was, in nearly all instances, not only abhorred by the legislators, but severely punished, as a rule with the death of both delinquents (XX. 13; Deut. XXIII. 18, 19; *Vendid.* l. c.; *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. VI. 10; etc.); and the second enormity seems to have been so deeply rooted among the Hebrews that it is hardly passed over in any collection of laws; it is denounced in the old "Book of the Covenant"; it is execrated in Deuteronomy which reflects the reforming zeal of the latest kings of Judah; and it is condemned with vehement emphasis in the still later levitical ordinances (Exod. XXII. 18; Deut. XXVII. 21; Lev. XX. 15, 16); both the perpetra-

**self therewith; nor shall any woman stand before a beast to have connection with it: it *is* pollution.**

tor and the instrument of his crime were inexorably to be removed by death.

Philological Remarks. — Sodomy, the Vendidad observes, is always practised on the instigation of the devs, who are especially addicted to it, and in this manner multiply their own accursed race (*Kleuker*, Zend Av. II. 342; *Spiegel*, Avesta, I. 146). Solon enacted a series of laws for the protection of boys; he fixed the age of the masters, the school hours, and the rules for the admission of strangers; he ordained that a child who had been hired out by his father, was not bound to support him in his old age, though he must bury him, and observe the usual rites of mourning; and he ordained that a man who ill-treated a free-born boy (ἐλεύθερον παῖδα) should instantly be put to death, or be heavily fined, and on no account whatever was he at any time allowed to fill a higher magistracy or a priestly office, whether at home or abroad, to be judge, advocate, or witness, "since he could not speak with a pure body"; nor was he permitted to be present at the public sacrifices, or to appear within the consecrated boundaries of popular assemblies: if he disregarded any of these injunctions, he was to suffer capital punishment. To avoid dangerous examples, slaves were to be subjected to precisely the same regulations as free citizens (*Aeschin*. Adv. Timarch. §§ 9—21, ed. Becker; comp. also *Plutarch*, Institt. Lacon. c. 7, ὁ δὲ ἐγκληθεὶς ὡς ἐπ' αἰσχύνῃ πλησιάζων ἄγαμος διὰ βίου ἦν). No less severe was the Roman law; any person who disgraced a boy against his will was put to death; and any one who readily consented was fined in half his property, and at his death forfeited half of the remainder to the state (comp. *Huschke*, Jurisprud. Antejustin. p. 547).— As to coition with beasts, the testimonies of both ancient and modern writers are abundant; and as they refer chiefly, though by no means exclusively, to Egypt, where the atrocious vice was palliated and encouraged by superstition, we may understand the necessity of cautioning the Hebrews again and again, especially as these also, like other ancient nations, long adhered to the worship of "goat-deities" (שְׂעִירִים, XVII. 7); comp. *supra* p. 345; *Pindar*, Fragm. III. 122, ed. Heyne (Μένδητα παρὰ κρημνὸν θαλάσσας, ἔσχατον Νείλου κέρας, αἰγιβάται ὅθι τράγοι γυναιξὶ μίσγονται); *Aelian*, Nat. An. VII. 19 (ἀκόλαστα δὲ κυνοκέφαλοί τε καὶ τράγοι, καὶ μέντοι καὶ ὁμιλεῖν γυναιξί φασιν αὐτούς . . . καὶ κύνες δὲ γυναιξὶν ἐπιτολμᾶν ἐλέχθησαν. Καὶ μέντοι καὶ κριθῆναι λέγεται γυνὴ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ μοιχείας ὑπὸ τοῦ γήμαντος, καὶ ὁ μοιχὸς ἐν τῇ δίκῃ κύων εἶναι ἐλέγετο. Ἤκουσα δὲ κυνοκεφάλους καὶ παρθένοις ἐπιμανῆναι καὶ μέντοι καὶ βιάσασθαι); *Plut.* Gryll. c. 5; *Sonnini*, Voyage, III. 297 (C'est sur les rives fangeuses du Nil que les crocodiles déposent leurs oeufs; c'est là aussi qu'ils s'accouplent. La femelle, qui dans l'accouplement est renversée sur le dos, a beaucoup de peine à se relever. Croira-t-on que dans la haute Egypte il se trouve des hommes qui . . . profitent de cette position forcée de la femelle du crocodile, mettent au fuite le mâle, et le remplacent dans de monstrueux ébats?"); *Manu* XI. 174 ("whosoever wastes that which might have produced a human being, upon irrational beasts, must perform the penance of *santapana;* for a dis-

24. Do not defile yourselves with any of these *things*; for by all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you. 25. And the land was defiled, and I visited its iniquity upon it, and the land vomited out its inhabitants. 26. You shall therefore keep My statutes and My judgments, and you shall not commit any of these abominations, *neither* the native nor the stranger that sojourns among you; 27. For all these abominations have the men of the land done who *were* before you,

graceful act with a cow the penance ought even to be much severer": the same code forbids several other excesses not mentioned in the laws of the Pentateuch, and probably not unusual among the lower and uneducated classes of the Hindoos, XI. 171, 174); *Yâjnav.* II. 289; *Khorda Avest.* XLVI. 21 (*Spiegel*, Avesta, III. p. 217); *Virgil*, Aen. VI. 24 (Hic crudelis amor tauri, suppostaque furto Pasiphaë mixtumque genus prolesque biformis Minotaurus inest, etc.); *Ovid*, Ars Am. II. 23, 24 (semibovemque virum semivirumque bovem); Her. X. 101, 102; *Philo*, De Spec. Legg. III. 8 (ὡς λυττᾶν . . . ἀλόγους ζώους, ὥσπερ ἐν Κρήτῃ φασὶ τὸ παλαιὸν τὴν γυναῖκα Μίνω τοῦ βασιλέως, ὄνομα Πασιφάην, ταύρου ἐρασθεῖσαν κτλ.).—The absolute case משכבי אשה (ver. 22) qualifies the preceding verb תשכב, as שכבת זרע does in XV. 18 (see p. 260).—רָבַע, kindred with רבץ (comp. Ps. CXXXIX. 3), is properly *to crouch* or *to lie down*, then *to lie* or *sleep with* some one (Onk. למשלט בה), and is construed with the accusative, like its synonym שכב (ver. 22; XV. 18; see p. 260); comp. XIX. 19; XX. 16; Sept. and Vulg. veiling the sense have βιβασθῆναι, nec miscebitur ei; while Ebn Ezra a. o. connect the term with ארבעה ("ex figura quam corpora eorum sic copulata efformant, ad quadratam non nihil accedente", *Gusset.* quoted by Rosenm. in loc.).—תֶּבֶל is *pollution*, from בלל in the sense of *staining* or *blotting*; Sept. μυσαρόν, and in XX. 12 ἠσεβήκασι; Vulg. scelus; Rashi לשון קֶדֶשׁ וערוה וניאוף, and in XX. 12 גנאי; others simply *confusion* (Rashi, לשון בלילה וערבוב זרע אדם וזרע בהמה, and in XX. 12 "the seed of the father is mixed up with that of the son"; Luzzatto, turpe mescolanza; comp. also Ebn Ezra in loc.), or *perversion* of the Divine order of things (Keil, a. o.); Luther Gräuel, and in XX. 12 Schande (Schandthat).

**24—30.** A most impressive warning concludes this group of laws; it evidently points back to the introductory exhortation, which resembles it in import, though not in power (vers. 2—5); and it applies, therefore, not merely to the iniquities forbidden immediately before (vers. 19—23), but to the ordinances of the whole chapter, which forms a little code in itself: the legislator stamps the neglect of the matrimonial restrictions as an offence not less culpable and fatal than adultery, human sacrifice, bestiality, and every other execrable crime; and he takes care to enforce: "Do not defile yourselves *with any of these things* (בכל אלה); for by all these the nations are defiled". Nothing would, therefore, be more arbitrary or more foreign to our section, than to make a distinction in the importance of the different laws, and to assume that, taken in

**and the land was defiled; 28. Lest the land vomit you out, when you defile it, as it vomited out the nations that *were* before you. 29. For whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, the souls that commit *them* shall be cut off from among their people. 30. Therefore shall you keep My ordinance, that you do not act according to *any one* of these abominable statutes, which were acted upon before you, and that you do not defile yourselves therewith: I *am* the Lord your God.**

their totality, they are meant to be binding upon the Israelites only, whereas other nations have merely to observe a certain portion of them, such as the prohibition of marriage between parents and children, and between brothers and sisters (so f. i. *Ebn Ezra* on ver. 18; *Michael.* Mos. R. § 112; Eheges. §§ 119—126). Though gradations are established in the penalties of the various offences (ch. XX.), none are made in the description of the offences themselves; the enumeration is uniform, and the same cautions and menaces apply to all. The holy land is the special abode of God and the place of His Sanctuary; and as it would be desecrated by any act of immorality committed within its boundaries, the stranger is included in the ordinances like the native Hebrew; and it is for this reason that the moral and religious obligations of both were, in the course of time, more and more equalised.

Philological Remarks.—The verbs וַתִּטְמָא, וָאֶפְקֹד, etc. (ver. 25) have the signification of the past, not of the future or present (see on vers. 1—5; Eng. Vers. "and the land is defiled, therefore I do visit", etc.). Keil observes, "The preterites are prophetic, and the diction is poetical" (similarly Brentano, Salomon, a. o.); but how can either prophecy or poetry be expected in a series of penal laws? Comp. also *Michael.* Orient. Bibl. II. 214.—וְלֹא תָקִיא (ver. 28) Vulg. ne evomat, Targ. Jon. וְלָא תְפַלֵּט, Onk., Rashi ולא תריקן; others less distinctly, as Sept. ἵνα μὴ προςοχθίσῃ (lest He be wroth).—גוי is to be taken collectively "the nations" or "the people" (אנשי הארץ ver. 27; comp. XX. 23).—אֵל (ver. 27) instead of אֵלֶּה, see Gramm. § XX. 1. — In ver. 29 the subject is emphatically repeated (הנפשות וכ').

## CHAPTER XIX.

Summary. — This section contains a variety of moral and ceremonial precepts admitting of no systematic classification, namely, after a general exhortation (ver. 2), 1. a command on filial duty (ver. $3^a$); 2. on the observance of the Sabbaths (ver. $3^b$); 3. against idolatry (ver. $4^a$), and against worship of images (ver. $4^b$); 4. on thank-offerings (vers. 5—8); 5. on the portions to be left for the poor in gathering the produce of fields and vineyards (vers. 9, 10); 6. on truthfulness and honesty (ver. 11); 7. against perjury (ver. 12); 8. against oppression and violence (ver. $13^a$); 9. against delay in paying the labourer's hire (ver. $13^b$); 10. on the consideration due to the deaf and the blind (ver. 14); 11. on judicial justice

and fairness (ver. 15); 12. against slander and bearing false witness (ver. 16); 13. on the love we owe to our fellow-men (vers. 17, 18); 14. against unnatural combinations of beasts, of seeds, and of stuffs for garments (ver. 19); 15. on punishing and expiating seduction of a maid-servant (vers. 20—22); 16. on the use of the fruit of newly-planted trees (vers. 23—25); 17. against eating blood (ver. 26[a]); 18. against enchantment and magic (ver. 26[b]); 19. against mutilating the hair or body (vers. 27, 28); 20. against unchastity (ver. 29); 21. on keeping the Sabbaths and reverencing the Sanctuary (ver. 30); 22. against necromancers and wizards (ver. 31); 23. on respect due to old age (ver. 32); 24. on kindness towards the stranger (vers. 33, 34); 25. on probity in judgment, in meteyard, weight, and measure (vers. 35, 36): and then follows a brief conclusion (ver. 37).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Speak to all the congregation of the children of Israel, and

1. This remarkable chapter is perhaps the most comprehensive, the most varied, and in some respects the most important section of Leviticus, if not of the Pentateuch; it was by the ancient Jews regarded as an epitome of the whole Law; it was adapted and paraphrased by the best gnomic writers, such as Pseudo-Phocylides; and it has at all times been looked upon as a counterpart of the Decalogue itself. It includes the chief moral laws of all the earlier codes, both of Exodus and Deuteronomy, and it exhibits at a glance the height of that ethical and spiritual refinement at which the Hebrews arrived within the Biblical times. But though it is the latest in date, it was compiled independently of those earlier codes, from which it differs partly in spirit and partly in style. Its chief defect is a complete want of arrangement; for it is irregular almost to confusion, and so desultory that its practical value as a moral guide is not immaterially diminished. In this respect especially it contrasts unfavourably with the Decalogue, which, beginning with man's duties towards God, advances to his obligations towards his fellow-men, filial obedience forming the link between both, while each half rises to a climax, and both parts to a certain extent correspond with each other: thus the Decalogue is so admirably systematic in structure that its teaching was readily and universally received as the corner-stone of a righteous life.

Philological Remarks. — The chapter contains parallels to nearly every one of the ten Commandments, but in terms almost entirely original; viz. I. Existence and Unity of God, ver. 4[a] ("turn not to the idols... I am the Lord your God"); II. Against Images and Idols, ver. 4[b] ("do not make to yourselves molten gods"); III. Against Perjury, ver. 12 ("you shall not swear by My name falsely, so that thou profane the name of thy God"); IV. Holiness of the Sabbath, vers. 3, 30 ("you shall keep My Sabbaths"); V. Veneration of Parents, ver. 3 ("you shall fear every one his mother and his father"); VI. Against Murder, ver. 16 ("thou shalt not rise up against the blood of thy neighbour"); VII. Against Adultery, ver. 29 ("let not the land become unchaste — תִּזְנֶה —, so that the land become full of wickedness"; comp.

**say to them, you shall be holy, for I the Lord your God *am* holy.**

ver. 20); VIII. Against Theft, ver. 11 ("you shall not steal"); IX. Against false Witness, vers. 11, 16 ("you shall not lie one to another"; "thou shalt not go about slandering among thy people"); and though the chapter contains no exact equivalent to the tenth Commandment — against covetous desires — it has some other and even more comprehensive injunctions which include that precept (comp. ver. 18, "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"). — The promiscuous nature of the contents will be more striking if we attempt some sequence in the arrangement, like the following: — Vers. 1, 2 (introduction); $4^a$ (first Commandment), $26^b$ and 31 (against enchantment and witchcraft); $4^b$ (second Com.); 12 (third Com.); $3^b$, 30 (fourth Com.); $3^a$ (fifth Com.); 32 (reverence of old age); $16^b$ (sixth Com.); 29, 20 — 22 (seventh Com.); $11^a$, $13^a$ (eighth Com.); $11^b$, $16^a$ (ninth Com.); 17, 18 (love of the neighbour); 14 (regard for the blind and the deaf); 9 and 10 (charity towards the poor and the stranger at harvest time), 33 and 34 (affectionate treatment of the stranger generally), $13^b$ (ready payment of hire to the labourer); 15, $35^a$ (judicial justice); $35^b$, 36 (honesty and good faith in weight and measure); 27, 28 (against mutilating or disfiguring the body); $26^a$ (against eating blood); 23—25 (on the early fruit of newly planted trees); 5—8 (on thank-offerings); 19 (against mixing different kinds of seeds, threads, and animals); 37 (conclusion). — It is impossible to imagine that this miscellany of ordinances should have been written down by the same author, whether at the same or at different times; we must suppose that it was gradually collected, enlarged, and finally incorporated in Leviticus — unfortunately in a very inappropriate place, since it separates two chapters, the 18th and the 20th, which treat of the identical subject, the laws of chastity; and it thus increases the inorganic dismemberment of the Book (see Comm. on Lev. I. p. XVIII). — "This section", Jewish Rabbins teach, "was read in public, because it includes most of the fundamental precepts of the Law" (מפני שרוב גופי תורה תלויין בה), or "because the Ten Commandments are comprised in it" (מפני שעשרת הדברות כללין בתוכה, *Siphra* fol. $86^b$ ed. Schlossb.; *Midr. Rabb.* Lev. XXIV. 3). Sagacious Rabbinical expositors, partially following older traditions, have endeavoured to point out a logical connection between the various commands. A few specimens will suffice. The fruit of newly planted trees must only be eaten when a part of it has been offered on the altar; so must meat not be eaten before the blood of the animal has been sprinkled on the altar (vers. 23—26). Or, Israelites do not mourn on Sabbaths, nor High-priests when officiating in the Temple; necromancers (אובות) consult the dead, old men are physically like the dead, and strangers are helpless like old men (vers. 30—33; see *Ebn Ezra* in locc.). — No less artificial are the kindred efforts of recent theologians, such as Baumgarten (Lev. pp. 206—212), Keil, a. o. Bertheau (Gruppen, pp. 201—206) insists indeed that our chapter contains just three decads of laws, but he admits that "a fixed plan in the arrangement is not discoverable, and was impossible on account of the heterogeneous nature of the commands".

**2.** The section begins with that

3. You shall fear every man his mother and his

doctrine which may well be considered as the ripest fruit of Hebrew culture, and which raises the Hebrew creed high above the tenets of other ancient nations: — "You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy". Thus guided, man's actions flow from the noblest motive and are directed to the loftiest aim; they are almost hallowed into priestly functions, and a Divine element is infused into the common concerns of life. Such a principle necessarily leads to the highest forms of morality, and the following laws prove that this notion, abstract and subtle as it might appear, is well calculated to engender practical piety and the tenderest humanity. It is indeed introduced in other parts of the Pentateuch also; but it is usually connected with ceremonial purity; while in our chapter it is made the foundation of a moral code which is of universal application, and is therefore expressly addressed to "all the congregation of the children of Israel" (כל עדת וכ'; see *supra* pp. 106, 184; comp. XI. 44; XX. 26; Exod. XXII. 30; Deut. XIV. 2, 21; also Exod. XIX. 6; Lev. XX. 7; Deut. VII. 6; XXVI. 19; XXVIII. 9; and the illustrations in *Maim.* Mor. Nev. I. 54; III. 33, 47).

**3.** The ordinances commence with a group of *religious* laws (vers. 3—8), the first of which relates to filial obedience — "You shall fear everyone his mother and his father". Precedence is given to this command, because parents shared, in some measure, Divine honours, and children were taught to regard them as God's earthly representatives; hence in the Decalogue the same law forms a part of the First Table, which comprises man's duties towards God; and in another remarkable composition, detailing the crimes which were branded on Mount Ebal with a public malediction, it follows immediately after the prohibition of idolatry (Deut. XXVII. 16). To the observations made before on this subject (Comm. on Exod. pp. 363—366) we add here a few supplementary remarks. It might seem strange that filial disrespect on the part of Ham brought down a curse not only upon himself, but upon his descendants for ever (Gen. IX. 25); but parallels are not wanting among Eastern nations. In China, such an offence causes the utmost alarm throughout the province in which it has been committed; the relations of the culprit are punished like himself; and the Mandarin, whose magistracy has been disgraced by the misdeed, is often compelled to retire. In fact, in China "man's duties are not merely based upon, they are comprehended under filial duty"; fathers are permitted to sell the children with whose conduct they are dissatisfied; they retain their authority, not merely, as among the Hebrews and other nations, till the children's marriage, but during their whole lifetime; and they can at pleasure compel their sons to marry certain women or to divorce them. Among the Hindoos, parents may still sell their children to strangers; and heavy penalties are imposed upon the person who comes forward as witness or as bail in a law-suit between father and son (*Yâjnav.* II. 239). In Greece, the father had the right to decide upon the life or death of his child within six days of its birth, though Solon and other legislators considerably limited the privileges of parents for the protection of the children. The Roman law of the Twelve Tables gave to the father

father; and you shall keep My Sabbaths: I *am* the Lord your God.

unrestricted power over the life and property of their children — "patri familias jus vitae et necis in liberos esto"; and "quicquid filius acquirit, patri acquirit" —; and children were expected to accord almost Divine honours to their departed parents: "When I am dead", wrote Cornelia to her son Gracchus, "thou wilt sacrifice to me and invoke thy goddess-mother" (*Corn. Nep.* Fragm.). There was a terrible earnestness in the warning that men should "fear" (תִּירָאוּ) their parents; for a previous command incorporated in Deuteronomy (XXI. 18—21) ordained, that if parents had vainly endeavoured to bring a rebellious son back to his duty, they were to take him by force before the elders of the people, and their simple declaration that he had been heedless of their admonitions sufficed to bring down upon him the death of lapidation by the whole community: the Chinese tribunals also require in such cases no proof, but condemn the child on the father's statement; and among the Parsees, a son who has three times shown disobedience to his father, forfeits his life (*Spiegel*, Avesta, II. p. XXXII; *Du Halde*, Chine, III. 155). That fathers were entirely at liberty to act with their children as they pleased, may be gathered from the history of Abraham and Jephthah; and even at so late a time as that of Nehemiah—or about the period when our chapter was compiled—they were entitled to sell them as slaves, or to mortgage them for their debts (Nehem. V. 5; comp. Exod. XXI. 7; Num. XXX. 6; 2 Ki. IV. 1; Isai. L. 1; Matth. XVIII. 25; see also the beautiful remarks of Plato on filial affection in his "Laws" IV. 8; *Heliod.* Aeth. I. 13; *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 23; *Priaulx*, Quaestiones Mosaicae, pp. 232—236).

The injunction of filial obedience is, as in the Decalogue, strangely coupled with the command to keep God's holy days; but here the "Sabbath" of the Decalogue is changed into "the Sabbaths" (שַׁבְּתֹתַי); for now the system of Hebrew festivals was completely developed — the agricultural, the historical, and penitential —, and they had become the most effectual means of cementing the new commonwealth and of permanently securing to it a specific and national character (see *supra*, pp. 266 *sqq.*; comp. ver. 39). Phocylides, in his didactic poem, thus joins the two precepts: πρῶτα θεὸν τίμα, μετέπειτα δὲ σεῖο γονέας (ver. 8).

The verse concludes, "I am the Lord your God" — which words point to God at once as the Holy One and as the Judge; they are meant both to encourage and to awe, both to exhort the Hebrews to vigilance, and to menace them with punishment. They occur frequently in this chapter, of which they are characteristic; but they have not always the same powerful emphasis.

Philological Remarks. — Jewish expositors deem it necessary to explain why in our passage the first place is given to the mother, and in the fifth Commandment to the father, and they offer this reason that, as a rule, children fear the father, but love the mother more particularly; they contend that fearing parents means, not to sit or to stand in the place set apart for them, not to speak in their stead, and not to contradict them; and that honouring parents consists in providing for them food, drink, and raiment, and in accompanying

4. Turn not to the idols, nor make to yourselves molten gods: I *am* the Lord your God.

5. And if you offer a thank-offering to the Lord, you shall offer it for your acceptance.
6. It shall be eaten the *same* day you offer *it*, and on the morrow; and that which remains until the third day shall be burnt in the fire.
7. And if it yet be eaten on the third day, it *is* an abomination, it shall not be accepted;
8. And *every one* that eats it shall bear his iniquity, because

them home and from home (comp. *Talm.* Kethuv. 103[a]; Kiddush. 31[b], 32[b]; *Siphra* fol. 87[a]; *Mechilta* fol. 77 ed. Weiss; *Yoreh Deah* § 240); and they account for the double command of our verse by paraphrasing it thus: "Although I warn thee to fear thy father, yet if he should order thee to profane the Sabbath, thou must not listen to him" (comp. *Talm.* Bab. Mets. 32[a]; *Siphra* l. c.).—Though the plural שַׁבְּתֹתַי is in Exod. XXXI. 13 undoubtedly employed in the sense of "Sabbath", it seems in our passage to signify "Days of rest", or festivals in general.

**4.** The preceding verse corresponds with the fourth and fifth, this verse with the first and second Commandments, and the combination is quite logical: God is one and all-powerful, and God is incorporeal; it is therefore as sinful and perverse to worship many deities, all of whom are "non-entities" (אֱלִילִים), as it is to represent them by images and molten figures; the latter crime is more explicitly denounced among the maledictions of Mount Ebal: "Cursed be the man that makes any graven or molten image, an abomination to the Lord, the work of the hands of the artificer, and puts it in a secret place: and all the people shall answer and say, Amen" (Deut. XXVII. 15; comp. Exod. XXXIV. 17; see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 397 *sqq.*; also *Talm.* Shabb. 149[a]; *Maimon.* Avod. Zar. II., III.; *Yor. Deah* § 141).

**5—8.** Now follows, abruptly, a law concerning thank-offerings (זבח שלמים), which seems to have been derived from some older document, since it is less stringent than a similar ordinance embodied in Leviticus (VII. 15—18); it disregards, or is unacquainted with, the division of that class of sacrifice in praise-offerings (זבח תודה) and the less holy vow and voluntary offerings (נדר או נדבה); and it uniformly permits the flesh to be eaten both on the day of the sacrifice and on the following day, whereas the more rigorous law restricts the time for the consumption of praise-offerings to the day of the sacrifice itself, under penalty of excision. This subject, and the probable reasons of this severe law, which was not merely directed against the eating of "old and putrid meat", but was prompted by the idea of the holiness of sacrifice, have been discussed in another place (Comm. on Lev. I. 40, 211, 245—248, 547—551; see *infra* XXII. 21—23).

Philological Remarks. — On לִרְצֹנְכֶם *for your acceptance* (ver. 5), that is, so that the offering be favourably received by God, see notes on I. 3, Comm. on Lev. I. 475 (Rashi explains here and in XXII. 19 אפיי"נ"ט or אפייזמנ"ט *apaisement*, for atonement, which sense is too specific; and Ebn

he has profaned the hallowed thing of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from among his people.

9. And when you reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, nor shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest. 10. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, nor shalt thou gather the scattered *grapes* of thy vineyard; thou shalt

Ezra, strangely, of your own free will, not by compulsion); and on הֵאָכֹל יֵאָכֵל and פִּגּוּל (ver. 7), see notes on VII. 18, Comm. on Lev. I. 550, 551. In VII. 18 the Sept. translates פגול הוא literally by μίασμά ἐστιν, but in our passage ἄθυτόν ἐσ.ιν "it ought not to be offered up", that is, probably, if it is the intention of the worshipper to eat the flesh on the third day, the victim ought not to be sacrificed, which is in accordance with the Jewish acceptation of the words האכל יאכל (see Comm. on Lev. l.c.; *Frankel*, Vorstudien zur Septuag. p. 190). The Vulgate, questionably referring פגול to the worshippers, translates profanus erit, and so Luther, so ist er ein Gräuel. — On the distributive singular in עֲוֹנוֹ and יִשָּׂא after the plural in וְאֹכְלָיו (ver. 8) "and those who eat of it — he shall bear his iniquity", i. e., everyone who eats of it, see Gramm. § 77. 9; comp. Exod. XXXI. 14 (מחלליה מות יומת); etc.

**9, 10.** The next command refers to what may be called the legal rights of the indigent, which were precisely defined by Hebrew legislators, and which, withdrawn from the arbitrariness of individuals, were controlled by the community. Thus they passed from the purely ethical to the civil and penal sphere. And this was both their excellence and their weakness; they effectually provided for the poor, and prevented abject and helpless beggary; but by restricting spontaneity and personal goodwill, and by imposing as a compulsory duty what is a double blessing only when exercised freely and generously, they converted charity into a poor-rate, analogous to that by which modern communities have found it necessary to protect the helpless. Yet being partly moral and partly political, they must be considered practical in the highest sense (see Comm. on Exod. pp. 428—435).

Our verses seem to be a thoughtful extension of former enactments; they include both the produce of corn-fields and of fruit-trees, and they apply alike to the stranger and the poor, the orphan and the widow (comp. XXIII. 22; Deut. XXIV. 19—22); but they derive also light from those earlier provisions; the general injunction, "Thou shalt not gather the gleanings of thy harvest", is elsewhere explained, "When thou hast forgotten a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go back to fetch it"; and we find there this reason adduced, "For thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt; therefore I command thee to do this thing" (Deut. l. c.) — which pathetic appeal to the painful experience of the past is in another part of our chapter also employed for exhorting the Hebrews to kindness and hospitality (ver. 34; comp. Exod. XXIII. 9; Deut. XV. 15; see also Lev. XXV. 5, 6, 35; Deut. XIV. 28, 29; XVI. 11, 12; *Phocylid.* vers. 22—30). In the Mishnah, the extent of the "corner" (פֵּאָה) to be left for the poor is enumerated among those things which,

**leave them for the poor and for the stranger: I *am* the Lord your God.**

like charity, filial duty, and the study of the Law, "have no limit" or "fixed measure" (שיעור); but it is never to be less than the sixtieth part of the field, and the size of the property and the number of the local poor are always to be taken into account. The law applies to such edible produce of cultivated land, which is gathered in at the same time, and is preserved or garnered up, especially to all kinds of grains and legumes, to fruit-trees, such as the vine, the olive-, the nut-, the almond-, the pomegranate-, and the palm-tree; and some other plants, as onions and garlick. In addition to this, the most minute instructions are given with reference to every conceivable contingency that may arise in connection with this precept; one specimen may suffice: "What is gleaning? (לֶקֶט). If a person, in cutting off or tearing out a handful of ears, is pricked by a thorn, and thus lets the stalks fall to the ground, they are not considered as gleaning, and belong to the proprietor of the field. Again, that which falls from the hand and from the sickle is left to the poor; but that which falls behind the hand and behind the sickle, belongs to the proprietor. That which falls before the extreme point of the hand and before the extreme point of the sickle, is, according to Rabbi Ishmael, given to the poor, but can, according to Rabbi Akivah, be claimed by the proprietor" (*Mishn.* Peah IV. 10; comp. I. 1 *sqq.*; *Talm.* Bab. Kam. 94; Macc. 16[b]; *Maimon.* מתנות עניים c. I; *Yor. Deah* § 332). — In heathen times, it was customary among the German husbandmen, when cutting their corn, to leave on the field a heap of sheaves, adorned with ribbons, as an offering to the gods (comp. *Grimm*, Deutsche Mythologie, p. 32).

Philological Remarks. — קְצִרְכֶם for קֻצְרְכֶם, comp. XXIII. 22; see Gramm. § LIV. 1[a]. Irregular combinations of the singular and plural, as in וּבְקֻצְרְכֶם and תְכַלֶּה, are in Hebrew a frequent form of anallage (comp. vers. 12, 15, 26, 33; esp. XX. 19 and notes in loc.; see Gramm. § LXXVII. 21. 2). The construction לֹא תְכַלֶּה····לִקְצֹר lit. "thou shalt not complete....in reaping", that is, thou shalt not wholly reap, the finite verb having adverbial force, is not unusual (see Gramm. § 103. 1), but has been misunderstood by some interpreters, as St. Jerome, who renders non tondebis usque ad solum superficiem terrae; and similarly in XXIII. 22, non secabitis usque ad solum; Luther, ihr sollt es nicht gar auf dem Felde einschneiden, etc. In Deuteronomy (XXIV. 20) the command is expressly applied to olive-plantations (זיתך), which may be included in the term כֶּרֶם used in our passage (comp. Judg. XV. 5, כרם זית). — פֶּרֶט from פָּרַט, kindred with פרש, פרץ, and פזר, *to scatter*, is properly "the scattering", hence פֶּרֶט כַּרְמְךָ is "the scattering of thy vineyard", that is, the grapes which after the regular vintage lie about on the ground scattered; and this sense is even more appropriate for "beating off" the fruit of the olive trees (Deut. XXIV. 20, כי תחבט זיתך); Onk., Jonath., and Syr., וְנִתְרָא דְכַרְמָךְ that which has fallen off from thy vineyard (comp. *Mishn.* Peah IV. 10; VII. 3, איזהו פרט הנושר בשעת הבצירה, and איזהו לקט הנושר בשעת הקצירה; *Talm.* Bets. 2[b]); Vulg. racemos et grana decidentia; Sept. simply τὰς ῥῶγας.

11. You shall not steal, nor deal falsely, nor lie one to another.

12. And you shall not swear by My name falsely, so that thou profane the name of thy God: I *am* the Lord.

**11.** Theft has before been tre ate from various points of view — as a moral transgression in the Decalogue, as a penal offence in the "Book of the Covenant" (Exod. XXI. 37—XXII. 3), and as a theocratic trespass in the sacrificial codes of Leviticus (V. 21 *sqq.*): on reference to the remarks made on those passages, it will be seen how the laws on the violation of the rights of property gradually became more defined, and were surrounded with greater religious solemnity (Comm. on Exod. pp. 372, 413—417; on Levit. pp. 517—525). In our context the command "You shall not steal" is simply a moral warning, as nearly all the injunctions of this section. Hebrew teachers extended it to receiving and purchasing goods that are known, or may be presumed, to have been stolen (comp. Prov. XXIX. 24; *Mishn.* Bab. Kam. VII. 1 *sqq.*; *Talm.* Bab. Kam. 118; Sanh. 87; *Maimon.* Hilch. Genev. c. I.; *Chosh. Mishp.* § 348).

It was certainly not superfluous to enforce truthfulness, for which quality Eastern nations are not conspicuous: a remarkable exception were the ancient Persians, among whom, as we know from various sources, lying was considered the most disgraceful misdemeanour, and next to it contracting debts, because this easily leads men to tell untruths (comp. *Herod.* I. 91; *Spiegel*, Avesta, I. p. 91; II. p. CXVI.); we can, therefore, well understand why our section, finally revised in the Persian period, lays such stress on the duty of veracity, and impresses it upon the Hebrews in many different forms (comp. vers. 16, 35, 36; also Isai. LXIII. 8).

Philological Remarks. — The words ולא תשקרו וכו' are by Jewish tradition referred to defalcations of trusts and deposits, and they have been similarly rendered by Phocylides (ver. 13) — Παρθεσίην ψευδῆ φεύγειν, τὰ δίκαια βραβεύειν (for so, it seems, the first word must read, instead of παρθενίην, virginity; comp. *Talm.* Shevuoth 36[b]; *Maim.* Hilch. Shevuoth I. 7; *Heilpern*, Mitsv. Hash. p. 36).

**12.** Perjury, the worst and most detestable form of falsehood, follows not illogically upon the preceding command, to which it is indeed closely joined (וְלֹא); as an iniquitous profanation of the Divine name, it was forbidden in the first part of the Decalogue, and menaced with the direct punishment of heaven (see Comm. on Exod. pp. 352—355); we will only remind the reader in this place of the extreme reluctance felt by the Persians to any oath whatsoever, and their deep abhorrence of false oaths, since "the speech of a pure man should only be yes and no" (comp. *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. p. LVI). Phocylides also expresses our verse with great emphasis (Μὴ δ' ἐπιορκήσῃς μήτ' ἀγνὼς μήτ' εἰκαῖος· ψεύδορκον στυγέει θεὸς ἄμβροτος ὅστις ὀμόσσῃ); and Jewish tradition applies it especially to heedless oaths (שבועת בטוי; comp. *Mishn.* Shevuoth III. 9 *sqq.*; *Maimon* Hilch. Shev. I. 1—6; *Yoreh Deah* § 236).

13. Thou shalt not oppress thy neighbour, nor shalt thou rob him.

Thou shalt not keep with thee over night the wages of the hireling until the morning.

14. Thou shalt not curse the deaf, nor put a stumblingblock before the blind; and thou shalt fear thy God: I *am* the Lord.

**13.** As theft and fraud are abominations, so are oppression and violence which, according to a levitical author, must be expiated by increased restitution of the property and a trespass-offering (comp. V. 21).

With the general injunction of honesty and fairness, a humane law is coupled which suggested itself to the Hebrews long before; for it is also found in Deuteronomy, where it is enforced not only more fully but more solemnly: — "Thou shalt not oppress a hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren, or of thy strangers that are in thy land within thy gates; on his day thou shalt give him his hire, and the sun shall not go down upon it; for he is poor, and he longs for it, lest he cry against thee to the Lord, and it be sin to thee" (Deut. XXIV. 14, 15). The admonition, thus repeatedly and strongly impressed, seems, at least in later times, to have been heeded (comp. Matth. XX. 8), and is indeed recommended by every consideration of expediency, justice, and kindness (comp. also Prov. III. 28; Jerem. XXII. 13; Mal. III. 5; *Philo*, De Humanit. c. 7). In the reproduction of this command, Phocylides is less happy and faithful than usual (ver. 19, Μίσθον μοχθήσαντι δίδου· μὴ θλίβε πένητα); but Rabbinical teachers, always eager to render the laws of charity most effectual, interpreted it in the most generous spirit, and declared that "he who treats a hireling with harshness sins as grievously as if he were taking away his life, and violates many laws" (comp. *Talm*. Bab. Mets. $110^b$—$113^a$; *Maim*. Hilch. Sechiroth XI; *Choshen Mishp*. §§ 89, 339).

**14.** Persons stricken with some defect which renders them helpless, stand under God's special protection; it would be heartless and impious to "curse the deaf", who is unaware of the attacks made upon him, which may involve calumnies, and which he is unable to rebut (comp. Ps. XXXVIII. 14, 15); and it would be cruel indeed to "put a stumbling block before the blind", to whom every right-minded man should be eager to "serve as eyes" (Job XXIX. 15); a crime like the latter was publicly cursed on Mount Ebal (Deut. XXVII. 18); and in both cases the Law warns the offender, "Thou shalt fear thy God", who hears if there is no other ear to listen, who sees if there is no other eye to see, and who, to punish thy wickedness, can strike thee with the same afflictions (comp. Exod. IV. 11): hence the same menace, "Thou shalt fear thy God", is repeated with respect to the treatment of old and infirm men, of poor persons, of dependents, and servants (ver. 32; XXV. 17, 36, 43). Philo inveighs vehemently against the inhumanity here forbidden, and observes that those who are guilty of it, "would not spare even the dead, in the excess of their cruelty, but according to a common proverb, would slay the slain again" (De Justit. II. 10). Jewish tradition

**15. You shall do no unrighteousness in judgment; thou shalt not favour the person of the poor, nor countenance the person of the powerful; in justice shalt thou judge thy neighbour.**

**16. Thou shalt not go about slandering among thy**

applies the second command of our verse figuratively to insidious advice or false information given to a man who is in ignorance or perplexity, whether on some question of learning or on some matter of business (comp. *Talm.* Avod. Zar. 15[b]; *Maim.* Hilch. Rotseach, XII; *Heilpern* l. c. p. 37). The law of Manu inflicts a pecuniary fine upon any one who taunts a person with being one-eyed or lame or deformed (*Manu* VIII. 274).

**15.** In a series of precepts enjoining tenderness and commiseration, it was doubly necessary to insist upon the strictest and most rigid justice, the main pillar of society and of national life; it was especially necessary to warn the judges against ill-advised leniency towards humbler offenders; the feeling of charity was not to confound the notions of right and wrong, and private benevolence was not to pervert public morality. How great and remarkable must have been the refinement of the legislator who deemed it his duty to check the impulses of charity, because he feared it might disturb the balance of reason and justice, and thus become mischievous and dangerous! The command "Thou shalt not favour the person of the poor in his cause", coupled as it is with the command, "Thou shalt not countenance the person of the powerful", bespeaks an age of no ordinary culture, and a writer of uncommon clearness and harmony of mind (comp. ver. 35; Exod. XXIII. 2, 3, 6—8; Deut. I. 16, 17; XVI. 18—20; Comm. on Exod. pp. 442—444). Phocylides admonishes the judges not to be oppressive to the poor, but he fails to reproduce the more characteristic command not to be partial to them, a command which is found in no other legislation (vers. 10, 11, Μὴ θλίψῃς πενίην, ἀδίκως μὴ κρῖνε πρόσωπον, κτλ.); whereas Jewish tradition perfectly understood and well developed its spirit (comp. *Talm.* Chull. 134[a]; *Maimon.* Hilch. Sanhedr. I; *Choshen Mishp.* §. 17; see also *Hottinger*, Jur. Hebr. Legg. pp. 319—321).

**16.** It is not improbable that this verse also refers to duties connected with the administration of justice, although both the first and the second part may have a wider scope: it may relate to slander uttered in private and in law-courts, and it may allude to secret plotting as well as to bearing false witness in public; it denounces, therefore, like so many previous ordinances, insidious defamation and false testimony in whatever form, because calumny tends to imperil the honour and the interests, and it may be the lives, of innocent fellow-men (comp. Exod. XXIII. 1, 7; Deut. XIX. 16 *sqq.*). Horace recommends (Epist. I. XVIII. 68—70): "Quid de quoque viro, et cui dicas saepe videto; Percontatorem fugito; nam garrulus idem est; Nec reticent patulae commissa fideliter aures". The Rabbins are particularly severe with regard to the offence of calumny; this, they declare, devastates the world; three sins remove man from this world, and deprive him of happiness in the next — idolatry, incest, and murder; but slander outweighs

**people; thou shalt not rise up against the blood of thy neighbour: I *am* the Lord.**

them all; it is like denying the foundations of faith; it kills three persons at a blow — the slanderer, the slandered, and the listener; and therefore the Targum of Jonathan thus paraphrases our passage, "Do not follow the thrice-cursed tongue, for it is more fatal than the double-edged and devouring sword" (comp. *Talm.* Kethuv. $46^a$; Sot. 15, 42; Kiddush. 70; Sanhedr. $31^a$, $103^a$; Avod. Zar. 18; Erach. $16^b$; *Maimon.* Hilch. Deoth c. VII; *Heilpern*, l. c. p. 38). The Hindoo law has a series of very severe provisions with respect to backbiting and defamation, graduating the fines and penalties in accordance with the position of the offender and the offended, whether they be priests, soldiers or merchants, artisans or servants: if a servant, who is only "once-born", commits the offence against a "twice-born", his "tongue shall be cut asunder, because he has been generated from the meanest part of Brahma"; if he insults a priest, "a red-hot iron rod, ten digits long, shall be put into his mouth", or "boiling oil shall be instilled into his mouth and ears". It teaches also, "The guilt of him who falsely accuses another, is twice as great as the guilt of one who divulges a crime that has actually been committed; the calumniator has to bear the punishment of the calumniated; and to purify himself, he must for a month remain in seclusion, repeat prayers in silence, and subdue his passions" (*Manu* VIII. 267—277; *Yâjnav.* II. 204—207, 210, 211, 234, 285—287). According to Jewish tradition, the second half of our verse intimates that, if we see any one in danger, we ought to try to save him, whether from drowning or from attacks of robbers and wild beasts; and that a man who happens to witness a crime or injustice, is bound to come to the rescue of the attacked, either by personal assistance or by bearing testimony before the judges; and the same sense is expressed by Phocylides (ver. 21, Μήτ' ἀδικεῖν ἐθέλοις, μήτ' οὖν ἀδικοῦντα ἐάσῃς; comp. *Targ. Jon.* in loc.; *Talm.* Sanh. $74^a$; *Maim.* Hilch. Rotseach I; *Choshen Mishp.* § 426).

Philological Remarks.—The noun רָכִיל (from רכל, kindred with רגל to go about, to traffic, whence רֹכֵל merchant) is properly *walking about*, then doing so without a legitimate object, or *tale-bearing* (according to Rashi for *espionage* אשפיינמנ"ט; comp. רגל to espy, to explore); and הלך רכיל is *to move about slandering*, רכיל being joined to the verb in the absolute case (similarly הלך קֶרִי XXVI. 21, 23, lit. to go in a hostile encounter, that is, to act inimically, like הלך בְּקֶרִי XXVI. 24, 27, etc.; see Gramm. § 86.4.c); אנשי רכיל is, therefore, *slanderers* (Ezek. XXII. 9; comp. Prov. XI. 13; XX. 19); and this term proves that רָכִיל is indeed *tale-bearing*, and not, as some suppose, *tale-bearer* (so f. i. *Ewald*, Gr. §§ $149^e$, $279^c$). Onk. has forcibly לא תיכול קוּרְצִין "thou shalt not indulge in slander" (lit. thou shalt not consume pieces, as in the French jargon to denounce is manger le morceau; comp. Dan. III. 8; VI. 25; *Talm.* Berach. $58^a$); Sept. not quite accurately, οὐ πορεύσῃ δόλῳ; Vulg. explicitly non eris criminator nec susurro; Luther correctly as to the sense, Du sollst kein Verläumder sein; Jewish interpreters, starting from the root קרץ used by Onkelos, explain, "thou shalt not make damnatory insinuations by winking with

17. Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart; thou shalt surely rebuke thy neighbour, so that thou bear not sin on his account.

18. Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge

thy eyes" (comp. Prov. VI. 13; X. 10). לא תעמד על דם רעך is literally, "thou shalt not rise up against the blood of thy neighbour", that is, thou shalt not scheme against his life, whether by cunning or violence, by speech or deed (comp. Dan. VIII. 25; XI. 14).

**17.** We hardly know whether to admire more the practical wisdom of the next injunction or its exalted morality: the faults of others should not engender in our hearts an unconquerable aversion; we should, on the contrary endeavour so to work upon the sinners by generous admonition, that they may become worthy of our friendship; for it is equally wrong to feel hatred, and to withhold correction. "Open rebuke is better than secret love", says a Hebrew Proverb (XXVII. 5); Christ enjoined upon his disciples, "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother"; and he advised, if this remonstrance should prove ineffectual, to repeat it before one or two witnesses, and if necessary before the whole congregation (Matth. XVIII. 15—17); and the Rabbins declared that a man who does not reprove an offender when it is in his power to do so, shares his sin; yet he must take heed not to humble him before others, "it would be better for him to throw himself into a burning furnace", and "those who do so have no share in a future life"; an exception, however, is permitted when matters of faith are concerned, or when impostors must be unmasked in the interest of public virtue (comp. *Mishn.* Av. III. 11, *Talm.* Berach. 31[b], 43[b]; Shabb. 54[b]; 56[b]; Yom. 86[b]; Kethuv. 67[b]; Sot. 10[b]; Bab. Mets. 31[a], 58s, 59[a]; *Maim.* Hilch. Deoth VI, VII; *Hottinger*, Jur. Hebr. Legg. pp. 321—323).

Philological Remarks. — The Vulgate, in rendering הוכח תוכיח *publice argue eum*, adds a notion which is probably not intended in the text. — The words לא תשא עליו חטא mean no doubt, "thou shalt not bear sin on his account" (comp. XXII. 9; Num. XVIII. 32; see Comm. on Lev. I. 514), and not "thou shalt not suffer sin upon him" (Engl. Vers., Marg. Read. however, "that you bear not sin for him"); על signifies not unfrequently "for the sake of" (Ps. XLIV. 23; LXIX. 8; etc.; Gramm. § 105. 5).

**18.** . "Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself": this noble precept has long been recognised as the fairest flower of Hebrew ethics, and as the essence of the religion taught in the Hebrew Scriptures. It was by Christ declared to be, next to loving God with all our power, the great commandment upon which hang all the Law and the prophets (Matth. XXII. 39; comp. XIX. 19; Mark XII. 31; Luke X. 27); St. Paul called it "the very fulfilling of the Law" (Rom. XIII. 8—10; Gal. V. 14; comp. Col. III. 12—14; 1 Tim. I. 5), and others the "royal command" (βασιλικὸς νόμος, James II. 8). It was by Jewish sages, as Hillel, Rabbi Akiva, and Ben Soma, expressed in the negative injunction, "What thou dost not wish that others should do

**against the children of thy people; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I *am* the Lord.**

to thee, that do not thou to others; this is the whole Law, the rest is only its interpretation; now go and learn" (דעלך סני לחברך לא תעביד וכ'; *Talm.* Shabb. 31[a]; *Talm. Jer.* Nedar. IX; see *supra* p. 117); and this was by Christ repeated in the positive form, "All things whatever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them; for this is the Law and the prophets" (Matth. VII. 12; Luke VI. 31). It was by later Rabbins variously applied and developed. When God had created the world, they allegorised, it rocked, unstable, to and fro, and could not find its equipoise; He took love and made it the foundation of the universe, which then at once stood firm, and grew into order and beauty (*Yalk. Shim.* Ps. § 702).—It cannot be supposed that principles of such loftiness as those set forth in our verse gained ground at a very early stage of Hebrew history; the Greeks and other ancient nations considered it the most enviable lot "to be able to be useful to one's friends and to do harm to one's enemy"; and the Jews probably adhered for a long time to similar views; at least Saul is reported to have said, "If a man find his enemy, will he let him go well away?" (1 Sam. XXIV. 20); and generous conduct like that of David was regarded as most remarkable, and was praised as exceptional (comp. Ps. XLI. 5 *sqq.*, etc.). But gradually purer notions took root; already "the Book of the Covenant" in Exodus enjoins the utmost consideration towards an enemy's beast, which is to be restored to him if it goes astray, and whose burdens are to be lightened if found to be above its strength (Exod. XXIII. 4, 5); and similar provisions, though more general in form, are made by the Deuteronomist (Deut. XXII. 1, 4). With regard to the enemy himself, a proverb in the collection prepared in king Hezekiah's reign, prescribes, "If thy enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink; for thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the Lord shall reward thee" (Prov. XXV. 21, 22); and another proverb inculcates the lesson; "Rejoice not when thy enemy falls, and let not thy heart be glad when he stumbles; lest the Lord see it, and it displease Him, and He turn His wrath from him" (Prov. XXIV. 17, 18). We have, therefore, no reason to doubt that in the command of our verse, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself", the term "neighbour" comprises both kinsmen and strangers, both Israelites and non-Israelites; indeed that same command is in a later portion of this chapter expressly repeated with respect to the stranger (ver. 34); and it is unwarranted to infer, by an assumed rule of the contrary, that "thou shalt love thy neighbour, but hate thy enemy", as we read in the Sermon on the Mount (Matth. V. 43; see *supra* p. 119). National animosity engendered indeed among the Hebrews, as it did almost everywhere else, hatred and implacable bitterness, and gave rise to sentiments like the following uttered against the Ammonites and the Moabites, "Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days for ever" (Deut. XXIII. 7); but national animosity is no test of individual morality, and however fierce, it is compatible with the tenderest feeling (comp. Ps. CXXXVII).

Nor should we be justified in asserting, that the difference between native and stranger was ever effaced among the Hebrews; it was upheld with decision and consistency by the Deuteronomist; and it was insisted upon, even with some harshness, by one as noble-minded and as generous as Philo. The former ordained, that money might be lent on usury to a stranger, but not to an Israelite; that in the Sabbatical year a loan might be exacted from a foreigner, while it should be remitted to a Hebrew debtor; and that a Hebrew, but not a heathen servant might claim freedom after six years of service (Deut. XV. 3, 12; XXIII. 21; comp. Exod. XXI. 2). And Philo observes: "The Hebrews called their fellow countrymen, with great felicity of expression, their brothers; but those who were not their fellow countrymen, were called strangers, as is very natural, for the fact of being a stranger shows, that a person has no right to a participation in anything, unless, indeed, anyone out of an excess of virtue should treat even strangers as kindred and related" (*Philo,* De Septen. 8, 9, 16; but see *infra* p. 436). However, the differences referred to, though affecting important social rights, do not seem to have caused oppression or humiliation. The Talmud, partially compiled in times when the Jews suffered cruel persecution, and when moral degeneracy prevailed in the Roman world, has indeed some intolerant maxims such as this: "You Hebrews are called men, but the idolatrous nations are not called men" (Yevam. 61ª; Bab. Mets. 114ᵇ), which distinction was applied to defilement by a corpse (comp. *supra* p. 111). But the Talmud has also sentiments of a very different nature; f. i. "A non-Jew who studies the Law is like the High-priest" (Bab. Kam. 38ª); or "The good men of all the nations of the earth have a share in the happiness of the future world" (Sanh. 105ª; comp. Acts X. 34, 35); or "Feed alike the Jewish and the gentile poor, nurse alike the Jewish and the gentile sick, and bury together the Jewish and the gentile dead, for the sake of peace" (Gitt. 61ª). It declares, that interest on money ought not to be taken even from a gentile (Macc. 24ª); and we find this noteworthy utterance: "'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' — Rabbi Akiva said, This is a most important principle of the Law; but Ben Azai contended, that the words, 'This is the book of the generations of men' (Gen. V. 1), which declare the equality of all human beings, because all alike bear the image of their common Father, involve a principle even more momentous than the former" (*Talm. Jer.* Nedar. IX; *Siphra* fol. 89ª ed. Schlossb.; comp. also *Mishn.* Avoth III. 14, חביב אדם שנברא בצלם).

Jewish sages explained, that "avenging" (נקם) means returning evil for evil; while "bearing grudge" (נטר) implies remembering an offence received, though good be returned for evil; they held, that it is not permitted to "hate" any one except only sinners who, having been duly warned and admonished, do not repent, but persevere in their evil ways; and they ordained that, if a man finds both a friend and an enemy in distress, he should first assist his enemy, "in order to subdue his evil inclination" (כדי לכוף את יצרו; comp. *Talm.* Yom. 23ª; Bab. Mets. 32ᵇ; Erach. 16ᵇ; etc.).

It might perhaps be possible to propound a rule more ideal and one involving greater self-abnegation than the maxims, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself", or "Do to others as you would that others should do to you", which adages, making

19. You shall keep My statutes: thou shalt not

self-love the basis and guiding principle of our actions, do not seem to aid us materially in the attainment of the supreme object of all moral training, the subjugation of self; yet they appear to be the highest that can be expected from human nature, and are therefore the most expedient and the most practical, provided that constant and strenuous care be taken that they do not result in cold justice devoid of mercy and generosity: for man cannot carry his sacrifices for others to the point of utterly forgetting his own interests, without finally endangering his dignity, if not his usefulness. "Owe no man anything but to lòve one another", explains St. Paul (Rom. XIII. 8). Nor do modern moralists condemn or undervalue self-love as a motive power of our actions —

"Two principles in human nature reign;
"Self-love, to urge, and Reason, to restrain;
"Nor this a good, nor that a bad we call,
"Each works its end, to move or govern all".

(*Pope*, Essay on Man, II. 2.)

Other nations were not unacquainted with precepts analogous to those here enjoined. The Spartans commonly prayed to the gods to make them bear injuries with meekness (*Plut.* Instt. Lacon. c. 26). A Hindoo code declares: "Virtue is not in a hermit's life; it appears only when it is practised; therefore men must not do to others what is disagreeable to themselves" (*Yâjnav.* III. 65). Confucius writes: "Do to another what you would he should do to you; and do not to another what you would not like to be done to you". Aristotle remarks: "We should behave towards our neighbours, as we would wish them to behave towards us". Cicero dwells upon the idea that "when a wise man has displayed benevolence, which is so widely diffused, towards one who is endowed with equal virtue, then that effect is produced which might appear incredible to some people, ... that he loves himself not more than he loves his friend", and he adds, that this would be the general rule among men, if they remained true to nature in its genuine purity (De Legg. I. 12 or 34; comp. De Offic. I. 11 or 33). And Seneca advised, "Live for another as you would live for yourself".

Philological Remarks.—It is true, that the terms אָח and נָכְרִי are occasionally placed in clear juxtaposition to denote "Israelite" and "foreigner" (Deut. XV. 3; XXIII. 21); but it is at least doubtful whether in our verse רֵעֲךָ is intended to be understood as a synonym of בְּנֵי עַמֶּךָ, and to mean also *Israelite* (comp. *Talm.* Bab. Kam. 38, כמה נפסך אי ריעהו דוקא ··· ואי ריעהו לאו דוקא וכ'). As a parallel to our verse and several preceding commands, may be quoted a passage of Zechariah (VIII. 16, 17) written at about the same period as our chapter: "These are the things that you shall do, Speak every man the truth to his neighbour; execute the judgment of truth and peace in your gates; and let none of you imagine evil in your hearts against his neighbour; and love no false oath: for all these are things that I hate, says the Lord".

**19.** We believe that the reason of the strange laws enacted in this verse is implied in the very words with which they are prefaced, — "You shall keep My statutes" (חֻקֹּתַי); but then the Hebrew term usually

let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind; thou shalt not sow

rendered "statute" must be taken in its original and most pregnant sense as that which is "engraven" and unalterably ordained: you shall not deviate from the appointed order of things, nor abandon the eternal laws of nature as fixed by Divine wisdom; for all things and living creatures, as they came perfect from the Creator's hand, were pronounced by Him to be "very good"; and every animal and plant was decreed to produce other animals and plants "after their own kind" (Gen. I. 11, 12, 21, etc.). These ideas were, by the Deuteronomist, worked out even more fully than in our passage; for though omitting the command with regard to the beasts, he declared it to be an abomination to the Lord, if a man wears garments of a woman, or a woman garments of a man, which Philo calls "adulteration of the coinage of nature" (De Sacrif. c. 13); he enacted that the produce of vineyards growing between corn "becomes holy" (תקדש), or as Jewish tradition explains it, must be "burnt" (תוקד אש; see notes in loc.); and he forbade ploughing with an ox and an ass together (Deut. XXII. 5, 9—11), "lest the weaker animal, being compelled to exert itself to keep up with the superior power of the other, should become exhausted, and sink under the effort" (*Philo*, De Justit. II. 11); and the same notions were by the later Rabbins thus allegorically expressed with reference to our law: "There is nothing in the world, not even the smallest herb, over which an angel is not appointed as guardian, according to whose command everything is ruled; therefore it is unlawful to mix together different sorts and species, for thus the supreme government of things would be confounded" (כי היא מבלבל פמליא של מעלה; *Yalkut Chadash* 147. 4; *Eisenmenger*, Entd. Judenth. II. 376). Our laws were, therefore, hardly prompted by expediency; and yet many such motives have been assigned for them from early down to recent times. It was supposed that mixing the breeds of animals was forbidden "from fear that this unnatural abuse might extend from beasts of different kinds to men" (*Joseph.* Antiq. IV. viii. 20; *Philo*, Specc. Legg. III. 8; a. o.); or as an indirect hint to the Hebrews to avoid intermarrying with foreigners (*Philo*, De Justit. II. 11; Cleric., Winer, Kitto, a. o.). A variety of produce in the same field or vineyard was believed to have been objected to for the following reasons:—one species injures the other (*Philo*, De Justit. II. c. 12); "the land ought not to be oppressed with burdens beyond its strength, out of mere covetousness" (*Philo* l. c.), and having supplied nourishment for one plant, ought not to be harassed by ploughing" (*Philo Josephus*, ll. cc.); again, the Hebrews were to be weaned from detestable habits like those of the Zabii who, whilst sowing different seeds and grafting trees of different kinds, performed disgraceful acts of superstition and immorality (*Maim.* Mor. Nev. III. 37, and the notes of Munk in loc.; similarly also *Spencer*, Legg. Hebr. Ritt. II. xxx. 2, pp. 529 *sqq.*); or they were to be taught "fully to trust in the providence of God, and not to make provision for a dry or wet season by sowing their fields with mingled seed", as is done in India and elsewhere (Roberts a. o.); and lastly, they were to be accustomed to a careful selection and separation of seed-grain, so useful for preventing the growth of weeds, and so es-

thy field with mingled seed; nor shall a garment *that*

sential for securing good crops (*Michael.* Mos. R. IV. § 218; comp. *Virg.* Georg. I. 193 *sqq.*; *Varro*, R. R. I. 52). A mixture of woollen and linen threads was considered inappropriate for reasons like these:—"wool and linen were appointed for the priests alone" (*Jos.* Ant. IV. VIII. 11; *Mishn.* Kelaim IX. 1), which statement is at least of doubtful truth (see Comm. on Exod. pp. 487—489); "the difference of those substances prevents their union, and the superior strength of the one is calculated rather to tear the other than to unite with it, when the material is used" (*Philo*, De Justit. II. 11); they were costly and led to extravagance; they were often interwoven with symbolical figures of plants and animals recalling the worst features of Egyptian idolatry; or the people were to be warned against the superstitions of heathen priests, who believed that, by wearing mixed garments of wool and linen under certain conjunctions of the planets, their sheep and their flax would be blessed and thrive (Maimonides).

However, the idea underlying our laws is so abstract and speculative, and it is applied with so much logical consistency, that it is impossible to suppose that these ordinances originated in early and untutored times. In fact, we find traces in the Hebrew Scriptures that they were entirely unknown nearly during the whole of the monarchical period. We will not lay great stress upon the fact that the Hebrews largely kept and used mules (2 Sam. XIII. 29; XVIII. 9; 1 Ki. I. 33, 38; X. 25; XVIII. 5; Ezra II. 66; etc.), although the reasons brought forward to explain the employment of these hybrids, are very unsatisfactory; it is asserted that the Israelites imported them from other countries (Winer, Knobel), or that they permitted an exception in favour of the horse and the ass (Ewald); it seems more probable to suppose that if a precept like that of our verse had existed, the Hebrews would have deemed it unlawful not only to breed but to use mules, just as they abhorred both the breeding and the keeping of swine (p. 110). But we turn to a more decisive proof. We read in Isaiah (XXVIII. 25): "When the ploughman has made even the surface of the field, does he not cast abroad fennel and scatter cummin, and cast wheat in rows, and barley on the appointed place, and spelt for its border?" Here evidently a large variety of grains is described as being sown on the same field, with an enclosure of a different kind forming part of the same piece of land; whereas the Mishnah (Kilaim IX. 9) expressly forbids a woollen border round a linen texture. It is a matter of experience that mixed seeds yield more abundant crops than single ones; because the former, as has been supposed, resist more successfully all injurious influences often fatal to the latter; different kinds protect each other, as various herbs and grasses do in fields; thus "clover may be frozen in winter and dried up in summer, but if mixed with other plants, it will indeed languish under the same conditions of temperature, but it will rise again luxuriantly in a more favourable season" (*Ergänzungsblätter*, I. 509). Whether the Hebrews were acquainted with this circumstance or not, they do not appear to have felt much disposed to comply with our law even long after its promulgation; a parable in the New Testament begins with the words:

*is* a mixture of linen and wool (*shaatnez*) come upon thee.

"A certain man had a fig-tree planted in his vine-yard" (Luke XIII. 6); and the doctors of the Mishnah and Talmud, though most minutely working out our ordinances from every conceivable point of view, found it necessary to interpret them, in several respects, very leniently, and to make many important concessions. For they taught, partially even against the spirit of the Biblical commands, that the mixing of seeds is prohibited only in the Holy Land; although grafting different kinds of trees is strictly forbidden, the fruit so obtained may be eaten; a certain number of plants, such as beans and peas, spelt and rye (שִׁיפוֹן), are not to be considered as heterogeneous (*Mishn.* Kilaim I. 1—4); a garden bed about six hand-breadths square, may be planted with five kinds of vegetables, four on the four borders, and the fifth in the middle; the law is not infringed, unless *three* different kinds of grain are sown on the same field, for inst., two sorts of wheat and one of barley, or one of wheat, of barley, and of spelt; or unless, in a vineyard, besides pippins of raisin, two grains, such as wheat and barley, are sown at the same time. Maimonides indeed finds this decision surprising because not founded on Biblical authority, but he explains it by one of his favourite theories, namely, that the simultaneous sowing of three kinds was a pagan usage (comp. *Mishn.* Kilaim I. 1—4, 9; II. 6, 7; III. 1—5; V. 8; VI. 1*sqq.*; IX. 1*sqq.*; *Talm.* Shabb. IX. 2; Berach. 22$^a$; Kiddush. 38, 39$^a$; Chull. 82$^b$, 136$^b$; etc. *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 37 fin.; Hilch. Kilaim I, V, IX; *Yoreh Deah* §§ 295—304; *Hottinger*, Jus Hebr. pp. 374—378).

It must, therefore, be concluded, that our laws are the result of a philosophical or religious theory, which could not well be realised in practical life; and it will be easy to estimate the opinion of Talmudists that they formed a part of those commands which were already enjoined upon Noah, either assuming ten such precepts, or differently defining the seven usually specified (*Talm.* Sanh. 56$^b$, 60$^a$; see *supra* pp. 9, 10).

Philological Remarks. — Some observations of Josephus seem indeed to involve more profound reasons, but they are vague and indistinct. "The seeds", he states, "ought to be pure and unmixed, and two or three kinds should not be sown together, since nature does not delight in the union of dissimilar things... Nor is anything to be allowed, out of which, by imitation, any subversion might arise in matters relating to the commonwealth" (*Jos.* Ant. IV. viii. 20). The same may be said of Philo's explanation: "No Jewish shepherd will endeavour to cross a sheep with a he-goat, or a ram with a she-goat, or a cow with a horse; and if he does, he must pay the penalty for dissolving an ordinance of nature, that is anxious to preserve the original kinds of animals free from spurious admixture" (*Philo*, Specc. Legg. III. 8). The notion of purity, "mixture causing uncleanness" (*Knobel*, Lev. p. 511), is but remotely associated with our laws. — The term שָׂדְךָ *thy field* must here, no doubt, be taken in the most extended sense, and includes the vineyard, which word is used in the corresponding law of Deuteronomy (XXII. 9), and which the Septuagint, unjustifiably narrowing the scope of our law, has in our passage (τὸν ἀμπελῶνα σοῦ): if "seed is sown" on the vineyard, the latter becomes thereby, in some measure, a field.—The mean-

20. And if a man lies carnally with a woman that *is* a bondmaid, betrothed to a man, but has not been redeemed, nor has received her freedom; punishment shall take place, *but* they shall not be put to

ing of שַׁעַטְנֵז is certain, for in our passage the word is explained by "mixture" (כִּלְאַיִם), and in Deuteronomy (XXII. 11) still more distinctly by "wool and linen together" (Jonath. in our passage כלאי עמר וכיתן), which were among the Hebrews the ordinary materials for garments (comp. XIII. 47); but no plausible etymology has hitherto been discovered; the term seems hardly of Hebrew origin, a quinquelitera consisting entirely of strong letters being against Shemitic formation; it may be Egyptian, and the word may have been introduced into Palestine together with the texture for which the Egyptians were famous. According to the Mishnah (Kilaim IX. 8), it is a compound of שוע, heckled, טוי spun, and נוז corded or woven, and denotes a material variously manufactured of wool and flax (comp. *Kimchi* sub voc.); which derivation is as improbable as that of modern linguists who believe that it signifies "a garment mixed with thread," and consider it a compound of שַׁעַ mixture (comp. Arab. شعشع to mix), עַט garment (comp. עָטָה to put on a garment), and נֵז thread (comp. Chald. נוז to twist threads); or that of Bochart who translates "mixed texture" (from سوط or ساط and נֵז). In Coptic, coloured material spun from wool and linen is called ΣΧΩΝΤΝΕΣ. The ancient versions afford no clue; the Sept. has κίβδηλον (adulterated, false — being neither the one species nor the other), the Vulg. merely veste quæ ex duobus texta est; the Samaritan version מנמרים dotted, of variegated colours, perhaps following a custom or law of the Samaritans of wearing only garments of one colour; Saad. ad Abu-Said "of wool and linen" (صوف وكتان; comp. *Buxt.* Lex. Chald. Talm. p. 2483; *Boch.* Hieroz. I. pp. 486, 487; *Jablonski*, Opusc. I. 291—295; *Gesen.* Thesaur. p. 1456). — We may observe, that the ordinance with respect to mixed materials was by Jewish tradition not applied to the shrouds of the dead (תכריכי המת), since the dead are free from the obligations of the Law (*Mishn.* Kil. IX. 4; comp. Ps. LXXXVIII. 6, במתים חפשי כמו חללים וכו'); and upon this view is based the argument of St. Paul, "You also are become dead to the Law by the body of Christ; . . . now we are delivered from the Law, that being dead wherein we were held"; or "I through the Law am dead to the Law, that I might live unto God" (Rom. VII. 4, 6; Gal. II. 19). — Niebuhr (Beschreibung von Arabien, p. 159) relates that Jewish agriculturists in Arabia, though refraining from blending different kinds of trees by grafting or inoculation, which is forbidden in the Mishnah (Kilaim I. 7, 8), do not scruple to grow heterogeneous crops on the same field, and to eat the produce, which, according to the Rabbins, Jews are permitted to do in any country except Palestine (see *supra*; comp. *Hottinger*, Jus. Hebr. p. 377).

**20—22.** If we were not prepared to find in our chapter a miscellaneous collection of laws, it would be difficult to account for the introduction, in this place, of the provisions contained in these verses: their proper position would either have been among the laws of sacrifice or among the laws of marriage; and they derive, therefore, no light from the context in which they occur.

death, because she was not free. 21. And he shall bring his trespass-offering to the Lord, to the door of the Tent of Meeting, a ram for a trespass-offering; 22. And the priest shall make an atonement for him

They belong no doubt to the same period as the commands of this section generally; for in Ezra's time an expiation by means of sacrifice similar to that here prescribed was demanded of those who had married foreign wives (comp. Ezra X. 19); and we are not surprised to find even in this late enactment the same invidious and degrading conceptions with regard to slaves, which are reflected in some of the earlier ordinances (comp. Exod. XXI. 20, 21, 32). For the slaves are here still regarded essentially as *property*, and not only are they inferior to other Israelites in social rights, but also in moral and religious duties: if a female slave is faithless to her betrothed, neither she nor her paramour suffers death, which is the legal punishment if the seduced is a free woman (XX. 10; Deut. XXII. 22—24); she has to perform no religious ceremony whatever, since she is no full member of the theocratic community; "her marriage with a free man is no perfect marriage" (אין קדושיה קדושין גמורין, Rashi), but is rather "like the 'heterogeneous mixture' (כלאים) just treated of" (Ebn Ezra); and the man has simply to present a ram for a trespass-offering, which is the ordinary atonement for offences against the rights of property (Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 267 *sqq.*). Yet we notice, in this enactment, a progress in two directions: in opposition to the ordinances of previous codes, the seducer was not compelled to marry the slave, without the liberty of ever dismissing her; and he paid the fine for the infringement of the laws of property not to the betrothed or the master of the slave, but to God (comp. Deut. XXII. 28, 29). Both the notions of marriage and of atonement had become more refined; a forced alliance was deemed immoral, because it is no *union;* and it was considered a supreme duty to restore the holiness of the community which had been disturbed by the offence. Whether any reparation was made to the injured bridegroom, or to the master whose property had been depreciated, and which was the penalty inflicted upon the woman, is not stated in our law; the matter was probably left to the discretion of the judges, to whom the legislator gave sufficient liberty by the general injunction "punishment shall take place" (בקרת תהיה). Jewish tradition deduced from these terms that the slave was punished with flagellation (*Mishn.* Kerith. II. 4).

Philological Remarks.—To establish a connection with the preceding verse, we should not be warranted in describing the laws under discussion as directed "against the intermingling of different classes," and in considering the particle וְ with which they begin (וְאִישׁ) as a proof that "a kindred subject" follows (Ebn Ezra, Knobel, a.o.): a free Hebrew was indeed allowed to marry a Hebrew slave, whether she obtained her liberty or not; and the particle וְ very frequently begins laws and sections which have no affinity whatever with the preceding ones (comp. f. i. ver. 23, וְכִי תבאו).—A learned critic has observed that "verses 19 to 22 give the impression of being later additions; at least they are ill suited to the other and more general subjects, and certainly vers. 21 and 22 do not stand in their right

with the ram of the trespass-offering before the Lord for the sin which he has done; and the sin which he has done shall be forgiven him.

23. And when you shall come into the land, and shall plant all manner of trees for food, you shall count

place" (*Graf*, Geschichtliche Bücher, p. 78): however, the laws of ver. 19 seem to accord well with the spirit of the chapter, and the mode of atonement prescribed in vers. 21 and 22 can hardly be separated from the statement of the offence itself in ver. 20. — The words נֶחֱרֶפֶת לְאִישׁ (ver. 20) are properly *given up to a man*, that is, *betrothed* to him (comp. חֵרֵף in Judg. V. 18; Isai. LIII. 12; and חֲרוּפָה in *Talm*. Kiddush. 6ª, where it is declared equivalent with אֲרוּסָה; *Onk*. aptly אֲחִידָא destined or intended, *Jonath*. מיתארסא, Saad. مخطوبة, Rashi מיועדת ומיוחדת, Rashb. מסורה ומיוחדת); the Septuagint has indistinctly διαπεφυλαγμένη ἀνθρώπῳ (De Wette "einem Manne vertraut"), Vulg. incorrectly nubilis, Luther a. o. against the Hebrew usage "die von dem Manne verschmäht ist" (Ebn Ezra "despised"; comp. חֶרְפָּה disgrace); Maimonides (Mor. Nev. I. 39), connecting חרף with the Arabic حرف, takes it as "turning away", and translates שפחה נחרפת לאיש "a servant changed from the condition of bondage to the condition of marriage"; and Schultens (Animadvers. Philol. et Crit. pp. 57—68), following a no less doubtful Arabic analogy, renders "serva vilis alicui (sc. domino) reddita"; which Dathe modifies thus, qua alius pro lubitu utitur; comp. Comm. on Lev. I. p. 267 note 15. — בִּקֹּרֶת תִּהְיֶה is properly *there shall be visitation*, for the root בקר includes, like the analogous one בִּקֵּר, both the notion of searching examination (XIII. 36) and correction, exactly like the Greek ἐπισκοπή, as the Septuagint translates in this passage. The Author. Vers., following the Rabbinical interpretation, renders "she shall be scourged" (מלקית ברצועה של בָּקָר!), and has, in the Marginal Reading, even more questionably, "*they* shall be scourged"; and so the Vulg., Dathe, a. o. vapulabunt ambo. — Jewish doctors curiously inferred from the words והפדה לא נפדתה — a very common use of the infinitive for emphatic expression — that the woman referred to in our law is one that "is half slave and half free" (כל שחציה שפחה וחציה בת חורין), and is betrothed to a Hebrew slave (*Mishn*. Kerith. II. 5); all which views are reproduced in the Targum of Jonathan: "If she is a servant and a free woman betrothed to a free man, . . . there shall be searching inquiry (בטשיט) for her judgment", etc.

**23—25.** This is one of the few laws peculiar to our chapter, and found in no other code of the Pentateuch: assuming, therefore, that it originated at a very advanced age, we can well understand, that, though based upon an old usage and upon practical observation, it is spiritual and levitical in tendency: Hebrew agriculturists may have known, as was known to the husbandmen of other ancient nations, that by stripping fruit-trees of their blossoms in the earlier years, they will thrive better, and bear more abundantly afterwards; but our legislator was not satisfied with merely sanctioning a practice of rural economy; he brought it into connection with the laws of firstfruits; and since, as a rule, the produce of the first three years is tasteless, stunted, and imperfect, or as he calls it "uncircum-

their early fruit as uncircumcised; three years shall it be as uncircumcised to you; it shall not be eaten. 24. And in the fourth year all their fruit shall be holy, a praise to the Lord; and in the fifth year shall you

cised," and therefore unfit for sacred gifts, he enacted that that produce should not be eaten; that the crop of the fourth year should be "holy, a praise to the Lord"; and that from the fifth year only the proprietor should be allowed to enjoy the produce of his trees. The firstfruits were, according to the Deuteronomist (XXVI. 1—11), consumed by the owner in common meals together with the Levite and the stranger; but according to the later ordinance of Numbers (XVIII. 12, 13), they belonged exclusively to the priests, and formed no insignificant part of their revenues (see Comm. on Lev. I. 613, 614). It is probable that the latter meaning is implied in the terms "holy, a praise to the Lord," and that the fruits of the fourth year belonged to the priesthood alone; they could, according to tradition, be redeemed by their equivalent of money, with the addition of the fifth part of their value (comp. XXVII. 31; Deut. XIV. 22—26; *Mishn.* Peah VII. 6; Terum. VI. 2 *sqq.*; Maas. Shen. V. 1 *sqq.*); or they were taken to the holy city, together with the tithes of other fruits, and there consumed by the master in the company of invited, especially needy guests (*Jos.* Ant. IV. VIII. 19). Our text prescribes merely that the produce of the three first years "shall not be eaten"; but Jewish teachers assert that it must be burnt or buried in the ground, since it ought to yield no advantage or benefit whatever; and working out the Biblical precepts with their usual minuteness, they partially extend, and partially contract their scope. Some are of opinion that even at present Jewish producers ought to redeem the fruit of the fourth year for a nominal coin, and to throw this "into the Dead Sea", that is, to "a forlorn place", where no one is likely to find it (See *Mishnah* Treat. Orlah; *Talm.* Berach. 35; Pesach. 22b; Rosh Hash. 2b; Kiddush. 38, 54b; Bab. Kam. 101a; *Maim.* De Cib. Vetit. X.; Mor. Nev. III. 37; *Yor. Deah* § 294; *Hottinger*, l. c. pp. 324—327).

Philological Remarks. — The words וערלתם ערלתו את פריו are literally "you shall declare as uncircumcised its uncircumcision, its fruit," that is, the earliest fruits of a tree, which are, as it were, its prepuce, shall be considered unclean; for עָרֵל uncircumcised is used metaphorically in many connections, especially in reference to the heart, the lips, and the ear (XXVI. 41; Ex. VI. 12, 30; Deut. X. 16; Jer. IV. 4; VI. 10; Ezek. XLIV. 9; see Comm. on Exod. p. 106); hence Onk. ותרחקון רחקא, the Sept. περικαθαριεῖτε τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν αὐτοῦ, and Philo in his allegorical manner, "he orders us to cut away vain opinions, which are impure by nature" (De Alleg. I. 15, οἴησις δὲ ἀκάθαρτον φύσει; comp. also the curious and elaborate allegorical exposition of our precept, which he describes as a χρησμός, in De Plant. Noae cc. 27—33; see De Abrah. I. 2).—קֹדֶשׁ הִלּוּלִים לַיהוה "holy, a praise to the Lord," that is, an offering of praise and gratitude; though הִלּוּלִים is also used for festivals of thankfulness (Judg. IX. 27; comp. *Hengstenb.* Authent. des Pentat. II. 99). The Sept. renders the word indistinctly αἰνετὸς τῷ κυρίῳ, and so the Vulg. laudabilis Domino; and Luther heilig und gepriesen; but the Samaritan codex and

eat of their fruit, that they may yield to you their increase: I *am* the Lord your God.

26. You shall not eat *anything* with the blood. You shall use no enchantment nor magic.

version have הִלּוּלִים "redemption," intimating that the produce of the fourth year might be redeemed by money given to the priests (see *supra*; comp. Deut. XX. 6; XXVIII. 30; Jer. XXXI. 5); and similarly Targ. Jonath. (מתפרק מן כהנא "redeemed from the priest"), and others (see *Geiger*, Urschrift, pp. 181—184).

**26, 31.** Though from early times thoughtful Hebrews felt a repugnance to the eating of blood of animals, since they considered blood as the soul or life breathed into the beasts by God and therefore sacred, the bulk of their countrymen could not easily be weaned from a habit which seems to have been general and deep-rooted, and was combated by arguments perhaps too speculative for their comprehension. The interdiction of eating blood was therefore repeated at different times, and was deemed necessary even in the Persian period; yet it is here introduced in a form so brief and elliptical—לא תאכלו על הדם— that it is evident that the subject had become familiar to all.

But in that period no warnings were more urgently needed than those against sooth-saying, enchantment, and sorcery of every description; for then the Jews, scattered throughout Babylonia, the ancient home of the divining arts, and living under the rule of the Persians, the consummate adepts in the mysteries of the spirit world, were in the utmost danger of adopting views and practices absolutely opposed to the doctrines of monotheism, and of thus "defiling themselves" (ver. 31). How imperfectly the Jews escaped this danger, has been pointed out before (pp. 287 *sqq.*); and we have, in another place, also reviewed the various forms of sooth-saying which flourished among the Hebrews at all times (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 374 *sqq.*).

Philological Remarks.—The command "You shall not eat anything with the blood," is sufficiently clear; but Jewish teachers, translating "you shall not eat so as to cause your own death", curiously referred those words to the law about the rebellious and gluttonous son, who was to be stoned to death (Deut. XXI. 18—21); or they explained, "you shall not eat the flesh of sacrificial animals while the blood is still in the sprinkling vessel" (*Targ. Jon.*; *Talm.* Sanh. 63[a]; Berach. 10). Maimonides, on this point as on some others at variance with Jewish tradition, asserts, at least in his Moreh Nevochim (III. 46), that the command applies merely to the Zabian practice of eating the flesh of slaughtered beasts at the pit into which they pour the blood as food for the demons; and he translates therefore, "You shall not eat near the blood" (see *supra* p. 3; comp. however, ***Maimon.*** Seph. Mitzv., negat. prec. 195; Hilch. Mamrim VII; ***Heilpern***, Mits. Hashem p. 40). But the preposition עַל means likewise "in addition to" or "together with" (comp. XXIII. 18, 20; Exod. XII. 8, ומצות על מרורים יאכלוהו); it stands here instead of the more usual בְּ or עִם (Gen. IX. 4; Deut. XII. 23), or instead of אֶל (1 Sam. XIV. 34, in which passage the phrase אכל עַל־הדם also occurs, vers. 32, 33). An ancient reading instead of על הדם seems to have been על הרים, for some Greek manuscripts have the translation ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων—a prohibition

27. You shall not round the corners of your head, neither shalt thou mar the corners of thy beard. 28. And you shall not make any cuttings in your flesh

not to eat sacrificial meals on the heights, which would, however, be too abruptly and enigmatically introduced. — On נִחֵשׁ to practise enchantment "by muttering spells in a mysterious whisper", see Comm. on Lev. I. 375 notes 15, 16, and on עונן ibid. p. 376 note 1; on אֹבוֹת necromancers ibid. notes 5—9, and on יִדְּעֹנִים wizards ibid. p. 374 note 11. The Sept. renders οἰωνίζεσθαι and ὀρνιθοσκοπεῖσθαι, ἐγγαστρίμυθοι and ἐπαοιδοί; the Vulg. augurari and observare somnia, magi and arioli; Luther auf Vogelgeschrei achten und Tage wählen, Wahrsager u. Zeichendeuter. Jewish tradition explains that נחש means being influenced in our actions by omina (f. i. "my stick fell out of my hand, therefore I will not go to-day to such and such a place"), and עונן considering certain months or seasons propitious or unlucky for certain undertakings; that אוב is one who makes others believe that a voice comes from under the earth or out of a skull, and a ידעוני one who takes into his mouth a bone of a certain bird called ידוע, burns incense, and then, in a fit of ecstacy, pretends to disclose the future (comp. *Talm.* Shabb. 67; Sanh. 65; Chull. 95; *Maimon.* Hilch. Avod. Zar. VI, VII, XI, XII; *Yor. Deah* § 179; *Hottinger* l. c. pp. 388—390, 394, 395; *Heilpern* l. c. pp. 40, 41).

**27, 28.** The human form which came perfect from the hand of God, and which, if it does not reveal, enshrines that which constitutes man's "similitude" and "likeness" with Him, is sacred; and it must not be disfigured or mutilated: this general principle had a special force and meaning for the Hebrews who where the chosen and holy community. The Deuteronomist conveys both the law and the reason with remarkable emphasis: "You are children of the Lord your God; you shall not cut yourselves, nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead; for thou art a holy people to the Lord thy God, and the Lord has elected thee to be a peculiar people to Himself out of all the nations that are upon the face of the earth" (Deut. XIV. 2). Various other commands were suggested by these notions (comp. Deut. XXIII. 2); and we can discover only one exception — the law of circumcision, which however, arising out of a physical cause and gradually spiritualised, was finally also connected with the idea of the sanctity of Israel and of every Israelite (see Comm. on Gen. pp. 386 *sqq.*). The opposition of the Deuteronomist to the customs referred to was the more justified, as they originated in superstitious conceptions and helped to confirm them. However, in this case as in many others which we have pointed out, the teachers of the nation were much in advance of the mass of the people; for these the great principle, "You shall be holy, for the Lord your God is holy", remained long a phrase of little significance; they clung to their idolatrous habits; and in the time of Jeremiah which coincides with that of the Deuteronomist, the forbidden practices still prevailed, and were apparently considered unobjectionable even by religious guides. For Jeremiah, foreshadowing the fearful massacres of the Hebrews, declared: "Both the great and the small die in this land; they shall not be buried, nor shall men lament for

**for the dead, nor brand any marks upon you: I *am* the Lord.**

them, nor cut themselves, nor make themselves bald for them" (Jer. XVI. 6). The same usages were preserved after the destruction of Jerusalem (Jer. XLI. 5); and the compiler of our chapter deemed it, therefore, necessary not only to renew the former prohibitions, but to extend them to the comparatively harmless custom of tattooing (כְּתֹבֶת קַעֲקַע; see *infra* on XXI. 1—15, p. 456).

Arab tribes, pretending to follow the example of their god Orotal whom Herodotus calls Bacchus, and who is probably identical with the Sun, used "to cut their hair in a ring away from the temples"; and other nomads living in northern Africa "shaved their heads so as to have tufts (λόφους κείρονται), and allowing the middle hair to grow, they shaved both sides close to the skin" (*Herod.* III. 8; IV. 175): this was considered by the Hebrews an unbecoming disfigurement of the head, and hence the Arabs were, with reproach and irony, called "people with the corner of their hair polled" (קְצוּצֵי פֵאָה, Jer. IX. 25; XXV. 23; XLIX. 32). If, as we may infer from the statement of Herodotus, the custom was associated with some form of Sabaean idolatry, there was an additional reason for enforcing our law.

An injunction not to mar the beard might hardly appear necessary, since it is well known with what pride and scrupulous care the beard was cultivated by the Hebrews and other Eastern nations; that it was deemed the greatest ornament of a man, a badge of his dignity, and a type of his vigour and perfect manhood; beard and life were hence often employed as synonymous, and oaths were confirmed, and blessings bestowed, by invoking the one or the other; suppliants, desirous to give the utmost solemnity to their appeals, touched the beards of those they addressed; and a mutilation of the beard was looked upon as an unbearable disgrace, and often regarded as more calamitous than death (2 Sam. X. 4, 5; Isai. VII. 20; Ezek. V. 1; *Hom.* Il. I. 500—502; VIII. 371; X. 454). In some countries the beard was the distinctive mark of free men. An old Spartan law forbade the ephori, from the moment of their taking office, to clip their beards; and those who had fled before the enemy in battle were compelled to appear in public with half-shorn beards. However, it was customary among several nations for young men "to present to their gods the firstlings of their beards" (*Lucian*, Syr. Dea c. 60, τῶν γενείων ἀπάρχοντα; *Stat.* Theb. VI. 199, 200); and it was possibly to prevent the adoption of similar usages among the Hebrews, that the injunction was deemed desirable. Besides, "marring the corners of the beard" was a heathen mode of mourning, which was not to be imitated, since it might easily lead to more objectionable perversities (compare XXI. 5; Is. XV. 2; Jer. XLI. 5; XLVIII. 37; Bar. VI. 31).

For the wild and frantic demonstrations of grief so common among eastern and southern nations, included cuts and incisions in the body among the Hebrews, the Philistines, and the Moabites, the Arabs and Ethiopians, the Babylonians and Armenians; among the early Greeks and Romans, people in bereavement, especially women, indulged in the hideous practice of "lacerating their cheeks"; and when the king of the

Scythians died, those of his subjects who received his body for burial, "cut off a part of their ears, shaved off their hair, wounded themselves on the arms, and drove arrows through their left hands" (compare X. 6, 7; XXI. 4; Jerem. XVI. 6; LI. 5; XLVII. 5; XLVIII. 37; Comment. on Exod. p. 176; on Levit. I. 342—344, 697; *Hom.* Il. II. 700; XI. 393; XIX. 284; *Herod.* IV. 71; *Xenoph.* Cyrop. III. I. 13; III. 67; *Eurip.* Hec. 655; *Plut.* Consol. ad Apollon. c. 22; Sol. c. 21; *Virg.* Aen. IV. 673; XII. 606; *Ovid*, Trist. III. III. 51; *Cic.* Tusc. III. 26 or 62, detestabilia genera lugendi... muliebres lacerationes genarum, pectoris etc.; De Legg. II. 23 or 59; *Geier*, De Ebraeor. luctu c. X; *Arvieux*, Beduinen, p. 153; *Morier*, Sec. Journ. p. 189; *Rüppell*, Abyssin. II. 57). Such acts, which are still customary among some tribes of Persia, Arabia, and Abyssinia, were to be shunned by the Hebrews, not only because immoderate grief is unbecoming a nation of priests, but because cuts and incisions, usually made by persons while engaged in prayer or other religious exercises, were meant as substitutes for self-immolation, and the blood thus shed was supposed to ensure atonement: such notions were held in abhorrence by the advanced levitical writers, who attributed the power of expiation to the blood of clean sacrificial animals, but not to human blood.

More wide-spread still was the custom of "inscribing" upon the body (כתבת), by means of a "caustic" (קַעֲקַע), words or short maxims, or of marking the forehead and cheeks, the hands, the arms, and the neck, with figures and emblems. It prevailed, and partially still prevails, in many countries of the old and the new world, both among savage and more civilised nations; and though in many cases it is in itself harmless, being merely intended for ornament, or for identification, as when a slave bears the name or the initials of his master, or the soldier those of his general, it was, in many instances, a very efficient mode of strengthening the most dangerous superstitions. It was so common for idolaters to have the name or image of their chief deities, or some other significant symbol associated with their faith, engraved upon their bodies, that even the earlier religious legislators of the Hebrews deemed it necessary to devise some substitute for that custom in harmony with their new creed, and they introduced the "phylacteries", which the Hebrews were to "bind" as "a sign" upon their head, and as "a memorial" between their eyes, "that the law of the Lord might be in their mouths" (Exod. XIII. 9, 16; Deut. VI. 8; XI. 18; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 223—227). Thus more than one advantage was gained; the sign or memorial was known to refer to none else but the One and true God of the Hebrews, and it was understood not as an amulet which in itself is a shield against danger and misfortune, but as an emblem meant to remind the Israelite of his duties and of their faithful accomplishment by his own zeal and vigilant exertion. Yet it was even after the exile considered unobjectionable to cover with such symbols the body itself, as is manifest from allusions of the second Isaiah (XLIV. 5; XLIX. 16). The levitical writers prohibited, therefore, tattooing of any kind and for whatever purpose, well aware how imperceptibly that practice might lead again to heathen rites and notions. Christians in some parts of the East, and Europaean sailors, were long in the habit of marking, by means of punctures and a black

29. Do not prostitute thy daughter to cause her to be unchaste; and let not the land become unchaste, so that the land become full of wickedness.

dye, their arms and other members of the body with the sign of the crucifix, or the image of the Virgin; the Mohammedans mark them with the name of Allah, and Orientals generally with the outlines of celebrated towns and places. A traveller relates that, as a preparation for an Arabian wedding, the women tattoo the bride with figures of flowers, houses, cypresses, antelopes, and other animals. Among the Thracians tattooing was considered as a mark and privilege of noble birth. The branding of prisoners and malefactors, extensively practised to this day, is included in the general interdiction of our verse (comp. Isai. XLIX. 16; Ezek. IX. 4; Gal. VI. 17; Rev. VII. 3; IX. 4; XIII. 16; XIV. 1; 3 Macc. II. 29, Ptolemy Philopator ordered that the apostate Jews "should be marked by fire upon their body with the attribute of Bacchus, an ivy leaf"; *Philo*, De Monarch. I. 8; *Herod.* II. 113; V. 6; *Lucian*, Syr. Dea. c. 59; *Prudentius* Hym. X. 556—560, Charaxat ambas ungulis scribentibus Genas etc.; *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. lib. II. cc. XIX, XX, pp. 403 *sqq.*; *Deyling*, Observat. III. 423—430; *Rosenm.* Morgenl. II. 306—308, IV. 254; VI. 136—138; etc.).

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — לֹא תַקִּפוּ וגו' is properly, "you shall not go round as regards the extremity of your head", that is, you shall not make a round tonsure by shaving off the ends of your hair; Vulg. neque in rotundum attondebitis comam; Symmach. οὐ περιξυρήσετε κύκλῳ τὴν πρόσοψιν τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν; and Herodotus also in the passage above referred to repeatedly expresses the notion of round about, κείρονται περιτρόχαλα, περιξυροῦντες τοὺς κροτάφους (*Herod.* III. 8). The Sept. has the unusual term σισόη, viz. οὐδὲ ποιήσετε σισόην ἐκ τῆς κόμης. Greek courtesans also are said to have shaved and arranged their hair in crest-like form (comp. *Hesych.* s. σκαφίον). — שֶׂרֶט or שָׂרֶטֶת (XXI. 5), is cut, incision (Sept. ἐντομίδες, Onk. and Jon. חבול injury), from שרט, like شرط, to make incisions in the body. — נֶפֶשׁ is a dead man, a corpse (as in XXI. 1; Num. V. 2; IX. 6; etc.); the parallel passage in Deuteronomy (XIV. 1) has מֵת, and sometimes both terms נפש מת are combined (XXI. 11; Num. VI. 6). — The words כְּתֹבֶת קַעֲקַע, both of them ἅπαξ λεγόμενα (see p. 386), are literally "writing of branding", that is, marks burnt into the skin (Onk. רושמין חריתין engraven marks, Jon. רשם חרית צוירא). כְּתֹבֶת seems to have been specially formed from כתב (prop. *to engrave*) to express the notion of tattooing, and קעקע is perhaps cognate with קָוָה, καύω, وقع cauterio signavit (comp. *Talm.* Kiddush. 36; Macc. 21; *Maimon.* Hilch. Av. Zar. XII; *Yoreh Deah* § 190; *Hotting.* l. c. pp. 392, 393; *L. Geiger*, Ueber die Entstehung der Schrift, in Zeitschrift der D. Morgenl. Gesellsch. XXIII. 166, 167).—Phocylides (v. 225) unjustly restricts the meaning of our verse to the branding of servants (Στίγματα μὴ γράψῃς, ἐπονειδίζων θεράποντα).

**29.** The unchaste worship of Ashtarte, known also as Beeltis and Tanais, Ishtar, Mylitta, and Anaitis, Asherah and Ashtaroth, flourished among the Hebrews at all times, both in the kingdom of Judah and Israel; it consisted in presenting to the goddess, who was revered as the female principle of conception and birth, the virginity of maidens as a

30. You shall keep My Sabbaths, and reverence My Sanctuary: I *am* the Lord.

firstfruit offering; and it was associated with the utmost licentiousness. This degrading service took such deep root, that in the Assyrian period it was even extended by the adoption of new rites borrowed from Eastern Asia, and described by the name of "Tents of the Maidens" (סֻכּוֹת בְּנוֹת); and it left its mark in the Hebrew language itself, which ordinarily expressed the notion of courtesan by "a consecrated woman" (קְדֵשָׁה), and that of sodomite by "consecrated man" (קָדֵשׁ; see Comm. on Lev. I. 312, 358—361, where the needful references will be found). It is natural that a matter so important both for the morals and the faith of the nation, should have engaged the constant and earnest attention of Hebrew legislators. Therefore the Deuteronomist ordained with remarkable distinctness: "There shall be no courtesan (קְדֵשָׁה) among the daughters of Israel, nor a sodomite (קָדֵשׁ) among the sons of Israel; thou shalt not bring the hire of an unchaste woman or the earnings of a dog (מחיר כלב) into the House of the Lord thy God for a vow; for both these things alike are an abomination to the Lord thy God" (Deut. XXIII. 18, 19) — for it was customary to offer the gain of prostitution or a part of it in the Temple, in order to hallow the gain and to sanction the prostitution. A similar prohibition is intended in our verse; but the difference between the wording of this passage and that of the Deuteronomist is striking and significant: "Do not prostitute thy daughter to cause her to be unchaste". The levitical author almost veils the gross abuse, evidently because in his more advanced age, when religious and moral laws began to be more strictly kept, he hardly had to apprehend a relapse into iniquities like those so plainly stated by his predecessor; he deemed a general allusion to the subject sufficient, and he chose terms which might be understood as a common injunction of virtue; and such an exhortation he indeed added, apparently as the principal object of the command—"and let not the land become unchaste, so that the land become full of wickedness". Thus the precepts faithfully reflect the various ages in which they were promulgated, and become historical witnesses of momentous changes in the inner life of the nation.

**30.** It would be extremely difficult to point out, without recourse to artificial devices, some logical connection between this and the preceding verse; but the combination of "the observance of the Sabbaths" and "the awe of the Sanctuary" is sufficiently intelligible: the festivals were celebrated, with imposing ceremonials, exclusively at the national Temple; most of them were made the occasions for common pilgrimages to the capital and for solemn sacrifices or for joyful offerings presented within the sacred precincts; and on every Sabbath the twelve shew-bread, placed on the golden Table in the Holy, were renewed by the priests in the name of the tribes of Israel. We can well understand that the command, "You shall keep My Sabbaths, and reverence My Sanctuary", became a current maxim; for in a few weighty and comprehensive words it reminded the Israelite of his chief duties as a theocratic citizen (comp. XXVI. 2). It originated, therefore, in a different circle of ideas from that which gave rise to a former

31. Turn not to the necromancers nor to the wizards; you shall not consult *them*, to be defiled by them: I *am* the Lord your God.

32. Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and

command, "You shall fear every man his mother and his father; and you shall keep My Sabbaths" (ver. 3) — which seems to have been suggested by the Decalogue (see p. 406). It is hardly probable that, as Maimonides supposes, our precept was meant to call forth a feeling of humility, if the worshipper, in contemplating the sublime holiness of the Sanctuary, compared it with his own frailty and weakness; and still less was it designed to discourage frequent visits in the Temple, which, it is asserted, would thus become less awe-inspiring: such conceptions led the author to the strange view previously referred to, that the ordinances of purity were purposely multiplied in order to prevent the Israelite from appearing too often in the holy place (*supra* p. 194; comp. *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 45, 47).

It is well known that the second Temple, compared with the first, was so humble a structure, that those who had seen the splendour of the old House wept bitterly when the new one was consecrated (Ezra III. 12): may we suppose that the injunction, "You shall reverence My Sanctuary" was intended to impress those whose ideal of a national Temple was not realised by Zerubbabel's edifice? — The Mishnah and Talmud thus defined the fear of the Sanctuary: a man must not come upon the mountain of the Temple with his stick, his shoes, or his pouch, nor with money tied up in his handkerchief, nor with dust upon his feet; he must not sit down in the Court, which was permitted to the Hebrew kings only; when he leaves it, he must walk backwards; and although it is destroyed, it remains in its holiness; no one ought therefore to sleep between east and west, nor ever imitate the building or any of its chief parts (comp. *Talm.* Berach. 62; Megill. 28; Yevam. 7; *Maimon.* Hilch. Beth Habbechirah VII; Hilch. Tephillah XI; *Hottinger*, l. c. pp. 328, 329).

**31.** See notes on ver. 26.

**32.** Old age was deemed sacred for various reasons—first, on account of its infirmities; wherefore the command of our verse concludes with the same words as that enjoining regard for the deaf and the blind — "And thou shalt fear thy God, I am the Lord" (comp. ver. 14); old age was next revered, because it arouses, or ought to arouse, filial sentiments in younger persons; then because it was regarded as the heavenly reward of a virtuous and Godfearing life; and lastly, because it was identified with the matured wisdom of experience, and consequently with the most perfect expression of the Divine similitude of man, as God Himself was called "the Ancient of days" (Dan. VII. 9, 13, 22). A Jewish poet has well expressed the spirit of our precept in these terms: "Distinguish an old man, since he is of the same age as thy father, with equal honours" (Phocylid. ver. 222, Πρέσβυν ὁμήλικα πατρὸς ἴσαις τιμαῖσι γέραιρε). It was a common maxim, "With the old is wisdom, and in length of days is understanding" (Job. XII. 12; comp. XXXII. 4, 7; Deut. XXXII. 7; 1 Ki. XII. 6 *sqq.*; Sir. VI. 34; VIII. 9; XXXII. 4, 10); and again, "The hoary head is a

**honour the person of the old man, and thou shalt fear thy God: I *am* the Lord.**

crown of glory" (Prov. XVI. 31; comp. XX. 29; *Talm.* Berach. 8; Megill. 28[a]; Yevam. 105; *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. LIX). "Elders", like *gerontes*, *senatores*, and *patres* among the Greeks and Romans, were a synonym of chiefs and guides, counsellors and judges; they filled the highest magistracies and composed the supreme tribunals (Exod. III. 16; Num. XI. 16; 1 Sam. IV. 3; VIII. 4; 2 Sam. XIX. 12; 1 Ki. VIII. 1; XX. 7; Prov. XXXI. 23; etc. etc.). Hence the ruthless eastern invaders, the ravagers of the holy land, are described as "a nation of fierce countenance, which has no regard for the old, nor feels compassion with the young" (Deut. XXVIII. 50); and in the pictures of wicked men or of degenerate times, disrespect shown to old age seldom fails to be introduced as one of the most reproachful features (Isai. III. 5; XLVII. 6; Lament. IV. 16; V. 12; Wisd. II. 10; comp. also *Philo*, Opp. II. 459, 633). In a commonwealth so thoroughly democratic as that delineated in the Pentateuch, the check of some superior authority like that of the elders, was particularly needed; and the same idea was acted upon by Solon, when he supported his popular institutions by the re-organisation of the Areopagus.

Old age, however, was described in most gloomy colours as "the evil days", and as the years when man says "I have no pleasure in them; when the sun, and the light, and the stars are darkened, and the clouds return even after the rain" (Eccl. XII. 1—5, and *Midr. Rabb.* in loc.; comp. *Talm.* Shabb. 152[a]). It was often regarded as an unbearable burden; and considerations kindred to those which prompted the humane commands of our verse, induced barbarous nations to release old men from their troubles by slaughtering or otherwise destroying them. Among the Bactrians, old men were given over to savage dogs called "entombers" (ἐνταφιασταί), to be devoured by them. The Caspii exposed persons over seventy years in a desert place and starved them to death; if the corpses were dragged from their place by birds, the deceased were pronounced happy; if by wild beasts or dogs, less fortunate; but if by none of these, ill-fated. The Derbices, a tribe in Mount Caucasus, put old men to death, and the nearest relations met and consumed flesh; old women were strangled, and then buried (*Strab.* XI. xi. 3, 8). As soon as an Ethiopian Troglodyte had attained the sixtieth year, he hanged himself with a cow's tail; if he omitted to do so, anyone had the right to kill him; for "it was considered the greatest evil, to love life, and yet to be unable to do anything worth living for" (*Diod. Sic.* III. 33). The Calantians, an Indian tribe, sacrificed their old men to the gods, and afterwards ate their flesh, of which the children received the largest portions (*Herod.* III. 38, 99). If among the Massagetae a man had attained to old age, all his kinsmen assembled and offered him up as a sacrifice together with some cattle; then his flesh was boiled and eaten; and "those who thus ended their days, were reckoned the happiest": a man who died of disease was not eaten, and his relatives bewailed his ill-fortune which deprived him of the glory of being sacrificed (*Herod.* I. 216). The Issedonians, in Scythia, did not kill their old men, but consumed their flesh, and then the skulls were set

in gold, and highly honoured and prized (*Herod.* IV. 26). In Sumatra similar usages prevailed in the time of Marco Polo, who relates, that if among the people of Dragoian a person falls ill, and is by the inspired magicians declared to be beyond the hope of recovery, his mouth is closed by experts until he is suffocated, after which they cut his body in pieces, and then "the relatives come together, and in a convivial manner eat the whole of it, not leaving so much as the marrow of the bones" (*Marco Polo*, Trav. Book III. ch. 14, p. 372 ed. Wright).

However, many of the civilised nations of antiquity equalled the Hebrews in reverential regard for the aged. In Egypt "young men meeting their elders in the streets gave way to them, and stepped aside; and if an elder came in where young men were present, the latter rose from their seats" (*Herod.* II. 80); and similar customs prevail in Egypt to this day (*Lane*, Mod. Eg. II. 121). The laws of Manu contain these remarkable sentences: "The spirit of life is ready to escape from a youth at the approach of an old man, but by rising and saluting him, it is saved. A youth who accustoms himself to salute and reverence the aged, has a fourfold gain in length of life, knowledge, fame, and strength" (*Manu* II. 120, 121; comp. *Yâjnav.* I. 26, 27, 117; II. 232). The respect shown by the Chinese and Japanese to old age is proverbial, and is only inferior to the homage paid by them to their parents (see *supra* notes on ver. 3, p. 406). In Homer already we find the sentiments that "the immortal gods honour men advanced in years"; and that "the Erinyes avenge insults committed against elders" (Il. XV. 204; XXIII. 788). The Spartans especially were famous for their deferential conduct towards their elders: "Young men were bound not only to honour and to obey their parents, but all their elders, to make room for them in the street, to rise before them and to keep silence in their presence" (*Plut.* Instit. Lacon. cc. 8, 10; *Herod.* II. 80; *Ael.* N. A. VI. 61; Gell. II. xv. 2; *Justin.* Hist. III. 3). Nor were the Athenians deficient in this virtue (*Aristoph.* Nub. 993); and Socrates observes, in one of the works of Xenophon: "Is it not everywhere deemed the duty of a younger man to yield the path to the elder when he meets him, and to rise from his seat when he approaches, to honour him with the softest couch, and to give precedence to him in conversation?" (*Xenoph.* Memorab. II. iii. 15, 16; comp. *Diog. Laert.* VIII. 22). In the best times of the Roman republic, we know on good authority, that "the elders were honoured by the younger people almost like gods and parents, and were everywhere and on all occasions distinguished before all others" (*Gell.* II. 15); indeed it was deemed "a fearful iniquity, to be expiated with death, if a youth did not rise before an old man" (*Juven.* Sat. XIII. 54, 55, Credebant quod grande nefas, et morte piandum, Si juvenis vetulo non assurrexerat; comp. *Ovid*, Fast. V. 57, Magna fuit quondam capitis reverentia cani etc.; *Cic.* De Offic. I. 34 or 122, est adolescentis majores natu vereri etc.).

The Jewish Rabbins enforced our command with the utmost solemnity by maxims like these: "He who receives or takes care of an old man, is rewarded as if he receives and seeks God" (*Talm.* Sanh. 110[a]); or "prophets are only believed if they come armed with Divine miracles, but old men at all times" (*Talm. Jer.* Berach.). They extended it, moreover, to learned men and to teachers. Onkelos already renders in our verse, "Rise before one

**33. And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, you shall not oppress him; 34. The stranger that dwells with you shall be to you as one born among**

who is versed in the Law" (מן קדם דסבר באורייתא יתקים; and similarly Targum Jonathan, the Samaritan Version, and Abu Said); the Mishnah defines an old man to be "one who has acquired wisdom" (*Mishn.* Avoth IV. 1); and Talmudical authorities teach: the fear of thy instructor is like the fear of heaven; as a man must honour and reverence his father, so, and even more, he must honour and reverence his teacher; if both fall into captivity, his first duty is to release his master; a man who presumes to decide in a matter of learning in the presence of his teacher, deserves death; a pupil must never take his master's seat; he should neither sit down nor stand before him until he receives from him permission to do so; "he must sit before him, as if he were sitting before the king". Similar and many other duties were enjoined with respect to scholars in general (תלמידי חכמים); it was declared, that those who insult them have no share in a future life; and yet the principle was upheld, that even scholars are obliged to rise before an old man, whether he be a Hebrew or a heathen, a learned or an illiterate person (see *Talm.* Berach. 8; Shabb. $119^b$; Erub. 62; Kiddush. $32^b$, 33; Bab. Mets. $83^a$; Bab. Bathr. $119^b$; Sanh. 5, 17, $96^a$, $99^b$, $109^b$; *Midr. Rabb.* Gen. LIX; *Maim.* Hilch. Talm. Tor. V, VI; Mor. Nev. III. 36; Affirmat. laws no. 209, לכבד לומדי תורה וזקן; *Yor. Deah* §§ 244, 248; *Hamburger*, Geist der Hagada, pp. 108–113). Pseudo-Phocylides also amplified our command (Αἰδεῖσθαι πολιοκροτάφους, εἴχειν δὲ γέρουσιν Ἕδρης καὶ γεράων πάντων γενεῇ θαλέθοντες. Πρέσβυν ὁμήλικα πατρὸς κτλ.).—According to the Hindoo law, a man who speaks ill of his master, or does not step out of his way in the streets, has to pay a very heavy fine (*Manu* VIII. 275).

**33, 34.** Inhabiting a land which they occupied by the right of conquest, and which they were never able to subdue completely, the Hebrews were from the beginning compelled to settle their relations with the "strangers", that is, the Canaanite natives. They had a twofold object in view—to guard against the influences of idolatry to which they were exposed from constant intercourse with the heathen, and to conciliate the national animosities sure to linger among subjected tribes. They signally failed in the one object, but they succeeded perfectly in the other, and this success was due to a series of laws singularly humane and judicious. They strove with remarkable consistency to draw the strangers, both politically and socially, more and more closely within the circle of the Hebrew community and of equal brotherhood; they assimilated both the privileges and the duties of Israelites and non-Israelites; and their efforts finally culminated in the two maxims: "One law and one statute shall be for you and for the stranger that sojourns with you" (Num. XV. 14—16, 29; comp. Ex. XII. 49); and "Thou shalt love the stranger as thyself", which command involves the highest ethical standard attained by the ancient Hebrews (see *supra* p. 415). In no legislative portion of the Pentateuch are the rights of the stranger forgotten. The Decalogue expressly includes him in the repose

**you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for you were strangers in the land of Egypt: I *am* the Lord your God,**

of the Sabbath (Exod. XX. 10; Deut V. 14). The "Book of the Covenant" not only confirms this privilege, but speaks of him almost with the same regard and tenderness as our passage: "The stranger thou shalt neither vex nor oppress, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt", and "you know the heart of the stranger" (Exod. XXII. 20; XXIII. 9). The Deuteronomist pathetically supports the same injunctions with the reason that "God loves the stranger" (Deut. X. 18, 19; XXIV. 14); he assigns to him a share in the gleanings of fields, vineyards, and orchards (Deut. XXIV. 19—22); and he repeatedly exhorts the tribunals to judge him with the strictest impartiality (Deut. I. 16; XXIV. 17; XXVII. 19). The middle Books of the Pentateuch repeat the older provisions with respect to the relief and sustenance of the stranger; they forbid the Hebrews to take from him interest on loans, which they should readily grant; they secure to him all the rights of the cities of refuge in case of homicide; and our verses almost summarise all the preceding enactments on the subject (Lev. XIX. 9, 10, 33, 34; XXV. 35—37; Num. XXXV. 15). The historians and great prophets of the Babylonian period allude to the stranger also with the warmest affection. The first Book of Kings, in the prayer attributed to Solomon, writes, "As to a stranger who is not of Thy people Israel, but comes from a distant country for Thy name's sake (for they shall hear of Thy great name, and of Thy strong hand, and of Thy stretched out arm); when he shall come and pray towards this House; hear Thou in heaven Thy dwelling-place, and do according to all that the stranger entreats of Thee" (1 Ki. VIII. 41—43). Ezekiel, in describing his ideal commonwealth, ordains, "You shall divide the land by lot for an inheritance to you, and to the strangers that sojourn among you, . . . and they shall be to you as born in the country among the children of Israel; ... and in what tribe the stranger sojourns, there shall you give him his inheritance, says the Lord God" (Ezek. XLVII. 21—23). And the second Isaiah, writing about a generation later, and also delineating the future organisation of the restored commonwealth, declares, "Let not the son of the stranger that has joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord has indeed separated me from His people"; for "the sons of strangers that join themselves to the Lord to be His servants, every one that keeps the Sabbath from polluting it, and observes My covenant, even them will I bring to My holy mountain, and make them joyful in My House of prayer; their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon My altar; for My House shall be called a house of prayer for all people" (Isai. LVI. 3, 6, 7): which sentiments are hardly less remarkable than that beautiful utterance of the earlier Isaiah (XIX. 24), "In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the earth; whom the Lord of hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt My people, and Assyria the work of My hands, and Israel My inheritance". We can well understand, how such noble germs, in the course of time, budded forth into the noteworthy command, "Thou shalt love the stranger as thyself".

But in proportion to the stran-

**35. You shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight, or in measure; 36. Just balances,**

ger's rights, his obligations also were extended. If he desired to enjoy any of the religious prerogatives, he was, from early times, obliged to be circumcised, and thus to recognise the personal sign of the Hebrew's covenant with God (Exod. XII. 44, 48); he had to pledge himself to the faithful fulfilment of the Law, as far as it concerned him, and to attend its public reading on the Feast of Tabernacles every seventh year (Deut. XXIX. 10—14; XXXI. 10—14); he had especially to submit to all the civil and moral statutes, as the "law of retaliation" (Lev. XXIV. 22), and to the precepts of chastity (XVIII. 26); he had, above all, to shun every idolatrous practice, and the profanation of the name of Israel's God (XX. 2; XXIV. 16); he had to conform to all the sacrificial ordinances whenever he desired to present offerings, and to the ceremonies of purification connected with the ashes of the "red cow" (Lev. XVII. 8, 9; XXII. 18; Num. XV. 14—16; XIX. 10); he had to abstain from blood, and as his position became more and more defined, also from נְבֵלָה and טְרֵפָה (Lev. XVII. 10, 12, 15; comp. Deut. XIV. 20); he had to keep the Passover (Num. IX. 14), and to fast on the Day of Atonement (Lev. XVI. 29); and Talmudists declared, that any of strangers who infringed "the seven laws of the children of Noah", deserved death (Sanh. 57; see *supra* pp. 9, 10). Many of these points remained indeed long subject to fluctuations, but all tended ultimately towards amalgamating the Hebrews with their non-Hebrew neighbours. Nothing would, therefore, be more incorrect and more unjust than to reproach the Israelites with hatred of the stranger, whom, on the contrary, they befriended to the full extent permitted by considerations of policy and religion. These limits and the position of the various classes of strangers have been explained elsewhere (see Comm. on Exod. pp. 431—433). It must have appeared particularly important to the young and small colony of Zerubbabel and his successors to secure the good-will of the heathen population that had settled in the country; and they hoped to attain this end best by establishing the closest possible ties of social and religious community. Pseudo-Phocylides expresses indeed our command faithfully (ver. 39, Ἔστωσαν δ' ὁμότιμοι ἐπήλυδες ἐν πολιήταις), but instead of supporting it, as our text does, by a fact of Hebrew history, he adduces a general and speculative reason: "For we all lead a restless life in a strange country; and in their native land men find no firm footing".

**35, 36.** It is commonly admitted, that the administrative organisation, the police supervision, and the execution of penal decrees, were most imperfect among the ancient Hebrews, and that they form the chief defects of the secular legislation of the Pentateuch. In proportion as these drawbacks were felt, moral teachers deemed it imperative to lessen their dangerous effects by emphatically enjoining as private virtues what could not be enforced as public duties. The prophet Amos reproaches the sellers of corn, evidently without being able to threaten them with a legal punishment, that they "make the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsify the balances by deceit, in order to buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes,

**just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin shall you have: I *am* the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt.**

and to sell the refuse of the wheat" (Am. VIII. 5). Micah announces the most fearful calamities, scourges of nature, and the direct judgment of God, exclaiming, "Are there yet treasures of wickedness in the house of the wicked, and a scant measure that is abominable? Can I be pure with the wicked balances, and with the bag of deceitful weight-stones?" (Mic. VI. 10, 11; comp. Hos. XII. 8). The Book of Proverbs contains a number of sentences declaring, "that a false balance is an abomination to the Lord, but a just weight is His delight" (Prov. XI. 1); or "a just weight and balance are the Lord's, all the weight-stones of the bag are His work" (XVI. 11; comp. XX. 10, 23). And the Deuteronomist begins with fully enjoining the precept, "Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small; thou shalt not have in thy house divers measures, a great and a small; thou shalt have a perfect and a just weight, a perfect and a just measure shalt thou have"; and then he adds as an inducement for the observance of the precept a promise which has almost a pathetic force, and is appended to the fifth Commandment also: — "that thy days may be lengthened in the land which the Lord thy God gives thee" (Deut. XXV. 13—15). Yet Ezekiel deemed it expedient to give fresh directions on the same subject; and he was not satisfied with simply declaring, "You shall have just balances, and a just ephah, and a just bath", but he fixed the size of the chief measures and the standard of the chief weights (Ezek. XLV. 10—12). And lastly, our author, after introducing the command in a very comprehensive form, he tries to impress it upon the Hebrews by bidding them remember, that God delivered them from Egyptian bondage by His great *mercy*, and that it is, therefore, not too much to expect from them strict *justice*. The Rabbins worked out the subject with the utmost earnestness; they recommended the appointment of public overseers of weights and measures, and enjoined the severest punishment of any fraud; they forbade merchants to employ for weights materials liable to become lighter by wear or rust; to be quite safe, they advised sellers to give in a certain quantity; and they taught, that "the crime of illegal weights and measures is more heinous than that of incest; that it is, in fact, equivalent to the heresy of denying the Divine redemption from Egypt" (comp. *Philo*, De Just. II. 9; *Talm.* Bab. Mets. 61$^b$; Bab. Bathr. 88—90; *Maimon.* Hilch. Genev. VII. VIII; *Chosh. Mishp.* § 231; *Hotting.* l. c. pp. 332—334, 395—397). On ephah and hin, two principal measures for dry goods and for liquids respectively, see Comm. on Exod. pp. 296, 297.

The Hindoo law imposes the highest fines not only upon those who falsify scales or measures, but upon official examiners of coins who pronounce a good piece bad or a bad piece good; it inflicts heavy penalties, and partially corporeal chastisement, upon those who overreach customers, give short measure or light weight, adulterate goods, or try to give them a deceptive appearance; and with respect to a trader in counterfeited gold, it enacts that "by order of the king he must be cut in pieces with

**37. And you shall observe all My statutes and all My judgments, and do them: I *am* the Lord.**

razors," or that "he must at least lose three limbs of his body, and pay the highest fine" (*Manu* VIII. 203; IX. 286, 287, 292; *Yâjnav.* II. 240, 241, 244, 262, 297). In Egypt, false coiners and the manufacturers of false weights were condemned to have both their hands cut off (*Diod. Sic.* I. 78); and fraudulent practices of this kind were held in equal detestation by other nations, and were visited with similar punishments (comp. *Virg.* Aen. XII. 725, 726, Jupiter ipse duas aequato examine lances Sustinet; *Pers.* Sat. IV. 10, Scis etenim justum gemina suspendere lance Ancipitis librae; etc., comp. *Phocylid.* vers. 14, 15, Μέτρα νέμειν τὰ δίκαια, καλὸν δ'ἐπίμετρον ἐπαντλεῖν· Σταθμὸν μὴ κρούειν ἑτερόζυγον, ἀλλ' ἴσον ἕλκειν).

**37.** A miscellany of laws so large and so varied as that of our chapter requires a distinct formula to mark it as concluded; and the formula supplied in this verse is both appropriate and emphatic.

## CHAPTER XX.

Summary. — Now follows a collection of ordinances, especially on idolatry and incest, the transgression of which is to be severely punished; for such sins would disgrace a people protected by a holy God and meant to be holy like Him, and they would surely cause them to be expelled from their fertile land (vers. 7, 8, 22—26). The laws are directed 1. Against the worship of Moloch by the burning of children, for which crime both the perpetrators and those who connive at it are responsible (vers. 2—5); 2. Against necromancy and soothsaying (ver. 6); 3. Against disrespect of children towards their parents (ver. 9); 4. Against adultery (ver. 10); 5. Against marriage with the step-mother (ver. 11), and 6. with the daughter-in-law (ver. 12); 7. Against sodomy (ver. 13); 8. Against marrying the wife's mother or daughter (ver. 14); 9. Against coition with beasts (vers. 15, 16); 10. Against marriage with a half-sister (ver. 17); 11. Against cohabiting with a woman in her menses (ver. 18); 12. Against marriage with the aunt—the father's or the mother's sister, or the uncle's wife (vers. 9—20); and 13. with a sister-in-law (ver. 21); and 14. Repetition of the interdiction of necromancy and soothsaying (ver. 27).

**1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying,**

**1.** In no part of Leviticus is it more difficult to discover logical sequence, or even to point out the principles of arrangement that may have seemed logical to the final compiler of the Book, than in our chapter if considered in conjunction with the two preceding ones. We have first laws of incest (ch. XVIII), then a variety of moral precepts (ch. XIX), and then again mainly laws of incest (ch. XX). That the same author should have written these three sections, and placed them thus incongruously, is out of the question. And was the third series of laws at all necessary? As regards the cases enumerated, it is far less complete than the first; it does

not mention the marriage with the mother and the full sister, the granddaughter, and the mother-in-law; it introduces indeed a new element by specifying in each instance the penalties of the transgressor; but the author, had he been the same who composed the former code (ch. XVIII), would have inserted those penalties in this code or affixed them to it (comp. XVIII. 29). How, then, is this strange irregularity to be accounted for? The compiler, having concluded the ceremonial ordinances, intended, in this division of the Book, to put together the chief moral injunctions which appeared to him necessary to ensure a holy life (see *supra* p. 383); he gave the first place, and not without good reason, to the laws of chastity (ch. XVIII); he then joined with them a variety of precepts drawn from various sources, and so comprehensive that they might well be regarded as an expansion of the Decalogue (ch. XIX); and these two sections, forming indeed in themselves a small digest of laws, were soon held to be inseparably united. We may well imagine that the subjects of consanguinity and affinity, of matrimony and of sexual intercourse in general, engaged the Hebrew legislators at an early period. A few directions are given by the Deuteronomist (XXVII. 20—23; XXII. 22; XXIII. 1, 18); but fuller outlines were drawn up by a thoughtful and more advanced writer deeply imbued with the mission of the Israelites as a holy nation, and fearing the dangers of immorality which threatened their very independence, as it had destroyed that of the pagan Canaanites. Those outlines were no doubt the groundwork both of the systematic survey embodied in a preceding section (ch. XVIII), and of the less exhaustive but more rigorous enactments of our chapter, which we have reason to believe is the older of the two (see on ver. 18; comp. *supra* pp. 263, 264), and which, just on account of the spirit of inexorable severity that pervades it, was naturally employed as a welcome addition by the final reviser of the Book, unconcerned at the repetitions and incongruities thus inevitably arising. In this manner the analogies as well as the differences of the two chapters may be best accounted for—both of them, besides interdicting marriage between certain relatives, contain the prohibitions of adultery and of intercourse with menstruating women, of sodomy, of coition with beasts, and of human sacrifices offered to Moloch; and both of them enforce their commands by the same menace, conveyed in analogous terms, namely, that immoral or idolatrous practices on the part of the Hebrews will most certainly result in the forfeiture of their conquered land: but the one, the eighteenth, simply states the laws, and merely calls attention to their sacredness by repeatedly adding, "I am the Lord," your Lawgiver; whereas the other, the twentieth, less complete, and different in arrangement, mentions penalties of the offenders in intelligible gradations—death by stoning and burning or by the direct vengeance of God, penal inflictions imposed by the judges or childlessness. Again, the former warns the Hebrews rather negatively, not to follow the iniquities of the Canaanites, whereas the latter positively and with increasing emphasis exhorts them to strive after the holiness of God, and thus to prove that they merit the distinction of being His elected people.

Philological Remarks. — It is not enough to acknowledge a double authorship of the 18th and 20th chapters; it is necessary to explain the numerous and peculiar coinci-

**2. And thou shalt say to the children of Israel, Any one of the children of Israel, or of the strangers**

dences of both (which De Wette — Beiträge II. 294 — fails to do); yet these coincidences merely prove a common source, and they establish by no means a systematic continuity between the three last chapters (as Ranke — Untersuchungen, II. 98—100 — endeavours to point out). Nor ought it to be asserted that our chapter simply expresses "moral detestation", without enacting penal laws (as is supposed by *Graf*, Geschichtliche Bücher, p. 77); yet these laws cannot fitly be connected with the ordinances of the 18th chapter by the supposition that "the Law first appeals to the conscience of the individual man on the ground of his relation to Jehovah, and then enacts such penalties as the order of the state required, and as represented the collective conscience of the nation put into operation" (which is suggested in *Cook's* Holy Bible on Lev. XVIII. 24—30); for our chapter makes no allusion to several laws contained in the eighteenth chapter; and the latter not only has a general menace of punishment, "Whoever shall commit any of these abominations, the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people" (ver. 29), but in the concluding sentences (vers. 24—30), it manifestly appeals to "the collective conscience of the nation," and even foreshadows *national* calamities. — The resemblance of this with the 19th chapter is very slight; both have only the precepts on soothsaying and filial reverence in common (comp. XIX. 3, 31 and XX. 6, 9, 27), and they were evidently written independently of each other. The eleventh chapter which treats of clean and unclean animals, is of earlier date than ours (comp. ver. 25 and XI. 16, 17). — On Bertheau's device of combining the fourteen commands of our chapter with the six laws of the seventeenth into two "decalogues", see *supra* p. 346.

**2—5.** The stern and emphatic severity with which the sacrifices of Moloch are here forbidden, proves how much they tempted the people even in the post-Babylonian period (comp. Deut. XVIII. 10—12); there was in fact a danger that they might be overlooked and connived at by the authorities and the nation. Yet both humanity and the purity of the Hebrew creed which was then developed with unusual zeal, demanded above all the extirpation of those atrocities. Therefore, our legislator exhausts all means, and employs all weapons both civil and theocratic, to terrify the guilty and to awe the wavering. The punishment of the offender, whether he was a Hebrew or a stranger, was to be inflicted by the whole people, as a mark of their abhorrence, and as a powerful warning to all not to imitate his evil example; the punishment was death by lapidation, that is, he was first crushed with stones, and then burnt to ashes, that his body might be removed from the face of the earth and the sight of men (comp. *infra* on ver. 14): if the people, from weakness, or more culpably still, from sympathy with his crime, left it unpunished, the writer threatened that God Himself would avenge the guilt; that He would utterly destroy not only the sinner, but all the members of his family who, above all others, ought to have chastised their wicked kinsman, and also everyone who showed a disposition to follow in his footsteps. This unsparing rigour was justified for two rea-

**that sojourn in Israel, that gives of his seed to Molech, shall surely be put to death; the people of the land**

sons — because the offender had polluted the soil hallowed by the Temple (comp. XV. 31), and because he had profaned the holiness of God who was the only Ruler of the land and the people, and to whom alone veneration and homage were due (comp. Comm. on Lev. I. 399). The religious spirit which actuated the new colony after its re-organisation by men like Ezra and Nehemiah, worked a beneficial change with respect to the worship of Moloch also; and another code compiled not long after ours indeed repeats the prohibition and the reason, but in a much less vehement form: "And thou shalt not give any of thy seed to let him pass to Molech, and thou shalt not profane the name of thy God: I am the Lord" (XVIII. 21). — The Talmud (Shevu. 39[a]) explains: "If one member of a family is a publican (מוכס, lit. *oppressor*), all are publicans, and all protect each other; therefore God threatens the whole house with His displeasure and with heavy trials, though the sinner alone shall be destroyed" (והכרתי אתו). However, his relations, by permitting the crime, become his accomplices and, according to our text, share his punishments.

Lapidation, as is well known, was frequently resorted to by excited mobs for the exercise of summary justice or revenge (comp. Ex. VIII. 22; XVII. 4; 1 Sam. XXX. 6; Acts XIV. 5, 19; *Herod.* IX. 5; *Xen.* Anab. I. III. 1, 2; *Thucyd.* V. 60; etc. etc.). But as a legal punishment it was not usual in the ancient world; it is only mentioned as a Macedonian and a Spanish custom, and as having been occasionally employed by the Romans (*Curt.* VI. XI. 38; *Strab.* III. III. 7; *Philo*, In Flacc. c. 20). Among the Hebrews, however, it was very common; it was counted as the first and severest of the four modes of inflicting capital punishment — the three others being burning, beheading, and strangling —; and it was in the Pentateuch ordained for a variety of offences, especially those associated with idolatry and incest (comp. vers. 2, 27; XXIV. 10—16; Num. XV. 32—36; Deut. XIII. 6—12; XVII. 2—7; XXI. 18—21; XXII. 20, 21, 23, 24; Josh. VII. 25; 1 Ki. XXI. 10—13; Ezek. XVI. 40; XXIII. 47; 2 Chr. XXIV. 21; John VIII. 5; Acts VII. 58, 59); in certain cases it was even inflicted upon animals (vers. 15, 16; Exod. XXI. 28, 29); and its application was by the Rabbins considerably extended (*Mishnah* Sanh. VII. 1, 4 *sqq.*; *Targ.* Ruth I. 17). As regards the proceedings observed, the Bible contains no hints except the statements that it took place without the precincts of the towns, and that the men by whose testimony the criminal had been convicted, were obliged to throw the first stones (comp. Lev. XXIV. 14; Num. XV. 36; Deut. XVII. 7; 1 Ki. XXI. 10, 13; Acts VII. 58). But the Mishnah gives the following account, some features of which are possibly of remoter antiquity. When the offender is being led away to the place of execution, an official remains at the door of the law-court, while a man on horseback is stationed at some distance, but so that the former can see him wave a handkerchief, which he does when anyone comes declaring that he has something to say in favour of the condemned; in this case the horseman at once hastens to stop the procession; if the convicted himself maintains that he can offer proofs of his innocence or extenuat-

**shall stone him with stones. 3. And I will set My face against that man, and will cut him off from among his**

ing circumstances, he is taken back before the tribunals; and this may be repeated four or five times, if there appears to be the least foundation for his assertions. A herald precedes him all the while, exclaiming, "So and so is being led out to be stoned to death for this and this offence, and so and so are the witnesses; whosoever has to say anything that might save him, let him come forward and say it". Having arrived about ten yards from the appointed spot, he is publicly called upon to confess his sins; for "whosoever confesses his sins, has a share in the future life"; if is he too illiterate to confess, he is ordered to say, "Let my death be the expiation for all my sins". At four yards from the place, he is partially stripped of his garments. When the procession has at last reached its destination, he is conducted upon a scaffolding the height of which is that of two men, and after drinking "wine mingled with myrrh" (Mark XV. 23; comp. Matth. XXVII. 34, 48), to render him less sensible to pain, he is by one of the witnesses pushed down, so that he falls upon his back; if he is not killed by the fall, the other witness throws a stone upon his breast; and if he is still alive, all the people present cover him with stones. When the corpse, which is usually nailed to the cross, is in a state of decomposition, the bones are collected and burnt in a separate place; then his relatives pay visits to the judges and the witnesses, in order to prove that they bear them no hatred, and that they acknowledge the justice of the sentence; and they must show their grief by no external mark of mourning (comp. *Mishn.* Sanh. VI. 1—6; *Goodwin*, Mos. and Aar. V. 6, 7; *Carpzov*, Apparat. pp. 578—585; etc.).

Philological Remarks.— The particle וְ in וְאֶל (ver. 2) seems to indicate the close connection between this and the preceding chapters. In XVIII. 21 we find instead of יתן למלך more clearly יתן לְהַעֲבִיר למלך (see p. 399). —Jewish tradition explains, that the offender shall be put to death by order of the legal tribunals; but if these have not sufficient power and authority, the people shall kill him (Siphra): this view seems, however, hardly warranted; for the retribution was in the first instance to be carried into effect by the people, who exercised their primitive rights of sovereignty. —עם הארץ (comp. IV. 27) is rendered by Onkel. emphatically עמא בית ישראל, since the whole "house of Israel" is polluted by the offence. — The third verse (to למלך) seems almost superfluous; at least it can logically neither be connected with the preceding nor with the following verse; unless it be referred to rites of Moloch practised in secret, without the cognisance of the Hebrew citizens: thus understood, our passage would imply three cases — open crime, hidden transgression, and popular connivance. — פָּנַי has here (vers. 3, 5, 6), as in XVII. 10, the meaning of wrath (see p. 349); Onk. אתן ית רוּגְזִי (comp. *Maim.* Mor. Nev. I. 37, where other texts are mentioned in which פנים is supposed to have the same signification, as Ps. XXXIV. 17; Lament. IV. 16; etc.). — The "defiling of God's Sanctuary" (טמא את מקדשי, ver. 3) does not denote "dishonouring the congregation of Israel which is holy to the Lord", or "polluting the people as identified with their Sanctuary" (so Ebn Ezra, Rashi, Nachman., a. o.),

**people; because he has given of his seed to Molech, to defile My Sanctuary, and to profane My holy name 4. And if the people of the land in any way turn their eyes from the man, when he gives of his seed to Molech, so that they do not kill him; 5. Then I will set My face against that man, and against his family, and will cut him off, and all that go astray after him, to go astray after Molech, from among their people.**

in which sense the Bible never employs the word מקדש (XV. 31; Num. XIX. 13; etc. are no parallels); nor does it consist in presenting the sacrifices of Moloch in the Temple (so *Movers*, Phoeniz. I. 327), which was not done, since they were burnt in the valley of Hinnom (Comm. on Lev. I. p. 366). In XXI. 12, 23 the phrase חלל את מקדש יהוה is used in a more literal meaning than in our passage. — The words ואם הַעְלֵם יַעְלִימוּ וכ׳ are properly "and if the people of the land should indeed hide (turn away) their eyes from that man"; and this "turning away" may either be done in anger and vexation (Isai. I. 15; Prov. XXVIII. 27), or from a desire of overlooking some offence; the latter meaning is intended in our passage; Onk. and Jon. translate literally ואם···יכבשון···ית עיניהון; the Sept. explains ἐὰν δὲ ὑπερόψει ὑπερίδωσιν···τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῶν; the Vulg. paraphrases quod si negligens populus terrae et quasi parvipendens imperium meum dimiserit hominem; Luther has aptly, und wo das Volk im Lande durch die Finger sehen würde dem Menschen. Some of the more accurate editions write וְהַעְלֵּם and יַעְלִּימוּ, with dagesh in ל, in accordance with the Masoretic rule that if, in the middle of a word, a guttural has shwa quiescens, the consonant beginning the new syllable takes dagesh (comp. נֶעְלַּם in IV. 13; V. 2, 4; comp. Gramm. § 2.b). — In harmony with the Talmudical explanation above referred to, Targ. Jonath. renders in ver. 5, "And I shall choose My time to attend to that man and to the members of his family who take him under their protection, and shall chastise them with painful trials, but the man himself I shall destroy". Jonah ben Gannach and others explain משפחתו here figuratively, "any one who resembles him", which interpretation has justly been rejected by Ebn Ezra and others, since that sense is rather implied in the following terms את כל הזונים אחריו, which are rendered by the Sept. καὶ πάντας τοὺς ὁμονοοῦντας αὐτῷ, and by the Vulg. et omnes qui consenserunt ei; but Onk. and Jon. have more literally ית כל דטען בתריה.

**6, 27.** Those who "turn after the necromancers and after the wizards", to consult them shall be destroyed by God's direct retribution; but those who "have in them the spirit of the necromancer or of the wizard", that is, the soothsayers themselves, shall be stoned to death by the Hebrew people (ver. 27); for the first offence may often be committed secretly, whereas the soothsayers, harmless as long as they remain unknown, are amenable to the civil laws when they come forward to practise their dangerous and pernicious arts. See notes on XIX. 26, 31, p. 426.

Philological Remarks.— Rabbini-

6. And the soul that turns after the necromancers and after the wizards, to go astray after them, I will set My face against that soul, and will cut him off from among his people.

7. You shall, therefore, hallow yourselves, that you may become holy; for I *am* the Lord your God; 8. And you shall keep My statutes, and shall do them: I *am* the Lord who hallows you.

cal expositors account for the difference just alluded to by the supposition, that in the one case the offender remains unpunished because witnesses are wanting, or fail to come forward with their testimony; or because in the one case the transgressor is ignorant of the law, while in the other he has been forewarned (בהתראה; comp. *Talm.* Shevu. 36; Sanh. 65; *Rashi* and *Ebn Ezra* on ver. 27). — Though the terms אוֹב and יִדְּעֹנִי are usually *necromancer* and *wizard*, they signify occasionally the *spirit* or *demon* who works in these persons, and to whom reality and power were attributed; and in the latter sense the words are employed in ver. 27, "A man or woman, if there be in them אוב or ידעני" (see Comm. on Lev. I. 374, 376); and so the Vulg. (vir sive mulier in quibus pythonicus vel divinationis fuerit spiritus), De Wette, and partially the English Version. Others, disregarding or misunderstanding the word בהם, translate, "If a man or a woman is a אוב or a ידעני"; so the Sept. (ὃς ἂν γένηται αὐτῶν ἐγγαστρίμυθος), Luther (wenn ein Mann oder Weib Wahrsager oder Zeichendeuter sein wird); etc. — The construction of the feminine נפש first with the feminine (הַזֹּנָה), and then, according to the sense, with the masculine (אֹתוֹ), is of frequent occurrence (comp. II. 1, and note in loc., Comm. on Lev. I. 483; comp. also IV. 2; VII. 20, 21; XVII. 15; XVIII. 29; XXII. 6; etc.). — It his hardly necessary to point out the irregular place occupied by the twenty-seventh verse, which, if not omitted as superfluous, should be linked with the sixth verse (as is done by Bertheau, Gruppen, p. 210), or ought at least not have been put after the elaborate conclusion which winds up not only this chapter, but a series of sections. That verse appears like an isolated addition, and all speculations in which earlier and recent writers have indulged in order to point out some organic connection with the preceding portions, have been unavailing (comp. Comm. on Lev. I. p. XVIII note 5.)

**7, 8.** The ordinances directed against idolatry having been completed, they are marked as a distinct division of the chapter by a separate conclusion, in which the chief principle that underlies all these commands, that of *holiness*, is insisted upon with the utmost force: the Hebrews are called upon to "hallow themselves" by their moral exertions, till they "become holy" and lead a life of piety and righteousness; and they are encouraged to strive after this high aim because God Himself "hallows" them by His guidance and protection, by His laws, and above all by His presence within their community (see pp. 184, 406).

Philological Remarks. — About והתקדשתם וגו' see on XI. 44, p. 185: the Sept. omits והתקדשתם, and has

9. Indeed everyone that curses his father or his mother shall surely be put to death: he has cursed his father or his mother; his blood *shall be* upon him.

10. And the man that commits adultery with *another* man's wife, that commits adultery with his neighbour's

simply καὶ ἔσεσθε ἅγιοι, but the Vulgate renders sanctificamini et estote sancti, Luther heiliget euch und seid heilig; Jonathan paraphrases "and hallow yourselves and be holy in your bodies, so that I may accept your prayer with favour". — אני יהוה מְקַדִּשְׁכֶם "I am the Lord who hallows you", namely, by electing you from all the nations to be My people, and by giving you laws and institutions designed to lead to a holy life (comp. Exod. XXXI. 13, where מְקַדֵּשׁ is used in connection with the holiness of the Sabbath).

**9.** Some other enactments threaten death to anyone who "curses" or "smites" his father or his mother (Exod. XXI. 15, 17; comp. Matth. XV. 4; Mark VII. 10); but they have essentially a penal or civil character: in our verse the moral hideousness of the crime is impressed by the emphatic repetition "he has cursed his father or his mother," as if the simple statement of the fact were sufficient to reveal its enormity; and by the addition "his blood shall be upon him," which implies that he deserves indeed the most rigorous penalty, and that pity would be an unpardonable weakness. Similarly the Proverbs declare, "He who curses his father or his mother, his lamp shall be put out in utter darkness" (Prov. XX. 20; comp. XXX. 17). Jewish doctors maintain that the culprit was stoned to death; that the punishment, however, was only inflicted if, in cursing his parents, he had used one of the chief names of God (שם המיוחד), but not if he had employed such general epithets of the Deity (כינוי) as the Almighty, the Merciful, or the Longsuffering, in which case his punishment was flagellation: the penalty is the same whether the parents be still alive or not (comp. *Targ. Jon.* a young man or an old man that curses his father etc.; *Mishn.* Sanh. VII. 4, 8; *Talm.* Sanh. 85[b]; Shevuoth 37; *Maim.* Hilch. Mamrim c. V; *Yor. Deah* § 241; see *supra* on XIX. 3, p. 406). Parricide is provided for in no code of the Pentateuch (see Comm. on Exod. pp. 397, 398).

Philological Remarks. — The particle כִּי is pleonastically used with אשר. — The words דמיו בו, which occur only in our section (vers. 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 27), are rendered feebly by the Sept. ἔνοχος ἔσται (he shall be liable sc. θανάτῳ), and so Onk. קְטָלָא חַיָּב, and in ver. 16 דין קטול חייבין; Rashi, however, has more appropriately, and after the analogy of דמו בראשו in Josh. II. 19, "he has brought it upon himself to be killed;" Luzzatto la colpa della morte è in lui (comp. also 2 Sam. I. 16; 1 Ki. II. 37; Ezek. XVIII. 13; XXXIII. 4).

**10.** Among the laws of chastity, that against adultery justly occupies the first place, as it is concerns not only private morality but the welfare of the community; it almost seems as if these two considerations are implied in the apparently superfluous repetition, "the man that commits adultery with another man's wife, that commits adultery with his neighbour's wife"; that repetition certainly adds emphasis to the interdiction — "the other", who has been injured in his most sacred re-

wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put do death. 11. And the man who lies with his father's wife, has uncovered his father's nakedness: both of them shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be* upon them. 12. And if a man lies with his daughter-

lations, is "a fellow-man" (רֵעַ) whom we are commanded to love as ourselves. The punishment of the crime was probably death by lapidation; it was certainly so in the Babylonian time and in the following centuries; but Jewish tradition contends, that it should be death by strangling (חנק), and that this is meant wherever the Bible simply ordains, "he shall be killed" (מות יומת; comp. Ezek. XVI. 40; XXIII. 47; John VIII. 5; *Mishn.* Sanh. XI. 1—6; *Talm.* Sanh. 52. See notes on XVIII. 20, p. 398).

Philological Remarks. — The repetition of the words אשר ינאף וכ' has given rise to various strange translations and expositions: Jewish doctors curiously refer them the first time to the wife of a minor, the second time to the wife of a heathen, and deduce from our verse the rule, that a Hebrew woman can conclude a valid marriage neither with a minor nor with a heathen (*Siphra* fol. 92[a] ed. Schlossb.; *Talm.* Sanh. 52); or they apply those words the first time to a betrothed, the second time to a married woman (thus Targ. of Jonathan, who moreover adds, that the former was stoned to death, the other strangled — בשינק סודרא אקישא בגו רכיכא "by strangling with a soft handkerchief wrapped round a hard rope"); others contend, that the first time the words mean adultery with any stranger's wife (אשת איש), the second time with the wife of a kinsman (רֵעַ, *Weber* quoted by Rosenm. in loc.); and others again, supposing that the words אשת איש וכ' are a gloss inserted at a later period, when the phrase אשת רעהו had fallen into disuse (*Geiger*, Urschrift, pp. 240—243; Jüd. Zeitschr. V. 282), omit those words altogether (Dathe, a. o.). The Septuagint connects both parts illogically by ἢ, and the Vulgate by *et*; while Luther takes the second אשר ינאף וכ' as an explanation of the predicate, and translates, "Wer die Ehe bricht mit Jemandes Weibe, soll sterben, beide, Ehebrecher und Ehebrecherin, darum, dass er mit seines Nächsten Weibe die Ehe gebrochen hat"; which is quite appropriate as regards the sense, but grammatically inadmissible; for the subject concludes only after רעהו, as the Masorites also have indicated.

**11.** See notes on XVIII. 7, 8, pp. 390, 391.

**12.** See notes on XVIII. 15, p. 394; and about תֶּבֶל on XVIII. 23, p. 402.

**13.** See notes on XVIII. 22, p. 400.

**14.** The punishment fixed in this verse seems cruel and barbarous; for the first wife, whether she be the mother or the daughter, is legitimate and blameless; but we may presume, that the legislator had cases in view when the three persons, the man and both women, had agreed upon the double marriage, and thus shared alike the guilt of incest, or when the man married the mother and the daughter simultaneously. However, looking at the rigorous spirit of this chapter, and taking into account a general conception of antiquity, we may suppose, perhaps with greater probability, that as the first wife, though herself innocent, was the in-

in-law, both of them shall surely be put to death; they
have wrought pollution; their blood *shall be* upon them.
13. And if anyone lies with a man, as one lies with a
woman, both of them have committed an abomination;
they shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be*
upon them. 14. And if a man takes a woman and her
mother, it *is* wickedness; they shall be burnt with fire,

direct cause of an illegal and reproachful alliance, and was thus drawn, however unconsciously, into a vortex of guilt, she was regarded as accursed, and forfeited her life. The same ruthless consistency suggested, that all the relations, the cattle, and other property of a criminal should be given up to destruction like himself; that a beast which had been the cause or instrument of some iniquity should be killed, and its flesh remain untouched; nay that even inanimate objects by which murder had been perpetrated, or which had accidentally occasioned the death of a man, such as an axe or a tree, should be destroyed; the crime cries to heaven, and must be expiated; "the evil must be removed from the midst" of the holy people: such were the principles which earlier generations, partially fettered by notions of fatalism, carried out with a pertinacity bordering on paradox (comp. vers. 15, 16; Exod. XXI. 28, 29; Deut. XVII. 7, 12; Josh. VII. 24; etc.; see Comm. on Genes. p. 179; on Exod. p. 409). We must reject other explanations of our verse, for instance, that by "a woman and her mother" the man's mother-in-law and her mother is meant, as Jewish tradition gratuitously asserts (*Talm.* Sanh. 76[b]); or that "they" (אֶתְהֶן) — the women who are to be put to death — really means "one" (ἕν), or "one *or* the other", so that if the mother was the man's first wife, the daughter shall be killed, and conversely, as some Rabbins very curiously suppose (comp. Rashi, Ebn Ezra, Wogue in loc.); or that the three persons shall not really be burnt to death, but merely be branded with a hot iron, to mark them as infamous, as modern interpreters assume against the unquestionable meaning of the Hebrew terms (באש ישרפו; comp. *Clarke* in loc.).

It is true, that "lapidation" seems usually to have been followed by "burning" of the corpse, as is evident from the fate of Achan (Josh. VII. 15, 25); but it would be hazardous to contend, that the Bible uses both terms promiscuously to denote the same punishment. It is related, that a Jewish tribunal, to execute judgment upon the unchaste daughter of a priest, ordered that she should be surrounded by twigs and leaves of the vine, and that these should be lighted, so that she might be burnt to death. But the Rabbins, guided by a very doubtful analogy, supposed, that the burning must be carried out so as to leave the body externally unchanged by the flames, as was held to have been the case with the dead bodies of Aaron's two sons Nadab and Abihu (X. 5; see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 695); they considered, therefore, the decision of the tribunal just referred to as the act of heretical and unlearned Sadducees; and they devised the following mode of proceeding. The criminal is put into dung up to his knees so firmly, that he is unable to

both he and they; that there be no wickedness among you. — 15. And if a man lies carnally with a beast, he shall surely be put to death; and you shall slay the beast. 16. And if a woman approach to any beast, to have connection with it, thou shalt kill the woman and the beast; they shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be* upon them. — 17. And if a man takes his sister, his father's daughter or his mother's daughter, and sees her nakedness, and she sees his nakedness; it *is* ungodliness, and they shall be cut off before the eyes of the children of their people: he has uncovered his

move; then a soft handkerchief enveloping a hard one is tied round his throat, and is drawn tighter at the one corner by the first witness, and at the other by the second, till he opens his mouth, into which then molten lead is poured, so that it penetrates into his entrails and burns them. This penalty of "burning" was inflicted in ten cases of incest (comp. Jonath. in loc. בְּאַתְּכוּת אֲבַר לְגַוְּמְהוֹן; *Mishn.* Sanh. VII. 2; IX. 1; *Talm.* Sanh. 55, 67; *Maim.* Hilch. Sanhed. XIV. XV).

**15, 16.** See notes on XVIII. 22, 23, pp. 400, 401; comp. *supra* on ver. 14. Targ. Jonath. renders "you shall kill the man by lapidation, but the beast with a club (בקֻולְפּי); while other Jewish interpreters contend that the beast likewise was stoned to death (comp. *Siphra* in loc.; see also *Talm.* Sanh. 54, 55).

**17.** The abhorrence felt by the author at the idea of conjugal intercourse with a half-sister was so intense that he accumulated expressions both of moral detestation and of legal guilt; this vehemence was perhaps partially prompted by the circumstance, that the Hebrews had for very long periods deemed marriages with the half-sister unobjectionable, and that they were likely to be strengthened in this habit by their contact with the Persians (see notes on XVIII. 9, 11, pp. 391—393, and p. 357). The punishment here threatened by the author was no doubt meant to be death by the ordinary tribunals, not by the vengeance of God.

Philological Remarks. — חֶסֶד seems to be one of the strongest terms used in denouncing unlawful marriages, such as זִמָּה, תֶּבֶל, נִדָּה (p. 386); by way of antiphrasis, it means both grace and disgrace (comp. XIV. 34; Prov. XXV. 10; ברך to bless and to curse, etc.); and as it signifies sometimes God Himself (Ps. CXLIV. 2; Jon. II. 9), it is here *ungodliness* or impiousness: most of the earlier translators have *disgrace*, so Sept. ὄνειδος, Onk. קְלָנָא (in Gen. XXXIV. 14, he renders חרפה by חִיסוּדָא), Jon. גְּנַיי, Rashi חרפה, and similarly Rashbam and Ebn Ezra, Luzzatto cosa ignominiosa; but Vulg. nefaria res, Luther Blutschande; see also *Nachman.* in loc. Targ. Jonath. reproduces the Jewish view that before the revelation of the Law, God mercifully permitted marriages with sisters that the world might be peopled (comp. *Talm.* Sanh. 58b; see *supra* p. 357 note 14). — It is difficult to see why the man, and not also the woman, should "bear the iniquity"; hence the Vulg. translates עונו נשא by portabunt iniquitatem suam; it may be that, though the punish-

sister's nakedness; he shall bear his iniquity. — 18. And if a man lies with a woman *while she is* unwell, and uncovers her nakedness; he has laid bare her fountain, and she has uncovered the fountain of her blood; and both of them shall be cut off from among their people. —
19. And thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister, nor of thy father's sister; for *such a one* lays bare his kinsman; they shall bear their iniquity.
20. And if a man lies with his uncle's wife, he has uncovered his uncle's nakedness: they shall bear their sin;

ment of both parties was the same, the man's guilt was considered to be greater, since, as a rule, he was held to be the originator of the offence; but the singular number in the words quoted may merely be an incongruity of style not unfrequent in this chapter (see f. i. ver. 19, comp. on ver. 6), while in vers. 19, 20 the plural is used, עונם ישאו and חטאם ישאו.

**18.** This law well illustrates the fluctuations to which penal ordinances were subjected as the spirit of the times changed, and new light was gained by better experience. For it enacts death for an offence for which a later code (XV. 24) merely prescribes uncleanness during seven days; this inconvenience was then deemed sufficient to deter men from a practice that was indeed always regarded as a physical defilement, but gradually ceased to be held either injurious or criminal. We admit that the wording of both laws—ours and that of XV. 24—affords some specious grounds for harmonising them; but a sound and unbiassed interpretation can hardly agree with the device (see pp. 263, 264).

Philological Remarks. — אִשָּׁה דָּוָה, is literally a woman that is unwell, i. e. a woman in her menses (comp. XII. 2, and *supra* p. 211); thus Vulg. mulier in fluxu menstruo, Ebn Ezra חולה בעבור הדם, Luth. zur Zeit ihrer Krankheit; but Onkel. אתא מכאבא, and Sept. γυνὴ ἀποκαθημένη "a woman sitting apart" or shunned on account of her uncleannes (נִדָּה). — מקור דמיה, properly, "the fountain of her blood" (comp. XV. 19, ואשה כי תהיה זָבָה דָּם יִהְיֶה זֹבָהּ בבשרה); so the Sept. in XII. 7 (πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς), where, however, it is the flow of blood itself, as the Sept. renders inaccurately in our verse (ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς); Vulg. correctly fons sanguinis, Luther Brunnen ihres Blutes; but Onk. again כיאבת דמהא the deflement of her blood.

**19, 20.** See notes on XVIII. 12—14 p. 393. While in all preceding cases transgression is avenged by death, the marriage with the aunt is merely stamped as "an iniquity to be borne" by the offenders, and probably to be punished as the judges may deem fit; and the marriage with the uncle's or the brother's wife is menaced with childlessness, which, in the eyes of the Hebrews, was hardly less calamitous than death. It is evidently meant as a heavenly and supernatural retribution; and the term "childlessness" is to be taken literally, implying that such a union will not be blessed with offspring (comp. Gen. XV. 2; Jer. XXII. 30); it does not express that "the children resulting from the alliance, shall be regarded as belonging to the husband's departed brother, and not to the pa-

they shall die childless. — 21. And if a man takes his brother's wife, it *is* uncleanness: he has uncovered his brother's nakedness; they shall be childless.

22. And you shall keep all My statutes and all My judgments, and shall do them; lest the land, whither I bring you to dwell therein, vomit you out. 23. And you shall not walk in the statutes of the nations, which I cast out before you; for they committed all these *things*, and therefore I abhorred them. 24. And I have said to you, You shall inherit their land, and I will

rents, who shall be considered as civilly dead"; nor does it denote that the children shall be held illegitimate, and shall have no right of inheritance (St. Augustin; Schol. Vatican οὐ λογισθήσεται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν εἰς τέκνα; *Michaelis*, Mos. R. § 116; Ehegesetze Mosis § 76; *Thiersch*, Verbot der Ehe innerhalb der nahen Verwandtschaft, p. 20).

Philological Remarks. — The first part of the 19th verse is expressed in the negative form לא תגלה, and in the second person, which is also employed in that part of our chapter which introduces the general principle of the chief laws (vers. 7, 8). Thus a strange irregularity of construction arises, which in the second part of the verse is enhanced by the transition from the singular into the plural (הערה and ישאו): the Syriac Version has מקבל קרבן אנון, thus trying to effect symmetry at least in one respect. — Rabbinical interpreters distinguish between ערירים ימותו and ערירים יהיו (ver. 21), and aver that the former means that the couple will have children, but will lose them; the latter, that they will remain childless (*Talm.* Yevam. 55; *Siphra* in loc.), because the one case treats of cohabitation with a woman absolutely forbidden, the latter of marriage with a woman conditionally permitted (Wogue); which distinctions are unfounded. The Samaritan text has in both verses ימותו, and the Sept. in both ἀποθανοῦνται. — Sadducee and Karaite writers strangely explain that ערירים is here synonymous with ערומים *naked*, and suppose that the offenders were publicly exposed, and perhaps then put to death (comp. *Menah. ben Saruk sub* ער, ed. Filipowski p. 137; *Ebn Ezra* in loc.).

**21.** See notes on XVIII. 16, p. 394.

**22—26.** These verses form a worthy conclusion to the long series of the laws of purity, both physical and moral, which constitute the second great division of the Book of Leviticus (ch. XI—XX). They allude to nearly all the principles, motives, and ends which the Hebrew was desired to remember in the observance of those precepts; but they lay particular stress upon two points, one of a practical, and one of an ideal nature. The mission which the Israelites had received of executing God's judgments upon the Canaanites, was to serve them as a constant warning against heathen depravity, and as a powerful incentive to piety and righteousness; and it was to remind them that they should not be satisfied with ordinary standards of virtue and excellence, but try to imitate God Himself, and consider Him not only as their Protector and King, but as their great example. Hence, while, as a rule, the laws of other

give it to you to possess it, a land that flows with milk and honey: I *am* the Lord your God, who have distinguished you from the nations. 25. You shall therefore make a distinction between clean beasts and unclean, and between unclean fowls and clean; and you shall not make your souls abominable by beast, or by fowl, or by any manner *of living thing* that creeps on the ground, which I have singled out for you as unclean.
26. And you shall be holy to Me; for I the Lord *am* holy, and I have distinguished you from the nations that you should be Mine.

27. And a man or a woman that has the spirit of the necromancer or of the wizard, shall surely be put to death: they shall stone them with stones; their blood *shall be* upon them.

nations actually reflect their national character and history, those of the Hebrews merely represent high aspirations: and many of their religious and political ordinances remained ideas, without ever becoming realities.

Philological Remarks. — Similar principles and exhortations are conveyed in XI. 44—47; XVIII. 3—5, 24—30; XIX. 2; and we refer the reader to the observations made on these passages (comp. also Exod. XIX. 4—6; Lev. XXV. 23; Isai. XXIV. 1—6). — הַגּוֹי (in ver. 23) has a collective sense, the nations, as in XVIII. 28, etc. — In אֲשֶׁר תִּרְמֹשׂ האדמה (ver. 25) רמש is construed with the accusative, as in Gen. IX. 2. — The words אשר הבדלתי לכם לְטַמֵּא are literally "which I have singled out for you to declare unclean", that is, to be held unclean (comp. טַהֵר to declare clean, XIV. 7, 48, etc.).

**27.** See notes on vers. 6, 27, pp. 444, 445.

V.

# SUPPLEMENTARY LAWS ON THE PRIESTHOOD AND SACRIFICES.

## CHAPTERS XXI, XXII.

SUMMARY. — A priest shall not defile himself for the dead, except for his nearest blood relations, viz. father and mother, son and daughter, brother and full sister if an unmarried virgin (XXI. 1—3), but not for a wife or her relations (ver. 4). He shall yield to none of the usual forms of violent mourning (ver. 5), for he is holy to his God (ver. 6). For the same reason, he shall marry no dishonourable and no divorced woman; and if a priest's daughter is guilty of immoral conduct, she is to be burnt to death (ver. 9). The High-priest, besides being subject to the same rules as the common priests, shall not even defile himself for his dead parents, and he must only marry a virgin (vers. 10—15). — Aaronites afflicted with a bodily defect, are forbidden to do the service of the Sanctuary, though they may eat of the priestly portions of holy gifts and offerings (vers. 16—24). Anyone of them who consumes these portions in a state of impurity, whatever the cause, is threatened with excision by the hand of God (XXII. 1—7). A priest must not eat the meat of animals that have died of themselves or have been torn by wild beasts (vers. 8, 9). He may share the holy food with slaves he has purchased or who have been born in his house, but not with his "sojourners" and hired servants, nor with his married daughter if her husband is no Aaronite; however, if she becomes a widow or is divorced, and has no children, she may eat of her father's food in his house (vers. 10—13). An Israelite partaking of the holy things unintentionally, must restore to the priest what he has eaten, and add to it the fifth part of its value (vers. 14—16).—The offerings and sacred gifts, whether presented by a Hebrew or a stranger, to be acceptable to God, must be free from all blemishes; a slight exception is, however, made with respect to free-will offerings, for which animals with limbs abnormally large or small (שָׂרוּעַ וְקָלוּט ver. 23) are admitted (vers. 17—25). — No animal is to be offered that is not at least seven days old (vers. 26, 27). — A beast and its dam must

not be slaughtered on the same day (ver. 28). — The meat of praise-offerings is to be consumed entirely on the day when they are presented (vers. 29, 30). — Then follows an exhortatory conclusion (vers. 31—33).

1. And the Lord said to Moses, Speak to the priests, the sons of Aaron, and say to them, There shall none

**1—15.** In order justly to estimate the spirit of these and the following ordinances, it is essential to consider their probable date and origin. A few obvious combinations will assist us in this inquiry. We find in our chapter the dignity of the "High-priest" (הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל) not only firmly established, but surrounded with supreme sanctity, and clearly defined in its relation to that of the common priests (see vers. 1—9 and 10—15). But we have elsewhere tried to prove, by comparing the various notices of the historical and prophetic Books, that the office of High-priest, as conceived and described in the Pentateuch, did not exist among the Hebrews before the Babylonian exile, and that it is similarly conceived or described in no other part of the Hebrew Canon: it had, until an advanced period, no specific name, and occasionally two principal priests are mentioned with equal rights and powers. The High-priest of the Pentateuch was, in fact, one of the latest creations of the hierarchy; he was a logical link in an elaborate theory, the crowning stone of a largely planned edifice, at once the perfect type and the representative of the nation of priests—one, hereditary, holy, and inviolable (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 574—576, 631, 649). Not even Ezekiel, in sketching his ideal theocracy, mentions a chief of the priests, but invests all the members of the order with the same prerogatives, and imposes upon all the same duties. Thus he ordains that "the priests the Levites the sons of Zadok" shall "take for their wives neither a widow, nor one that is divorced, but they shall take virgins of the seed of the house of Israel, or a widow that had a priest before" (אלמנה מכהן, Ezek. XLIV. 22). The levitical compiler of our chapter had no doubt this passage in his mind, as we have before pointed out that not a few of the levitical laws were based upon the writings of Ezekiel (see p. 386); but he was obliged to deviate from his source in so far as he had to make a distinction between High-priest and common priests; and he enjoined that the former should marry none but a virgin, whereas he permitted the latter to take widows from any Hebrew tribe (vers. 7, 13, 14), thus being more stringent than the prophet with regard to the one, more lenient with regard to the others. Again, Ezekiel allowed all priests alike to attend to the dead bodies and the funeral rites of their fathers and mothers, their sons and daughters, their brothers and unmarried virgin sisters, and he forbade all alike to shave their heads and to let their hair grow dishevelled (Ezek. XLIV. 20, 25); but our author, again both more severe and more indulgent, forbade the High-priest to approach even the bodies of his parents, while he had no objection to common priests evincing their grief as mourners by allowing their hair to grow, and rending their garments (vers. 5, 10). The gradation had, in our legislator's time, become more marked and decisive; and extending

defile himself for the dead among his people. 2. But for his kin that is near to him, *namely,* for his mother,

downward to Levites, Non-Levites, and menial assistants (or *Nethinim*), it completed that hierarchical organisation which has been the object of so much undeserved blame and of so much undue praise (see Comm. on Lev. I. 578, 582—585, 587—597). We must, therefore, not expect to find in the laws of these sections that spirit of freshness and freedom which stirs a youthful nation, and which even now breathes in the works of the Hebrew prophets; we must rather be prepared for a spirit of severity and awe weighing down a struggling and sorely tried people, labouring in vain to ensure a noble and righteous life by a complex formalism.

The Hebrew priests were "holy to their God", and they ministered at the Sanctuary, the abode of life, in order to secure the spiritual energy of a chosen community; they owed it, therefore, both to God and the people, to shun uncleanness, and above all uncleanness caused by death. The priests of other ancient nations had indeed to observe similar rules; but they observed them to maintain their own sanctity and that of the deities they served; they were guided by no considerations for the inner life of the people, who followed their worldly pursuits, and guarded their secular interests. Thus the Egyptian priests and overseers of sacrifices were bound to keep aloof from "burials and graves, from impure men and menstruating women" (*Porph.* Abst. II. 50). Plato recommended that the Greek priests should shun tombs (*Plat.* Legg. XII. 3, p. 947 D). The Roman Flamen Dialis "never approached a place where there was a tomb with ashes, and never touched a corpse, though he was permitted to attend to funeral rites" (*Gell.* X. xv. 24). It was customary in Rome, to place a bough of the cypress tree before a house in which a dead person was lying, "lest a chief priest enter unwittingly and defile himself" (*Serv.* ad Aen. III. 64). No priest or augur was permitted "to engage in ceremonies of the dead" (*Tacit.* Ann. I. 62). If any one invested with sacerdotal dignities delivered a funeral oration, he spoke behind a curtain, though he was not forbidden to look at the corpse (*Dion Cass.* LIV. 28, 35; LVI. 31; *Senec.* Ad Marc. de Consolat. c. 15). However, Lycurgus, to banish prevailing superstitions, repealed all the common rules of defilement through the dead (see *supra* p. 198), permitted burials near the temples, and forbade weeping and lamentation (*Plut.* Institut. Lacon. c. 18); and the law of the Hindoos, which offers so many analogies with that of the Hebrews, extending the principle of relationship to the spiritual sphere, permits the student to bury not only his dead father and mother, but his instructors in the Vedas, and the Brahmin who invested him with the holy cord (*Manu* V. 91; comp. Comm. on Levit. I. 572).

Although the maxim, "A man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cling to his wife" (Gen. II. 24), remained among the Hebrews no empty phrase, as it became one of the leading principles of the laws of matrimony (p. 358); it could not be carried out to its full depth and extent as long as polygamy was legal; the idea of husband and wife being "one flesh" can only be realised if the man has only one wife, or at least only one wife at a time; therefore, a conjugal couple was assumed to be less closely allied than blood-relations; and

**and for his father, and for his son, and for his daugh-
ter, and for his brother, 3. And for his sister, a virgin**

priests, though permitted to approach the dead bodies of some of the latter, were absolutely forbidden to "defile and profane" themselves as husbands (ver. 4); for they were not to take part in the obsequies of their wives or of any of their wives' kinsmen. Thus here again a fine principle was partially unapplied, because it was opposed to popular notions and habits. Later Judaism, however, advancing in the right direction, placed the wife, and even the betrothed, in the same position as the six blood-relations enumerated in our text; and it included also the half-brother and half-sister, whether they were of the same father or the same mother as the priest. The Rabbins, moreover, held that the rules here given concerned only Aaronites fit for the holy service; and that they must still be observed by the male descendants of those families; the former decision is no doubt in harmony with the spirit of our text, while the latter is not, as the Aaronites, after the destruction of the Temple, can perform no functions as holy intercessors in behalf of the people (comp. *Talm.* Yevam. 60[a]; Nazir 42[b]; Macc. 21[a]; *Maim.* Hilch. Avel cc. I—III; *Yor. Deah* §§ 365—374).

Though the priests were allowed to take part in the funeral rites of their nearest relations as a tribute of affection, they were never to forget that their mission required constant and undisturbed serenity; that their outward appearance must never reflect sadness and distress, decay or death; and that, just in bereavement and affliction, they must prove by their calm demeanour that they knew how to merge worldly sorrows and interests in their Divine duties and aspirations (comp. Deut. XXXIII. 9): for they themselves were "near God" (קרובים), and they had to "bring near Him" (הקריב) those offerings which were "His food" (לֶחֶם), and by which the people conveyed their feelings of devotion and penitence (see Comm. on Lev. I. 560). By disturbing their peace of mind and yielding to earthly cares, the priests profaned the name of God, or His holiness. Therefore, they were forbidden to indulge in any external sign of mourning; they were neither to shave their head, nor to mutilate their beard; much less were they to make incisions in their flesh, by which the body would be permanently disfigured. These are indeed intelligible emblems of grief, and were commonly employed as such in the ancient world.

The hair of the head, regarded as a sign of vitality and strength, and therefore often used as a metaphor or a correlative of luxuriant growth and produce, was cut off to symbolise that the hand of death had cut off one that had once enjoyed life and vigour (comp. Job I. 20). Conquerors, desirous to show their power, allowed their hair to grow; while the defeated, to mark their weakness and disgrace, cut it off (*Herod.* I. 82; comp. Isai. III. 17, 24; VII. 20; XV. 2; XXII. 12; Jer. XVI. 6; XLVIII. 37; Ezek. VII. 18; Am. VIII. 10; Mic. I. 16; etc.; see also Ezra IX. 3). Young men vowed their locks to the gods, and deposited them in the temples as a proud sign of manhood. Locks of hair were, often profusely, placed on the bier, the corpse, or the tomb of beloved friends and relatives (*Hom.* II. XXIII. 135, 141—153; *Soph.* Electr. 51—53; *Eurip.* Orest. 96; Troad. 1182; *Quint. Smyrn.* III. 685 686; *Ovid.* Metam. VIII. 526, 527;

**that is nigh to him, who has had no husband, for her may he defile himself. 4. A husband shall not defile himself**

Trist. III. III. 51; *Stat.* Theb. VI. 194—196). Shedding tears and shearing the hair, says Homer, are the only honours we can accord to the dead (*Hom.* Od. IV. 197, 198; comp. *Cic.* Tusc. III. 26 or 62). When a Persian chief died, his subjects cut off not only their own hair but that of their horses and beasts of burden (*Herod.* IX. 24; comp. Jon. III. 7, 8). The only exception to the general custom were the Egyptian priests, who regularly every third day shaved off all the hair of their body for the sake of cleanliness, but allowed it to grow in times of mourning (*Herod.* II. 36, 37).

On the beard as a symbol of manliness and dignity, and on cuts and incisions made in the body as marks of grief and as means of expiation, we have above made a few observations which apply with even greater force to the priests than to the people (see on XIX. 27, 28, pp. 427–429). But with regard to the High-priest, who was now raised to the loftiest eminence both in his duties and privileges, two other ceremonies of mourning were proscribed: he was not to let his hair be dishevelled, and he was not to rend his garments (ver. 10); though these most usual forms of expressing grief were doubtless originally forbidden to the entire priesthood (see *supra*; comp. Comm. on Lev. I. p. 697). Neglected and disarranged hair was not only deemed undignified in the High-priest, but unbecoming in one who ministers before his Lord and King. Rending of the garments, always suggestive of overpowering sorrow, and of happiness irrevocably destroyed, would have been sinful in the High-priest, whose vestments, made "for glory and distinction", symbolised his holy mission and functions, bore sacred emblems, and conveyed, both individually and collectively, the ideas of unity and integrity, and therefore also of inward harmony and peace (see Comm. on Exod. pp. 522—580; on Lev. I. 580).

We may trace these laws likewise to the works of Ezekiel as their source. Alluding to the impending death of his wife, the prophet writes: "The word of the Lord came to me, saying, Son of man, behold, I take away from thee the delight of thy eyes with a stroke; yet thou shalt neither mourn nor weep, nor shall thy tears flow; forbear to cry, make no lament for the dead, bind the turban of thy head upon thee, and put on thy shoes upon thy feet, and cover not thy beard, and do not eat the bread of men. So I spoke to the people in the morning, and in the evening my wife died; and I did in the morning as I was commanded" (Ezek. XXIV. 15—18). And as a practical illustration of these severe rules of self-control, the levitical compilers inserted the commands given to Aaron and his two younger sons when the two elder ones had suffered a sudden and awful death for profaning the Sanctuary: "Do not let your heads be dishevelled, nor rend your clothes, lest you die, and lest He be wroth upon all the congregation; . . . and you shall not go out from the door of the Tent of Meeting, lest you die; for the anointing oil of the Lord is upon you" (X. 6, 7). Yet we have proofs that the priests were not always subjected to the same austerity; on special emergencies they adopted all the ordinary marks of affliction and distress (2 Ki. XIX. 2); in earlier times their

**among his people, to profane himself. — 5. They shall not make baldness upon their head, neither shall they shave off the corner of their beard, nor make any cuttings in their flesh. — 6. They shall be holy to their God,**

human feelings and affections were allowed fuller scope; domestic grief was accepted as a valid plea for neglecting even the most important official duties; in fact, the unnatural "killing of the flesh", which later assumed so many deplorable forms, was a fruit of that hierarchical over-refinement which unreasonably divided the unity of human powers, and created an artificial and fatal opposition between man's spiritual and worldly instincts (comp. X. 16—20; see Comm. on Lev. I. 637, 704—706).

Nor could even in much later periods that unbending rigour be maintained; nature, stronger than the most logical organisation ever devised, asserted its rights, and broke through the burdensome trammels; and we find priests and High-priests giving vent to passionate grief and indignation by rending their garments, by covering their heads with ashes, and sitting in sackcloth; and the Mishnah, yielding to necessity, legalised rites of mourning for the High-priest, and merely controlled them in accordance with his dignity, ordaining, for instance, that in bereavement he should rend his garments in the lower parts where the tear is less visible, while others must rend them across the chest; and that he should sit on a couch while others sit on the ground (comp. 1 Macc. XI. 71; Matth. XXVI. 65; *Jos.* Bell. Jud. II. xv. 4; *Mishn.* Horay. III. 5; Sanh. II. 1; comp. *Porph.* Abstin. II. 50).

As according to the Pentateuch, the Hebrews were singled out from the nations, and the priests from the Hebrews, for holiness and the diffusion of spiritual truth, the one were not to intermarry with pagans (see p. 356), and the others were in their matrimonial relations always to remember their sacred calling (see p. 366); and as their office was hereditary, it was the more incumbent upon them to study the purity of their race. They were, therefore, forbidden to marry a disreputable (זוֹנָה) or a fallen woman (חֲלָלָה), or even one that had been divorced from her husband, since in the latter case also she was, as a rule, not free from guilt; while the High-priest was besides to take no widow, probably because she had already borne another name, or because, as Philo expresses it, "the holy seed was to be sown in a pure and untrodden field, and the offspring should have no admixture of the blood of any other house" (*Philo*, De Monarch. II. 9); he was, in fact, to take none but a blameless virgin; by any other alliance he would "profane his seed among his people" (ver. 15). But the levitical legislator did not go farther; he did not desire to extend to the social sphere the strong religious separation that had been established between the priests and the people; he permitted the High-priest to marry a virgin, and the common priest a virgin or a widow, from whatever tribe; he could not make the barrier between the sacerdotal order and the other classes of the Hebrew people as rigorous as between the latter and the pagan nations, since the entire Hebrew community was invested with holiness, and the creation of so-

**and not profane the name of their God; for they present the offerings of the Lord made by fire, *which are* the food of their God; therefore they shall be holy. 7. They shall not marry a courtesan or a dishonoured woman, nor shall**

cial castes was impossible. However, as the holiness of the people differed from that of the priesthood not only in degree but in quality, the notion gained ground in the course of time, that priests ought to marry within priestly families; and it seems that during the last centuries of the Jewish commonwealth this view was extensively acted upon (comp. Luke I. 5). Josephus indeed merely states that a priest's wife must be a Jewess who has neither been a captive, nor has been married to a foreigner, one who has never gained her living by a cheating trade or by keeping an inn, so "that the stock of the priests may continue unmixed and pure" (Ap. I. 7; Ant. III. xii. 2); and Philo says essentially the same in reference to common priests; but as to the High-priest, he observes with great decision that God "commanded him to marry not merely a woman who was a virgin, but also one who was a priestess, the daughter of a priest, so that both bridegroom and bride might be of one house, and as if it were of one blood" (De Monarch. II. 11). Yet such a law occurs nowhere in the Pentateuch, and was subsequently devised because it seemed logically to follow from the position and office of the High-priest; just as later teachers assumed as positively that he ought to live in monogamy. That stricter view seems already to be expressed in the Septuagint version, and was therefore the more readily adopted by Philo (see Philol. Rem.). Clerical celibacy, which was compulsory in some Greek tribes, could not be tolerated, much less recommended or enjoined among the Hebrews, who regarded marriage as an important religious duty (see *supra* pp. 375, 376; comp. *Paus.* VII. xxv. 8; VIII. xiii. 1).

It is well known how scrupulously and anxiously, in later times, the genealogies of the priests were preserved, and those of their wives scrutinized. The documents were sent from all countries to the central authorities in Jerusalem. No woman was admitted as a priest's wife, unless her descent was found blameless and legitimate four or five generations upwards. The stricter Rabbins declared that, as a rule, a priest must not marry the daughter of a foreigner or of a released slave even in the tenth generation; though he may marry a woman whose father or mother was a proselyte. If a town had been besieged and was taken by the enemy, the wives of all the priests were divorced from their husbands, because they were supposed to have suffered violence, unless the contrary was established by valid proofs. John Hyrcanus, according to a narrative preserved by Josephus and the Talmud, fell away from the Pharisees and joined the Sadducees, because the former had not given him sufficient satisfaction when, at a public banquet, some one had declared that he—Hyrcanus—should be content with the civil government, but should resign the office of High-priest, since his mother had been made prisoner at the capture of Modin. The Jews boasted that they possessed lists of their High-priests, from father to son, ex-

**they take one that has been divorced from her husband; for he *is* holy to his God. — 8. Thou shalt therefore sanctify him; for he presents the food of thy God; he shall be holy to thee; for I, the Lord who sanctify**

tending over more than two thousand years, though we know that the succession was broken more than once, and that the High-priesthood was altogether of very late introduction. Even in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah many priests married foreign wives, and the Mishnah alludes to a High-priest who married a widow.

Some other nations were hardly less careful with regard to priestly marriages. Thus the Hindoo law ordains that a Brahmin should choose a wife not from a family distinguished by great wealth, but from one which has produced at least ten illustrious scholars, and which is free from all hereditary infirmity and illness; she must be a virgin of his own caste; one "who has all the attributes of excellence"; her name should be agreeable and auspicious; she must not be related to the Brahmin either from the father's or the mother's side up to the sixth generation; she ought to have neither too much nor too little nor reddish hair, and to be healthy and comely; "her gait should be graceful like that of a flamingo or a young elephant"; she must not be "intolerably loquacious"; she must have brothers, lest her father take away her eldest son to bring him up as his own child; she should be younger than her husband, and he must truly love her (comp. Ezr. II. 62; IX. 1, 2; X. 18, 19; Neh. VII. 64; XIII. 28—30; 2 Chron. XXXI. 16—18; *Philo*, De Monarch. II. 8—11; *Joseph.* Vit. 1; Ap. I. 7, and *Zipser* ad loc.; Ant. XIII. x. 5; *Mishn.* Bikkur. I. 5; Yevam. II. 4; VI. 4, 5; Kethuv. II. 9; Kiddush. IV. 4—6; Midd. V. 4; *Talm.* Yevam. 56[b], 59[a], 61, 68, 79[b], 84; Kethuv. 17; Kidd. 66[a], 71; *Manu* III. 4—12; *Maimon.* Hilch. Issur. Biah, cc. 17—19; *Even Haëzer* § 6; *Selden* De Success. in Pontific. Ebraeor. lib. II. cc. 2—5; *Yâjnav.* I. 52—54; Comm. on Lev. I 563, 576, 577).

Philological Remarks. — The priests are usually designated בני אהרן הכהנים; in a few very late compositions only the sequence of the words is reversed, viz. הכהנים בני אהרן, and our passage (ver. 1) has the latter formula, which is meant to glorify the order of the priests as being wholly descended from Aaron (comp. besides, 2 Chron. XXVI. 18; XXXV, 14; Neh. X. 39): this circumstance, immaterial as it may appear, is an accessory proof of the very late date of this section—a conclusion to which a Jewish divine, though starting from peculiar premises, has also arrived (*Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. III. 112, where he observes: "this portion of Leviticus belongs likewise to a time which had the exaltation of the priests as Aaronites much at heart, and both its matter and its form support this supposition"). — Bertheau (Gruppen, pp. 216—228), comprising the contents of XXI. 1 to XXVI. 2 under the heading of "miscellaneous laws," divides them in accordance with his usual principles, but with more than usual success, into four groups or seven "decalogues". — The Talmud (Kiddush. 78) endeavoured to remove the contradiction between the words of Ezekiel (in XLIV. 22) והאלמנה אשר תהיה אלמנה מכהן יקחו and our section (vers. 7, 14) by translating those words as follows, "And any widow

you, *am* holy. — 9. And the daughter of any priest, if she defile herself by being unchaste, she profanes her father: she shall be burnt with fire.

10. And *he that is* the High-priest among his brethren,

who is really a widow, anyone of the common priests may take her" (comp. Uzziel in loc. וארמלתא די תהי ארמלתא מְשׁאר כהניא יסבון); and the Masorites evidently desired to express the same sense by providing אלמנה with a distinctive accent: but it is unnecessary to observe that neither the phrase itself nor the context bears such a version. A recent commentator remarks: "A somewhat stricter rule for the priests' marriages was revealed to the prophets in later times" (*Cook's* Holy Bible in loc.): was the ordinance of the Pentateuch repealed or superseded by the prophet's revelation? — The word נֶפֶשׁ is here (ver. 1) used in the sense of *dead person* or *corpse*, as in XIX. 28, p. 430, comp. XXII. 4; Onk. renders here מִית (comp. infra ver. 11 נַפְשֹׁת מֵת); and the parallel passage Ezek. XLIV. 25 has אל מֵת אָדָם לא יבוא.— In לא יִטַּמָּא בְּעַמָּיו the verb and the suffix are in the singular, though they must be construed with the plural הכהנים, an irregularity very frequent in these portions (comp. XX. 17, 19; and notes *ibid.* p. 451): in our passage those words may be understood in a distributive sense — "none of them shall defile himself"; the Vulgate repeats sacerdos (ne contaminetur sac.), while the Sept., deviating from the original Hebrew, has the plural, οὐ μιανθήσονται ἐν τῷ ἔθνει αὐτῶν; and so also in ver. 3 ἐπὶ τούτοις for לָהּ, which refers only to the nearest noun לאחותו, and in ver. 7 ἅγιοι ἔσονται for קָדֹשׁ הוּא (the Vulg. consecrati sunt): which are a few proofs showing the tendency of the Greek Pentateuch to more symmetrical constructions. — The phrase שְׁאֵר הַקָּרֹב אֵלָיו (ver. 2) is almost synonymous with שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ (XVIII. 6, see p. 389), meaning his near kinsman or blood relation; Sept. aptly τῷ οἰκείῳ τῷ ἔγγιστα αὐτῶν, and Onk. לְקָרִיבֵיהּ דְקָרִיב לֵיהּ; but Vulg. erroneously in consanguineis *ac* propinquis; and Jewish tradition takes שְׁאֵרוֹ as "his wife", or as a synonym of בְּשָׂרוֹ (comp. Gen. II. 24); and so Targ. Jonath. לְאִנְתְּתָא דְקָרִיבָא לְגוּפֵיהּ, that is, his lawful wife; but this explanation is artificial and opposed to the context (comp. ver. 4). Hence we are inclined to interpret the words אחותו · · · הַקְּרוֹבָה אֵלָיו (ver. 3) as *full* sister, in contradistinction to half- or step-sister; although we admit that they may be construed with the succeeding words, and mean a sister who, not having been married, has remained associated with her own family, and "near" her brother, whereas by marriage she would enter into the family of her husband and become with him "one flesh". The Septuagint renders הקרובה אליו literally τῇ ἐγγιζούσῃ αὐτῷ, Luther questionably die noch bei ihm ist, the Vulgate omits the words. — In accordance with Jewish tradition, Jonathan adds after "who has had no husband", the qualification, "and who is not betrothed." — The words לֹא יִטַּמָּא בַּעַל בְּעַמָּיו (ver. 4) can, in our context, only refer to the priest as husband (בַּעַל, comp. 2 Sam. XI. 26; Joel I. 8; etc.), as distinct from son, father, and brother: in the former position he must not, in the latter relations he may "defile himself" by attending to funeral ceremonies; and thus some ancient and modern interpreters have

upon whose head the anointing oil was poured, and who is consecrated by putting on the garments, shall not let *the hair of* his head grow wild, nor rend his clothes;
11. And he shall not go near any dead body; not for

understood the phrase (e. g. Targ. Jonath. though unjustly restricting the prohibition to unlawful wives, Ebn Ezra, Rashbam, Engl. Vers. Marg., De Wette, Knobel); but others take בַּעַל in the sense of "chief", and either translate generally "a chief in his people (רַבָּא בְּעַמֵּיהּ) shall not defile himself" (Onkel., Arab., a. o.), or they restrict the command to the priest or High-priest, "he shall not defile himself, being a chief among his people" (Engl. Vers., Rosenm., Michael., Baumgarten, Zunz, Luzzatto, a. o); or they still more questionably render as if the Hebrew text were לְבַעַל, "he shall not defile himself even for a ruler of his people" (Vulg., Syriac, Dathe; Luther an irgend einem das ihm zugehört unter seinem Volke); the Sept. represents בַּעַל by ἐξάπινα suddenly, that is, perhaps, quickly, or for a slight cause, as if reading בְּפֶתַע פִּתְאֹם as in Num. VI. 9, or as has been conjectured בגעל which is suddenly in Syriac; and Ewald curiously suggests that בַּעַל means *besides* or *otherwise*, almost like the Arab. بعد. Keil (Comm. p. 128) takes indeed בַּעַל as husband or head of the family, but supposes that the deflement here meant is of the kind caused by the offences specified in vers. 7 and 9; but this construction is impossible, as the two intervening verses (the 5th and 6th) have no relation either to husband or chief of the household. — At the beginning of the 5th verse, the Sept. adds ἐπὶ τῷ νεκρῷ; this is the sense required by the context (comp. XIX. 28); and so the verse has been understood by Jewish tradition (comp. *Siphra* in loc.; *Talm.* Kiddush. 36; Menach. 20). — On קָרְחָה (ver. 5) see *supra* on XIX. 28 (p. 430), where the masculine form שֶׂרֶט is used. — The term לֶחֶם יהוה "bread or food of the Lord", at first taken in a literal, and subsequently in a figurative sense (Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 6—8), is by the Septuagint rendered "presents" (δῶρα), in order to avoid the anthropomorphism, and by Onkel., Jon., Luther, a. o. for a similar reason simply "offering" (קֻרְבָּן). The Vulgate translates incensum Domini *et panes* Dei sui, which implies a double inaccuracy, for לחם אל' is the apposition to אשה יה' (comp. ver. 21), whence *et* is superfluous, and לחם is not restricted to the shew bread (panes, sc. propositionis, so also Luther in ver. 21), but applies to any sacrifice or oblation. The words "and they shall not profane the name of their God" (ver. 6, ולא יחללו וכ'), refer evidently to defilement in connection with death; but they were generalised by Jewish tradition, and understood to mean that a priest should, under penalty of destruction by the hand of God, perform no sacred function in the Temple on the day when he had taken a bath of purification (i. e. when he is טבול יום; comp. *Talm.* Sanh. 83; Zevach. 17a; *Maimon.* Hilch. Biath Mikd. c. 4).— חֲלָלָה (ver. 7) is literally "a profaned," dishonoured, or fallen woman, who is no habitual prostitute (זונה; Sept. βεβηλωμένη; Vulg. vile prostibulum, in ver. 14 sordida; Luth. a. o. eine Geschwächte); but Jewish tradition supposes that the word means the offspring of some unlawful priestly alliance, as for instance, the daughter of a High-priest and a widow, or the

his father or for his mother shall he defile himself.
12. And he shall not go out of the Sanctuary, nor profane the Sanctuary of his God; for the crown of the anointing oil of his God *is* upon him: I *am* the Lord.

daughter of a common priest and a divorced woman (comp. *Talm*. Kidd. 77), and thus also Jonathan renders (דאיתילידא מן פסילא).—"Thou shalt sanctify him" (וְקִדַּשְׁתּוֹ, ver. 8) is equivalent to "he shall be holy to thee" (קדוש יהיה לך) — the people shall consider and treat the priests as sacred persons, because God, the holy One, has invested the Hebrews themselves with holiness, and therefore wishes those who stand between Him and the people to be regarded as no ordinary men. Jewish tradition deduces from those words the duty of the Israelites to honour the priests and Levites by allowing them precedence in all religious privileges, whether in the Synagogues or in social gatherings (see *Talm*. Gitt. 59; *Maim*. Hilch. Kele Hammikd. c. 4; *Orach Chay*. §§ 135, 201; see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 654 note 3).—Jewish doctors, anxious to mitigate the rigour of the law with respect to the unchaste daughter of a priest (ver. 9), explain, evidently against the legislator's intention, that it applies only to betrothed and married women; thus Targ. Jonathan qualifies the priest's daughter as מְאָרְסָא, Ebn Ezra as בעולה אי ארוסה, and Rashi observes, that "all agree that the text does not refer to unmarried women" (comp. *Talm*. Sanh. 50, 51, 66[b]).—אִישׁ כֹּהֵן is simply a priest, like אִישׁ שַׂר (Exod. II. 14) a chief, אִישׁ נָבִיא (Judg. VI. 8) a prophet, though אִישׁ may have been premised to emphasize the dignity (comp. ver. 7 אִשָּׁה זֹנָה).—תֵּחֵל is the fut. Niph. of חלל, instead of תֵּחַל (see Gramm. § LXII. 4.c), and means, therefore, "she will be defiled," as in ver. 4 the infinit. לְהֵחַלּוֹ is "to defile himself"; and so render the Sept. (ἐὰν βεβηλωθῇ), Ebn Ezra, Eng. Vers., a. o.; some translate, "if she begins to be unchaste" (Onk., De Wette, a. o.), which, however, would require תָּחֵל, as חלל in the sense of beginning occurs only in the Hiphil (comp. Gen. IX. 20; Deut. II. 25; etc.); and the Vulg. has quite freely si deprehensa fuerat in stupro.—On מִלֵּא יָד (ver. 10) to consecrate, to install, see Comm. on Lev. I. 557; and we may add that the Samaritan Version renders יד by אתרה place, place of honour, or dignity, "and who has fully attained his high position," and so Abu Said (وملا مكانه; comp. *Kohn*, Samar. Stud. p. 74).—As is not unfrequently the case, the infinitive לִלְבֹּשׁ את־הבגדים defines and supplements the preceding notion וּמִלֵּא את ידו, and the sense is "he was consecrated for his office *by putting on* his holy garments" (comp. V. 4; VIII. 15, and notes in locc.; see Gramm. § 98. 5). Many of the ancient versions render the words literally and therefore indistinctly, as Onk. and Jon. "he who has presented his offering to put on (לְמִלְבַּשׁ) his garments"; Sept. τετελειωμένου τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἐνδύσασθαι τὰ ἱμάτια; a. o; the Vulg. more clearly, though inaccurately, cujus manus in sacerdotio consecratae sunt, vestitusque est sanctis vestibus; but Luther correctly und seine Hand gefüllt ist dass er angezogen würde mit den Kleidern; and aptly De Wette der eingesetzt ist mit Anziehung der Kleider.—הַבְּגָדִים, with the article, are the garments *par excellence*, the High-priest's own holy or official garments (comp.

**13. And he shall take a wife in her virginity. 14. A widow, and a divorced and a dishonoured woman, *and* a courtesan, these shall he not take; but he shall take a virgin of his own people *to* wife. 15. And he shall**

Gramm. § 83. 4). Targ. Jon. adds, at the conclusion of the 10th verse, "in the time of distress" (בשעת אניקי), justly extending the command to any trouble, and not limiting it, as has frequently been done, to times of bereavement. — The reasons which induce us to take פרע in the phrase את ראשו לא יפרע in the sense of letting the hair be dishevelled, and not in that of uncovering (Sept. ἀποκιδαρώσει, Vulg. discooperiet, Engl. Vers., Luther, Michael., Bähr, a. o.), or of shaving the head (Gesen., Maurer, a. o.), bave been stated in Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 699, 700, where the distinction later adopted between פרע and קרע as two different modes of tearing garments has also been adverted to. In other connections פרע may indeed be understood as uncovering the head (XIII. 45, *supra* p. 234; Num. V. 18, comp. Comm. on Lev. I. 285). — The words לאביו ולאמו (ver. 11) are emphatically placed first — "*not even* for his father or for his mother shall he defile himself" (see Gramm. § 75. 4). — Considering the connection of our laws with the narrative of the death of Nadab and Abihu (X. 1 *sqq.*), we can hardly doubt that the words ומן המקדש ··· לא יצא (ver. 12) mean, "and he shall not go out of the Sanctuary", his permanent abode (comp. 1 Sam. I. 9; III. 2), to attend to funeral rites (*Ebn Ezra* אחר המת); for in that passage (X. 7) we find instead of מן המקדש the term מפתח אהל מועד "from the door of the Tent of Meeting"; the translation "he shall not leave the holy things or his condition of holiness", is too vague and general, and moreover necessitates a different translation of the second מקדש in the same verse (Sept. καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων οὐκ ἐξελεύσεται, καὶ οὐ βεβηλώσει τὸ ἡγιασμένον or τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἡγιασμένον τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ; Vulg. nec egrediatur de sanctis, ne polluat Sanctuarium Domini): the doctors of the Mishnah also disagreed on the subject, some taking מקדש here as Sanctuary, others as state of holiness or purity (*Mishn.* Sanh. II. 1). In X. 7 we have instead of נֵזֶר שֶׁמֶן simply שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת יהוה מִשְׁחַת אלי, and both phrases are not essentially different; the term נֵזֶר in our passage seems chiefly to refer to the copiousness of the High-priest's anointment, which encircled his head like a *wreath* (comp. ver. 10; see *Talm.* Kerith. 56), whence he was simply called "the anointed priest" (הכהן המשיח, IV. 3, 5, 16; VI. 15; comp. VIII. 12; XVI. 32; Num. XXXV. 25; Comm. on Lev. I. 574); but נֵזֶר may also imply that his *crown* marked him as spiritual chief, and that his *distinction* and anointment *separated* him from the rest of the people (comp. Num. VI. 7; *Carpzov*, Appar. Hist. Crit. p. 60). The Sept. has simply τὸ ἅγιον ἔλαιον, Vulg. oleum sanctae unctionis; Onk., Jon., a. o. render literally כליל משח רבותא; and others take נזר separately in the stat. absol. (Luther, die heilige Krone, das Salböl seines Gottes; a. o.). — After the words "and he shall take a wife in her virginity" (ver. 13), the Greek translators add ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ, that is מעמיו, as in ver. 14; they seem to have been of opinion that the High-priest should only marry a priest's daughter, and therefore taken עמיו as "his relatives", which

**not profane his seed among his people: for I the Lord do sanctify him.**

**16. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 17. Speak to Aaron, saying, Whosoever *he be* of thy seed, in *all***

meaning is indeed by some attributed to that word wherever it occurs; certain it is, that Philo, who read the Pentateuch only in the Septuagint translation, understood our passage in that sense (see *supra*); whereas Ezekiel merely prescribes that a priest's wife should be "from the seed of the house of Israel" (מזרע בית ישראל, Ezek. XLIV. 22). The Vulgate also, in paraphrasing the words ולא יחלל זרעו בעמיו (ver. 15) by ne commisceat stirpem generis sui vulgo gentis suae, evidently desired to convey that a High-priest should marry within his own tribe.

**16—24.** Everything associated with the service of the perfect God, was to be perfect, and above all His ministers, who had been sanctified by election and anointment and were clothed in holy garments, who constantly approached His altars to present faultless offerings, and "came near" the vail which shrouded His mysterious presence. A priest, therefore, was not only to be "perfect" in his life, but also in his person, which was to be the fit abode of a pure soul, and to reflect Divine similitude and holiness. Not that he required great physical strength; for his duties were not onerous, as the menial services were entrusted to the Levites, who, on their part, were assisted by the *Nethinim*. But he was disqualified not only by such striking defects as blindness or lameness, a fractured hand or foot, but by any blemish that mars the symmetry of the body, and is displeasing to the eye, by disproportionate or stunted growth, and by any irregularity which points to some hidden fault in the organism, as for instance a flattened nose or humped back, a dwarfish size or a scabby skin. Health and harmony, vigour and freshness were to distinguish the men who, as mediators with God, were to secure for the people all those boons, together with other and far more precious blessings; and the same motives prompted the law that priests should only officiate during the years of their strength and unimpaired manhood (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 571, 572). However, as, through Aaron, all his descendants had for ever been singled out and hallowed, no priest could entirely forfeit or renounce the privileges of his birth. Therefore, even those Aaronites who on account of some physical blemish, were unfit for sacerdotal functions, received for their sustenance portions from the holy and most holy gifts, of course from those stores only which were set apart for distribution among all the members of the order, whereas other revenues were reserved for the officiating priests (see Comm. on Lev. I. 546; comp. *Jos.* Bell. Jud. V. v. 7; and on the difference between "most holy" and "holy things," קדשי הקדשים and קדשים, Comm. l. c. pp. 76, 77, 619, 620).

Keeping these principles in mind, it would obviously be unjust to suppose that faultless and comely priests were demanded in the Hebrew Temple, exactly as faultless and comely attendants were required in the palaces of Eastern kings (comp. Dan. I. 4); for at the time when the laws of this section were framed, the earlier and ruder stages of religious cul-

HH

their generations, that has a blemish, let him not approach to present the food for his God. 18. For any man that has a blemish, shall not approach — a blind

ture had long been passed, and the idea of organising the service of the Sanctuary on the model of a royal court, had been essentially abandoned, or was at least subordinated to more ideal aims. Nor are the true depth and meaning of those commands reflected in the Talmudical view, which is thus expressed by Maimonides (Mor. Nev. III. 45): "The Hebrews were forbidden to admit to the holy service any one with a personal defect; . . . for the multitude does not appreciate a man for that which is his true form [for his mind or intelligence], but for the perfection of his limbs, and the beauty of his garments; those laws were, therefore, given to make the Temple honoured and respected by all" (and similarly Abarbanel, *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. I. vii. 3. a. o.). The legislator did not so much study the relation in which the priest stood to the people, but that in which he stood to God; and Maimonides himself adduces, immediately afterwards, the traditional opinion that the Levites, who were engaged at the Sanctuary even more constantly than the priests, were not required to be faultless in form, and were incapacitated for their functions only if they lost their voice for chaunting the sacred hymns (comp. *Talm.* Chull. 24[a], הלויים אין נפסלים אלא בקול).

We have before adverted to the analogy of our laws with the priestly ordinances of the Greeks and Romans and other nations (Comm. on Lev. I. p. 571); and we shall in this place only add a few supplementary remarks. The Hebrews insisted that their priests should be healthy and free from bodily defects, but they never made *beauty* a necessary qualification, as the Greeks did in some instances (*Pausan.* VII. xxiv. 2; IX. xxii. 2); not merely because their sense of the beautiful was not so highly developed, but because they were better able to separate the physical from the spiritual sphere, and because, according to their notions, the chief element of perfection is the fitness, and not the beauty of things. The Hebrew writer declared, "God saw that everything that He made was *very good*"; whereas the Greeks called the world *beauty* (κόσμος). Nor did the Hebrews, as more untutored nations did, unduly prize a tall and imposing stature, since they did not believe that only "majestic men are capable of great deeds" (*Curt.* VI. v. 29): though Saul towered high above all others, his more illustrious successor was much too small to wear his armour; and in praising the beauty of Absalom, the Hebrew historian, besides alluding to his luxuriant hair, merely adds, "From the sole of his foot to the crown of his head, there was no blemish in him" (2 Sam. XIV. 25).

As might be expected, the Rabbinical teachers were anxious to carry out the commands of our section with the utmost scrupulousness. In the second Temple, a special chamber was set apart in the Court, in which the great Sanhedrin examined all the Aaronites. Those who were declared to be physically unfit for the sacred office, "put on black garments, wrapped themselves in a black cloak, and went away in silence," to be subsequently employed for such services as selecting wood for the altar; but those found to be perfectly

man or a lame one, or one that has a flat nose, or
anything superfluous, 19. Or a man that is broken-footed,
or broken-handed, 20. Or crook-backed, or a dwarf,

qualified, put on white garments and a white cloak, and at once joined their brethren to assist in the sacred functions; and then they gave to their friends a feast, which they opened with this benediction: "Blessed be the Lord, because no blemish has been found in the seed of Aaron the priest; and blessed be He, because He has chosen Aaron and his sons to stand and to serve before the Lord in His most holy Sanctuary" (*Mishn.* Midd. II. 5; V. 4). These regulations and usages seem to be in harmony with the spirit of the Bible; but the Jewish doctors fixed no less than 142 disqualifying defects, partly constitutional and partly transitory (מום קבוע or עובר), which they derived, by their well-known rules of deduction, from the twelve irregularities named in our verses, and some of which are — a pointed or a flat head, a complexion too red, or too white, or too black, squinting eyes of different colours, eyes as large as those of a calf, or as small as those of a goose, diminutive or spongy ears, an upper lip hanging over the under lip, or conversely, broken teeth, knees bent inward or bent outward, crooked legs, large warts on the fingers or toes, broad and flat feet. Persons suffering from mental debility (שוטה) were of course not tolerated as priests: *moral* blemishes are not specified, as they are in the laws of the Parsees; but we know that priests convicted of idolatry, homicide, or any other great offence, were not permitted to officiate. According to later conceptions, the faultlessness of the body was meant to be "a symbol of the perfection of the soul"; such views were, in the course of time, minutely worked out; blindness, for instance, was understood to point to want of intelligence, fracture of the hand to indolence, flatness of the nose to deficiency of judgment; and elaborate typical expositions naturally followed in due course (comp. *Philo*, De Monarch. II. 5, ἅ μοι δοκεῖ πάντα σύμβολα τῆς περὶ ψυχὴν εἶναι τελειότητος; *Theodor*. Quaest. 30 in Levit.; comp. *Mishn*. Bechor. VI. 1—12; VII. 1—6; *Talm*. Kiddush. 66[a]; Bechor. 43; *Maim*. Biath Mikd. c. VI; *Selden*, De Success. in Pontif. II. 5, 6).

"And Moses told it to Aaron, and to his sons, and to all the children of Israel" (ver. 24): although all these laws concerned the Aaronites only, they were communicated to the whole people, that they might watch over the faithful observance of commands so important for their spiritual and temporal welfare. The Pentateuch makes no pretension to priestly secrets and mysteries, but clearly explains all its ordinances; though fully developing an hierarchical organisation, it does not sever the intellectual bonds between people and priests, and is, in this point, greatly superior to other hierarchical systems, especially those of the Hindoos and Egyptians. But on the other hand, it does not bear comparison with the liberal institutions of some other ancient nations, as the Greeks, who admitted all citizens to sacred offices, and made no castelike distinction between priests and people.

Philological Remarks. — As regards חָרֻם (ver. 18), most of the ancient translators, if they do not retain the word (as Onk. and Syr. חרים), associate with it some defect or ano-

**or that has a blemish in his eye, or is scurvy or scabbed, or has his stones broken; 21. No one of the seed of Aaron the priest that has a blemish shall come nigh**

maly of the nose; thus Sept. κολοβόρις (stump-nosed; Gr. Ven. the synonym σιμός), though another reading is χολοβοχείρ (and similarly Parchon he who has but one hand); the Vulg. has for חרם או שרוע parvo vel grandi vel torto naso; Jonath. דלקי בחוטמיה (one whose nose is injured); and the Talmud (Bechor. 43[b]) has this explanation: "The nose is bent in at the upper part (חוטמו שקוע), so that he paints his two eyes at once" (כוחל שתי עיניו כאחת), that is, one whose nose is so flat that he has no difficulty in passing the paint-brush from one eye to the other; and in this sense the word is also taken by Rashi, Kimchi, a. o.; and similarly by Luther (mit seltsamer Nase), Engl. Vers. (one that has a flat nose), Clericus, Michaelis, Rosenmüller (qui nasum habet depressum ut simiae), Gesenius (drawn in or depressed at the nose, comparing the Arabic خرم to bore through the cartilage between the nostrils of a camel for putting in a ring), De Wette (Stumpfnasiger), a. o.; some propose a more general sense (as Knobel, "one who has suffered some mutilation, especially in the face"); but there is no valid reason for deviating from the traditional acceptation. — Nearly the same agreement prevails with respect to שָׂרוּעַ; for it is generally referred to שרע in the sense of *stretching out* or *extending* (comp. Isai. XXVIII. 20 קצר המצע מהשתרע "the bed is too short for a man to stretch himself on it"; comp. شراع the long neck of the camel, and סֶרַח Exod. XXVI. 12), and it is therefore rendered "a person with limbs abnormally extended"; some have attempted to fix these limbs, while others, avoiding hazardous surmises, have left them undefined; thus the Syr. has כריך אדנא large-eared; *Talm.* Bechor. 40[a] "a person who has one member larger than the other, as one eye or one shoulder"; similarly Bochart, Michaelis, Gesen. one who has a member, especially the ear, too long; De Wette Langgliedriger; some, however, give to the term a different modification, without apparent reason, as Engl. Vers. one that has anything *superfluous* (Onk. in XXII. 23 יתיר, Gr. Ven. ὑπερτεταμένον, Ar. Erp. and Abus. زيد, Kimchi עודף), for instance, more than ten fingers or ten toes (2 Sam. XXI. 20, Knob.), or anything *abnormal* (Luther mit ungewöhnlichem Glied); others, on the contrary, assume that it implies some deficiency, as Sept. ὠτότμητος with ears slit or cropped (and so *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 287, comparing the Arab. سلع), Parchon a person who has but one foot, Targ. Jon. one whose thighs are dislocated (דמשתמטין ירכיה); others, as Menachem ben Saruk, suppose that שרוע is the opposite of דק, and consider it synonymous with גב "a stout and heavy man, too clumsy and awkward to perform the sacred services" (comparing הרים גבנונים Ps. LXVIII. 17). Taking שרע in its most comprehensive sense, we are led to explain שרוע one who has too large or too many limbs, or whose body is abnormally "enlarged". — One of the qualifications of the Athenian priest was that he was required to be ἀφελής, which is explained to mean "one who has neither anything too much (πλεονάζων) nor too little in his body" (compare Etym. magn. s. v.).—The terms שֶׁבֶר רֶגֶל and שֶׁבֶר יָד (ver. 19) are intelligible in themselves (Sept. σύντριμμα

**to present the offerings of the Lord made by fire; he has a blemish, he shall not come nigh to present the food of his God. 22. He may eat the food of his God,**

χειρός and ποδός, Vulg. fracto pede and fracta manu, etc.); they do not apply to *weakness* in the hand or foot (so Luther, der an einem Fuss oder Hand *gebrechlich* ist), nor to a fracture that has been cured without leaving a trace, but to one that permanently disables the limb and causes disfigurement; such instances may not have been rare, since "among the ancient Hebrews a fracture of the hand or foot was probably but seldom entirely cured." — The term גִּבֵּן (ver. 20) has, with some unanimity, been rendered *hump-backed* or *crook-backed* (Sept. κυρτός, Vulg. gibbus, Onk. גְּבִין, Kimchi, Parchon hump-backed like a camel, and so Luther, Engl. Vers., Rosenm., Gesen., etc.). But some doctors of the Mishnah (Bechor. VII. 2) explain גִּבֵּן to be a person who has only one eyebrow or none, and Siphra on our passage adds "one who has many eyebrows"; others suppose that it means a person whose eyebrows are pressed down (שגביניו שוכבין), or so long that they reach over the eyes, and others again one who has two backs and two spines; and these interpretations occur in other Jewish works also; thus Targ. Jerus. has, besides hump-backed, two other translations — "his eyebrows cover his eyes" (דגביניו חפין עינוי), and "he has no hair on his eyebrows" (so also the Peshito; comp. *Siphra* in loc.; *Talm.* Bechor. 43[b]; Targ. Jonath., Rashi, a. o.). However, the connection of גִּבֵּן with גַּב is decidedly in favour of some defect of the *back* rather than of the *eyes*. — With respect to דַּק, the Masorites and many interpreters suppose, and no doubt justly, that it is to be taken absolutely, and not joined with בעינו, and the word has commonly been rendered *dwarf* (דַּק properly thin, small, hence in Aethiopic *boy*), as by Onkelos (דַּקָּא), Jonathan (ננים), the Talmud (Bechor. 45[b]), the Peshito (זעיר), Ebn Ezra (קצר קומה), a. o. (comp. *De Dieu*, Crit. Sacr. p. 38); or it has been taken as *emaciated* (since דַּק is also lean, meagre), so the Engl. Vers. Marg. (too slender), Dathe (nimis gracilis), Gesenius (one having a withered limb), De Wette (Dürrer), Knobel (an krankhafter Abmagerung einzelner Gliedmassen oder des ganzen Leibes leidend, comparing, not altogether appropriately, Lev. XXVI. 16; Deut. XXVIII. 22; 1 Ki. XIII. 4; Zech. XI. 17), Keil, a. o.; while the Septuagint has ἔφηλος *sun-burnt* or *freckled*. Some, however, construe דַּק with בְּעֵינוֹ, and understand some disease of the eyes; so the Talmud (Bechor. 38, "he who has a cataract or a black amaurosis הדק שחור in his eye"), and similarly Rashi and Nachmanides (דק means טילא, that is, lat. tela, french toile, veil; comp. דֹּק Isai. XL. 22 thin cloth), Vulgate (lippus blear-eyed) and Saadiah (أخفش dim-sighted, purblind), Kimchi (one who has a skin over his eyes) and Parchon (a vitiated condition of the eyelids by which the eyes are very much narrowed and contracted), a. o. — The words תְּבַלֻּל בְּעֵינוֹ are rendered by the Septuagint πτιλλὸς τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, that is, one suffering from an affection of the eyelids, when these become swollen and inflamed, while the eyelashes fall off; those words would, therefore, mean some disorder which gives to the eye a "confused" (בלל) appearance; and, in the absence of a sure tradition or a safe etymology, we are disposed to acquiesce in that trans-

*both* of the most holy and of the holy; 23. Only he shall not go in to the vail, nor come nigh to the altar, because he has a blemish; that he profane not My Sanc-

lation. But many other versions have been ventured; for instance, quite generally "one that has a blemish in his eye" (תְּבַלֻּל, so Ebn Ezra, Eng. Vers., Michael. morbus vel noxa oculi), or more specially "one who has a white film on the eye" (Vulg., Dathe, albuginem habens in oculo), or a white spot or streak (Gr. Ven. λεύκωμα, Saad. وكت, Ar. Erp., Gesen., De Wette, Knob.), or a skin (Luther), or a sty (חִלִּיז, Onk.; Bochart χάλαζα), or a constant dripping (Menachem ben Sar. רטיבת הראש היורדת לעינים, Parchon), or in whose eye the white is mixed up with the black (Jonath.; comp. also *Talm.* Bechor. 38[a]; Rashi, Kimchi, *Michael.* Supplem. pp. 181—184). The Syriac translator, in his perplexity, gives three versions, "a person whose eyebrows have fallen off, or who is dim-sighted, or has a white film over his eye". Diseases of the eye were, as they are still, very frequent in Palestine, and modern travellers have noticed the prevalence of leucoma, nebula, pannus, and other disorders (comp. *Pruner*, Krankheiten des Orients, pp. 432 *sqq.*; *Hartmann*, Skizze der Nilländer, p. 410; *Tobler*, Nazareth in Palästina, pp. 273 *sqq.*). —The two next words גָּרָב and יַלֶּפֶת seem to denote kindred infirmities, and they have by ancient and modern interpreters been rendered with great agreement. The Talmud (Bechor. 41[a]) observes that גרב and ילפת are two kinds of scurvy (שחין), the former being dry within and without (חֶרֶס), the latter dry within but moist without (חוזרית המצרית), and "clinging" to men till they die (ילפת identical with דבק; comp. לפת Judg. XVI. 29); and similarly Onkelos (גַּרְבָן and חֲזָזָן), Jonathan (דמלי חרסין יבישין and דמלי חזזיתא מצריתא), Septuagint (ἐν ᾧ ἂν ψώρα ἀγρία and λειχὴν malignant scurvy and scab), the Vulgate (jugem scabiem habens and impetiginem in corpore habens), Luther (grindicht and schäbicht), Engl. Vers. (scurvy and scabbed), De Wette (der die Krätze und der die Flechte hat), etc. Both maladies are, in a subsequent portion of this section, also mentioned among the defects which rendered animals unfit for the altar (XXII. 22); and it is interesting to find that the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles, in specifying several disqualifying disorders, mentions at least one which seems to be kindred with those named in our passage; for it proscribes כל מזרח וכל שבח וכל מרזח (line 16), where מזרח seems to be analogous to גָּרָב (comp. *Movers*, Opferwesen der Karthager, p. 115).—Lastly, the legislator excludes from the priesthood a man that is מְרוֹחַ אָשֶׁךְ, which words have by most of the ancients been rendered "one with crushed testicles" (Onk. מריס פחדין; *Mishn.* Bechor. VII. 5, Siphra, Kimchi, a. o. שנמרחו אשכיו ונמעכו, Rashb. מעוך ביצים, Sam., Ar. Erp., etc.), and this translation has, no doubt with good reason, been adopted by nearly all modern interpreters. But Targ. Jonath. has דפחדוי נפיחין וקליטין "one whose testicles are swollen or contracted," and Menach. ben Saruk נפוח אחד; the Mishnah (l. c.) gives these additional explanations—one that has no testicles or only one (so also the Septuagint, Syriac, and Targ. Jerus., μονόρχις, דחסר כוליא, חדא אשכא; however, the notion of *one* is not implied in the Hebrew words); or a person that has wind (רוח) in his testicles; or one whose testicles have "a black

tuaries: for I the Lord do sanctify them. — 24. And Moses told *it* to Aaron, and to his sons, and to all the children of Israel.

appearance" (מראיו השכים); Judah ben Koreish (followed by Knobel, who proposes to read מְרֻחַּ אשך) suggests enlargement of the scrotum (but אֶשֶׁךְ, Syr. אשכא, is testicle or stone, not scrotum); and some render vaguely — "a ruptured person" (Vulg. herniosus, Saad., Abus., Luther der gebrochen ist). An earlier writer, anxious for the holiness of the Hebrew community, had already ordained that anyone "whose stones are crushed, or whose privy member is cut off, shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord" (Deut. XXIII. 2): the injunction of a similar law with regard to the Hebrew priests is, therefore, the less surprising if it be remembered that the idolatrous worship of some ancient tribes was conducted by castrated ministers (as the Galli, the Megabyzi, a. o.; see Comm. on Lev. I.571; comp. *Creuzer*, Symbol. II. 370, 574). — A priest with a bodily blemish shall not come near the vail (אֶל־הַפָּרֹכֶת לֹא יָבֹא, ver. 23): this general sense seems to be implied in the words, which embrace the translation both of the Sept. and of the Vulg. πρὸς τὸ καταπέτασμα and *intra* velum, and which have so been understood by Jewish tradition (comp. *Talm.* Zevach. 98[a]; Bechor. 43[b]); such a priest was, much less, to lift the vail, and thus to enter into the Holy or the Holy of Holies. Ebn Ezra explains, "he shall not come near the vail for the purpose of sprinkling seven times the blood upon the altar," which interpretation is too contracted and specific. — After וידבר (ver. 24) some such complement must be understood as the Vulg. adds, cuncta quae fuerant sibi imperata (Rashi המצוה הזאת, Luth. und Moses redete solches, Dathe haec omnia). — It seems clear that this portion belongs to the latest compositions of the levitical code; the distinctness in characterising the priests as being "near God," the clear division of the offerings in "holy" and "most holy" ones, and the great minuteness in enumerating disqualifying defects — all this points to a time advanced indeed in theological refinement, but very far removed from that largeness of thought and that freedom of spirit which guided the old prophets.

## CHAPTER XXII.

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Speak to Aaron and to his sons, that they keep aloof from

**1—7.** The sacrifices and gifts presented at the Sanctuary were meant either to secure the favour of God, or to provide sustenance for His ministers; and thus hallowed both by the purpose they served, and by the place in which they were offered, they were to be consumed by the priest, nay approached and touched by him, only in a state of purity; for as perfection of bodily form was the external counterpart of holiness, so was physical purity its ritual type; and the one great end of all priestly

the holy things of the children of Israel, and that they profane not My holy name *in those things* which they consecrate to Me: I *am* the Lord. 3. Say to them, In *all* your generations whosoever of all your seed approaches the holy things, which the children of Israel consecrate to the Lord, having his uncleanness upon him, that soul shall be cut off from My presence: I *am* the

functions and of the entire service was holiness. From this point of view, we may understand the extreme rigour of threatening with excision by the hand of God any Aaronite who might come near the sacred gifts, whether "holy" or "most holy", in a condition of uncleanness: he was considered to have "profaned the holy name" (שֵׁם) of God, that is, His chief and most essential attributes, and was, therefore, no longer to be suffered to come near Him, and serve in His presence (ונכרתה ··· מלפני). He was to keep aloof from sacred things especially at times when he was affected with any disorder or any uncleanness recalling the notions of decay, dissolution, or death, such as leprosy or "a running issue", defilement, however indirect, through a corpse or a dead "creeping thing" (שֶׁרֶץ): in these and all similar cases, he was with respect to the duration and the removal of his pollution, to conform to the rules prescribed in the levitical code; and then only, having waited the lawful time and performed the necessary purifications, he was restored to all the privileges of his order (see *supra* pp. 198, 201). Even on all ordinary occasions, the priests were commanded, on penalty of death, to wash their hands and feet before entering upon their duties at the altar or in the Holy; not merely in order to remove any *uncleanness* unwittingly contracted, but to guard against any *uncleanliness*; for which purpose the large brazen laver was placed in the Court between the altar and the Holy (comp. Comm. on Lev. I. 572, 573). That similar rites and precautions were prescribed by other ancient legislations, has been observed before (see *supra* pp. 197, 198; comp. *Manu* II. 176; V. 138, 145; *Yâjnav.* III. 48; *Athen.* IX. 75; *Herod.* II. 37; *Plut.* Quaest. Rom. 73; etc. etc.); we will only add one striking analogy. The Zend-Avesta, even more rigorous than the most advanced levitical writers, because regarding every physical defect or deformity as a taint stamped upon the body by Ahriman, excludes from sacrificial meals, on the one hand, calumniators and liars, persons known to be passionate or quarrelsome, malicious or spiteful, haughty or averse to prayer; and on the other hand, the blind and the deaf, men whose teeth exceed the common size, or who are affected with any symptom threatening to undermine life or health: a sacrifice of which any such person had partaken, would it was taught be rejected, and be considered as not having been presented at all (see *Khorda-Avesta* XXI. 92, 93; *Vendid.* II. 80 *sqq.*; comp. *Spiegel*, Avesta, III. 55, 56).

Philological Remarks.—The term וְיִנָּזְרוּ (ver. 2) that "they keep aloof" or "separate themselves" (*Siphra* אין נזירה אלא פרישה), as many translators render (Onk. and Jon. ויפרשון, Sept. καὶ προσεχέτωσαν ἀπὸ κτλ., Vulg. ut caveant ab etc., a. o.; see on XV. 31, p. 265), is employed in an emphatic or pregnant sense — the

**Lord. — 4. What man soever from the seed of Aaron *is* a leper, or has a running issue, he shall not eat of the holy things, until he be clean. And any one who touches any thing *that is* unclean *through* a corpse, or a man from whom discharge of semen goes out; 5. Or a man who touches any creeping thing, that is unclean to him, or a man that is unclean to him, whatsoever unclean-**

priests shall be careful how and when they approach holy things; and we must supply some complement such as "when they are in a state of uncleannes". — The words אשר הם מקדישים must be construed with מקדשי בני ישראל "from the holy things of the children of Israel ... which they consecrate to Me", so that the intervening words ולא יחללו וכ' are a rather irregular parenthesis; the translation of the Engl. Vers. "that they profane not My holy name *in those things* which they consecrate to Me", seems to establish a grammatical sequence, but does not really do so, since אשר can in no way be considered to belong to יחללו; the Masorites even placed under קדשי an accent so strongly distinctive as athnach. Onkel., Jonath., and the Sept. translate quite literally, and therefore reproduce the anomaly of the original; but the Vulg. renders שם קדשי, questionably, nomen *sanctificatorum* mihi, and then continues quae ipsi offerunt. Most of the modern interpreters merely give the sense, without adhering to the words (e. g. Luther, dass sie sich enthalten von dem Heiligen der Kinder Israel, welches sie mir heiligen; etc.). — Jewish commentators explain that "approaching" the holy things (ver. 3) means *eating* them (Rashi, Rashbam, a. o.); but there is no reason why that term (אשר יִקְרַב) should not be taken in its literal sense. — לדרתיכם "in your generations", that is, now and in all future time (comp. XXI. 17, לדרתם). — The words, "that soul shall be cut off from My presence" (ונכרתה ··· מלפני), have a more emphatic meaning than, "that soul shall be excluded from the Sanctuary", which, under the circumstances described, is a matter of course, but they imply the threat of "excision", or of death by Divine retribution. — והנוגע בכל טמא נפש (ver. 4) is "anyone who touches anything that is unclean through a corpse" (Dathe qui rem cadavere contaminatam attigerit); but the Sept. has indistinctly καὶ ὁ ἁπτόμενος πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας ψυχῆς; the Vulgate more accurately, qui tetigit immundum super mortuo; Luther incorrectly, wer etwa einen unreinen Leib anrührt; see on XXI. 1, p. 461. — שכבת זרע *discharge of semen* as in XV. 16, p. 258; the Sept. has here also κοίτη σπέρματος, the Vulg. semen quasi coitus, in which translations the true meaning of שכבת is misunderstood. — The ל in לְכֹל טֻמְאָתוֹ (ver. 5) has the force of comprehensive generalisation — "whatsoever his uncleannes may be" (comp. on XI. 26, p. 167); the Sept. renders with sufficient accuracy, κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀκαθαρσίαν αὐτοῦ, and the Vulg. quemlibet immundum; but Luther *und* alles was ihn verunreinigt. — Targ. Jonathan expresses (in ver. 6) the view of Jewish tradition, "until he has bathed his flesh in forty seahs of water". — On the leper (צָרוּעַ) see XIII. 1 *sqq.*, pp. 215 *sqq.*; on persons afflicted with a running issue (זָב) XV. 2 *sqq.*, pp. 254 *sqq.*; on deflement through a corpse

ness he has; 6. The person that has touched any such shall be unclean until the evening, and shall not eat of the holy things, unless he wash his flesh with water. 7. And when the sun is down, he may afterwards eat of the holy things; because it *is* his food. — 8. That which dies of itself, or is torn *by beasts*, he shall not eat to defile himself therewith: I *am* the Lord. 9. And they shall keep My ordinance, lest they bear sin for it,

(טְמֵא נֶפֶשׁ) XXI. 1 *sqq.*, pp. 455, 456; on uncleanness by emission of semen, whether involuntary or in intercourse, XV. 16—18, pp. 257 *sqq.*, and by contact with a creeping thing XI. 29 *sqq.*, pp. 167 *sqq.*

**8, 9.** As the priests were forbidden to eat holy things in an unclean state, so they were, above all other Hebrews, warned not to eat unclean things at any time, and especially not the flesh of animals that have died of themselves (נְבֵלָה) and of those that have been torn by wild beasts (טְרֵפָה). It might appear superfluous, and it is indeed surprising, that the legislator expressly prohibits to the priests food which, from early periods was rigorously forbidden to all Israelites as a hateful abomination, and was in the course of time interdicted to the very strangers who happened to live among them (XVII. 15, 16; see *supra* pp. 351, 352). But the history of the levitical code suggests an explanation. Though the laws of נְבֵלָה and טְרֵפָה had been repeatedly enforced, they were, like many other religious ordinances, so little acted upon, that even Ezekiel, in delineating his hierarchy, saw fit to command that "the priests shall not eat of any thing that has died of itself or is torn, whether it be fowl or beast" (Ezek. XLIV. 31); and this passage of Ezekiel seems to have caused the repetition of the laws in our section; for as we have more than once pointed out, the work of the prophet was one of the sources of the levitical author (pp. 386, 457). Nor does the latter seem to have been very confident as to the observance of the command, and he found it necessary to enforce it with great earnestness and with a severe menace—"lest they bear sin for it (My ordinance), and die therefore, if they profane it". Of course, death "by the hand of heaven" is meant, as Jewish tradition explains (*Talm.* Sanh. 83).

Philological Remarks. — עָלָיו (ver. 9) *on that account*, as in XIX. 17 (p. 415); Sept. δι' αὐτά; Vulg. omits the word; Rosenmüller, unnecessarily taking עליו collectively for עליהם, renders, ne ferant *super se* peccatum. The suffix ought properly to agree with the feminine משמרתי, but this noun is understood in a general sense "all that I have ordained" (comp. VIII. 35; XVIII. 30; etc.; Dathe servent praecepta mea), and is therefore used as a masculine (neuter); in any case the suffix in בו refers to the same noun as that in עליו, whereas the Vulg. has et moriantur *in Sanctuario* cum polluerent *illud*; Ebn Ezra also believes that משמרתי stands here for מקדשי, which substitution is uncalled for; and similarly some others suppose that the suffixes apply to קֹדֶשׁ, which word does not at all occur in the preceding part of the chapter, except in ver. 2, where it means holiness, and not Sanctuary or holy offering. Others translate still more inaccurately, as Jonathan,

and die therefore, if they profane it: I the Lord do sanctify them.

10. And no stranger shall eat *of* the holy things; a sojourner of the priest, or a hired servant, shall not eat *of* the holy things. 11. But if a priest buy a slave with his money, he may eat of it, and he that is born in his house: they may eat of his food. 12. And if a priest's daughter is *married* to a stranger, she may not eat

"lest they be killed for it by a blazing fire", like Nadab and Abihu; or Luther, dass sie nicht Sünde *auf sich* laden und daran sterben wenn sie *sich* entheiligen (יְחַלְּלֻהוּ). —

**10—13.** The "holy things" might be shared by the priests with those who composed their domestic circle, not only with their wives and children, but with slaves born in the house or acquired by money, for these were, as a rule, received into the Hebrew community by circumcision, and were admitted to the paschal lamb and in fact to every privilege of the Israelite. But all others were regarded as "strangers" or "profane" persons (זָרִים) in reference to the offerings, and by eating them they "defiled" their sanctity, and brought upon themselves "the iniquity of trespass". Such "profane person" was not only the heathen who stayed with the priest as a sojourner or served him as a hireling, but even his married daughter, who by her marriage left her own family, and entered that of her husband; yet if she became a widow or was divorced, and had no children, she returned to her father's house and might again partake of his food; if her deceased husband was a non-Aaronite, and she had children, these were not permitted to share the sacred offerings, and then the same prohibition extended to herself, since she could not separate her life from that of her children. So systematically and so rigorously were the levitical principles carried out. Yet we have historical evidence to prove that these principles were unknown in the earlier times of the Hebrew monarchy. When David, escaping from the persecution of Saul, came to Nob, weary and exhausted, and asked the presiding priest Ahimelech for some food, the latter replied, "There is no common bread (לֶחֶם חֹל) under my hand, but their is hallowed bread" (לֶחֶם קֹדֶשׁ), in fact, "shew-bread, (לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים) that has been taken from before the Lord, to put in its place hot bread on the day when it was taken away"; and Ahimelech had no objection to give this holy bread to David, a man of the tribe of Judah, and to his promiscuous crowd of followers, on the sole condition that they had of late kept aloof from sexual intercourse, which was from early times considered as causing defilement for the day (1 Sam. XXI. 1—7; comp. *supra* p. 259; Comm. on Exod. p. 336; on Lev. I. p. 167; also *Talm.* Biccur. 82. Yevam. 68b, 70b, 76, 85a, 86a; Sanh. 83; Macc. 13a; *Maim.* Hilch. Terum. VII—X.).

Philological Remarks. — זָר (ver. 10) is here a non-Aaronite, a stranger with regard to the priestly families; for the meaning of the word is qualified by the object with which it is associated (see Comm. on Lev. I. 698, notes on X. I); the Sept. has ἀλλογε-

of the heave-offering of the holy things. 13. But if a priest's daughter becomes a widow or is divorced, and has no child, and returns to her father's house as in her youth, she may eat of her father's food: but no stranger shall eat thereof.

14. And if a man eat *of* a holy thing unwittingly, then he shall add to it the fifth *part* thereof and shall

νῆς, Vulg. aliegena; Onk. and Jon. חִילוֹנִי a *profane* person, that is, one who is not a priest; Siphra "a Levite or an Israelite".—תּוֹשָׁב is a *resident stranger* or an emigrant from a foreign land, and שָׂכִיר a *hireling*; but the Rabbins make this distinction that תושב is a slave whose ear has been pierced, and has thus become his master's property till the jubilee (לעולם, comp. Exod. XXI. 6 and notes in loc.); while שכיר is one that has been hired for a limited time, and goes out free after six years. The Hebrew servant of a priest was, therefore, not permitted to eat holy food, since he could not properly be bought by money like a heathen slave, and he was in that respect treated like a זָר (Siphra; *Talm.* Yevam. 68, 70; comp. *Maimon.* Hilch. Terum. VII—X). — The word כִּנְעוּרֶיהָ (ver. 13) should properly be כְּבִנְעוּרֶיהָ "as *in* her youth" (Sept. κατὰ τὴν νεότητα αὐτῆς); but after כְּ, prepositions are not seldom omitted (see Gramm. § 109. 9.c).

**14—16.** Our legislator ordains that "if a man eat of a holy thing unwittingly, he shall add to it the fifth part thereof, and shall give back the holy thing to the priest". But another author prescribes, besides, that the offender shall present a trespass-offering (V. 14—17; see Comment. on Levit. I. 519). This difference is the more striking, as our section is not designed to protect the property or the revenues of the priests, but centres in the idea of holiness; it would, therefore, have been most fit to supplement restitution by expiation. On many ritual points, various theories and opinions were entertained; and the practice was neither uniform nor unchangeable. It has been vaguely contended, that "the author has only small things in his mind; for greater things he prescribes, besides, a trespass-offering" (*Knob.* p. 524): no such distinction between small and great is expressed in the two texts, both of which treat generally of "eating of holy things unwittingly". Or it has been observed, that "the offence committed against God is here not taken into account" (*Baumgarten* p. 220): but would it have been overlooked, if one invariable mode of atonement had been fixed?

The significance of one *fifth*, or the double of one *tenth*, has been pointed out before (Comm. on Lev. l. c.); and we may, moreover, refer to the Hindoo law which ordains that any one who, claiming found property as his own without being able to prove his claim by certain tests, was bound to pay the *fifth* part of its value into the royal treasury (*Yâjnav.* II. 171). Jewish Rabbins declared, with questionable justice, that a person eating unconsciously of holy things, has in fact to restore the *fourth* part of them, which, together with the original quantity, makes up the *five* parts (comp. *Mishn.* Terum. VI. 1 and *Bartenur.* in loc. החומש הוא רביעית מה שאכל). They taught, moreover, that a person advisedly eating of holy things, had indeed to return the equivalent

**give back the holy thing to the priest. 15. And they [the priests] shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel, which they offer to the Lord, 16. Or suffer them [the Israelites] to bear the iniquity of trespass, by eating their holy things: for I the Lord do sanctify them.**

**17. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 18. Speak**

of what he had consumed, but without the addition of the fifth part, since his guilt, which rendered him liable to death by the hand of heaven, was not expiated by the restitution of the property; if he had been cautioned, he was punished with stripes, and restitution was not accepted. These and many similar points were, on the basis of our verses, minutely worked out by the Rabbins (see *Mishn.* Temur. cc. VI., VII.).

Philological Remarks. — The words וְנָתַן לַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַקֹּדֶשׁ (ver. 14) are simply "and he shall give back the holy thing to the priest", which meaning fully accords with the tenour of the verse (so the Sept. καὶ δώσει τῷ ἱερεῖ τὸ ἅγιον, a. o.; similarly Luther "und dem Priester geben *sammt* dem Heiligen); but the Vulg. has et dabit sacerdoti *in Sanctuarium*, which translation is neither supported by the words nor the context. — Nor can the sense of the phrase וְהִשִּׂיאוּ אותם עון אשמה (ver. 16) be doubtful, if we keep in mind that נָשָׂא עָוֹן signifies "to bear guilt," whence הִשִּׂיא פל׳ עון is "to make some one bear guilt," or to cause him to be guilty: the priests must neither themselves profane the holy gifts, nor must they permit the Israelites to eat them and thus to sin; אותם is, therefore, not *themselves* (Sept. καὶ ἐπιτάξουσιν ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς ἀνομίαν πλημμελείας; Vulg. ne forte sustineant iniquitatem delicti sui; Rashi את עצמם ישיאו עון; Rosenm. ne sibi poenam noxae contrahant; *Cook's* Holy Bible "they shall incur a sin of trespass who eat of their holy things"; a. o.), but *them*, i. e. the Israelites (so Engl. Vers. correctly or suffer them to bear the iniquity of trespass; Dathe neque illos ad peccandum seducant; Michael. auch nicht veranlassen dass Andere . . . eine Schuld auf sich laden; De Wette und so ihnen Schuld aufladen; etc.). Others suppose the subject of והשיאו to be the Israelites, and then the sense would be, "and the people shall make the priests bear their (the people's) guilt by eating their holy things" (comp. X. 17): but irrespective of the strained construction, it was in sin-offerings only that the eating of the flesh on the part of the priests belonged to the rites of atonement (see Comment. on Levit. I. p. 210). Some other versions have even less probability (e. g. Keil "the holy gifts of the Israelites must not be profaned . . . , and those non-priests who eat of them by chance must be made to bear the penalty of their guilt", עון אשמה). Onkel. renders "when they eat in impurity" (במיכלהון בסואבא), which is no doubt an inappropriate qualification, as no "stranger" was, at any time and under any condition, to eat of the hallowed offerings. — The two synonyms עֲוֹן אַשְׁמָה, of which the first is in the construct state, impart to the notion a strong emphasis — "heinous guilt"; comp. שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ XVIII. 6, p. 389.

**17—25.** All the preceding laws relating to the purity of the priesthood were based not only upon the

to Aaron, and to his sons, and to all the children of Israel, and say to them, Whosoever *he be* of the house of Israel, or of the strangers in Israel, that will offer his

holiness of the Temple, but also upon the holiness of the offerings; the priests were not to defile themselves by contact with the dead nor to show immoderate grief in mourning, because "they brought forward the offerings of the Lord made by fire" (XXI. 6); they were to be free from bodily blemishes, because "they approached to present the food of their God" (XXI. 17, 21); and they were not, when in a state of impurity, to touch or to eat their portions, because these were "holy things which the children of Israel hallowed to the Lord" (XXII. 3). Regulations with regard to the faultlessness of the offerings are, therefore, now appropriately appended, and logically complete the subject; they refer indeed only to the sacrificial animals; but they readily suggest an application to any kind of gift or offering set apart for sacred purposes; and Jewish tradition expressly declares, that the wine for the libations, and the oil and flour used for bloodless offerings, were required to be of superior quality; nay that even the wood that burnt on the altar was to be carefully selected so as to include no worm-eaten pieces, which task was assigned to Aaronites unfitted for the service of the altar by some physical defect (see *supra* p.466; comp. *Mishn*. Menach. VIII. 1, וכולן אינן באים אלא מן המזבח; *Maimon*. Issur. Mizbeach, cc. 1, 6).

The injunctions of this section seem by no means to have been superfluous in our author's time. The Deuteronomist indeed declared it to be an abomination to sacrifice "any bullock or sheep wherein is blemish or any defect," and he instanced blind and lame beasts as unacceptable to God (Deut. XV. 21; XVII. 1). But his directions, like those of his younger contemporary Ezekiel (XLIII. 22—25; XLV. 16, 23; etc.), appear to have been little heeded; for the prophet Malachi, about a century after the return of the Jews from Babylon, bitterly complained, that they offered "polluted food" (לֶחֶם מְגֹאָל) upon the altar, as if "the table of the Lord were contemptible"; and he endeavoured to enforce his warnings by an illustration remarkable for its homely or anthropopathic character: "If you offer the blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? and if you offer the lame and sick, is it not evil? Pray offer it to thy governor, will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person, says the Lord of Hosts"? (Mal. I. 6 *sqq.*). The levitical legislators, therefore, never failed to command that all offerings and gifts should be faultless; they gave this command with respect to the oldest and most common kinds of sacrifices, the burnt- and thank-offerings; but they insisted upon it most frequently in connection with the expiatory sacrifices, at once the holiest and latest class, and to a certain extent their own most praiseworthy creation. Yet nowhere did they so elaborately dwell on the subject as in our passage, which no doubt conveys one of the final features of their system. Here they betray, in every point, both their age and their peculiar bias. They forbade indeed, like their predecessors, blind victims; but they were neither content with the general phrase "no

offering, *whether it be* any of their vows, or any of their free-will offerings, which they will offer to the Lord for a burnt offering; 19. *You shall offer it* for your acceptance,

blemish or defect" used by the Deuteronomist, nor with the vague term "sick" employed by the prophet Malachi; they attempted a full, if not an exhaustive, enumeration of the disqualifying blemishes and defects, and they attempted to specify and to define the forms of sickness; and though they did not advance to the minuteness of later Rabbins, who named no less than 73 such disorders (*Mishn.* Bechor. VI. 1 *sqq.*), they were imbued with an anxious spirit of accuracy, which helps us to understand how in the course of centuries, and on the basis of their ordinances, the expansions of the Mishnah and the Talmud were possible. Again, between offerings presented as vows and as freewill gifts they established a distinction of which we find no trace in previous writings; and for freewill offerings they permitted animals, not indeed afflicted with any organic defect or disease, but unsightly from some abnormal largeness or smallness of limbs (שָׂרוּעַ וְקָלוּט). We may well question the view that such offerings, because not required by any command, and partially consumed by the worshippers themselves, might be of an inferior kind, since spontaneous gifts presented to the Deity should pre-eminently embody the idea of sacrifice. Some Rabbinical authorities were indeed desirous to remove that laxity, and declared, against the context, that the animals here alluded to as freewill gifts were not intended for the altar as offerings, but for labour to be performed in connection with the Temple (לבדק הבית; comp. *Talm.* Temur. 7$^b$); yet others, advancing farther in the direction of our precepts, fixed the still more doubtful principle, that the laws of faultlessness were limited to quadrupeds, and did not apply to birds. And lastly, our authors included in their ordinance the "stranger" (גֵּר) so unreservedly that he appears like a member of the holy community both with regard to his privileges and his obligations; for they permitted him to present, at the common Sanctuary and through Hebrew priests, any offering or sacrifice, and subjected his gifts to the same rigorous scrutiny as those of Hebrews; nay they partially included "the foreigner" (נֵכָר) who "came from a distant land" to pay homage to the God of Israel (vers. 18, 25; comp. Num. XV. 14; 1 Ki. VIII. 41—43): but this equality of native and stranger was not established until a very late period, when, the land and the community being held as equivalents, the general command could be given, "In your land you shall not offer" any thing that is blemished (see XVII. 8—10; XIX. 33, 34, pp. 435—437).

The qualifications prescribed by the Bible for offerings and victims have elsewhere been discussed in their various aspects, and we refer the reader to those observations, in the course of which the analogies and differences between the Hebrew and heathen customs have also been pointed out (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 92—108; on burnt offerings *ibid.* pp. 234 *sqq.*; and on thank-offerings *ibid.* pp. 241 *sqq.*).

The Rabbins admirably applied our laws to the moral sphere; starting from the maxim that "all the fat belongs to the Lord" (Lev. III. 16),

**a male without blemish, of the bullocks, of the sheep, or of the goats. 20. Whatsoever has a blemish, *that* shall you not offer; for it shall not be for your acceptance.**

and taking fat in the sense of the "choicest part", they taught that in all matters of charity men ought to exercise the same self-abnegation which has been prescribed for the sacrifices of the altar; their places of worship should be more splendid than their dwelling-houses; they should dedicate for religious purposes their most valued property; and they should feed the hungry, and clothe the poor from their best stores (comp. *Mishn.* Menach. VIII. 1 *sqq.*; *Maimon.* Issure Mizbeach, cc. 1, 6).

Philological Remarks. — The construction of vers. 18, 19 is elliptical, and a word like תַּקְרִיבוּ must be supplied after לִרְצֹנְכֶם; most of the ancient versions render both verses quite literally; the Vulg., however, inaccurately omits לרצנכם, translating ut offeratur per vos masculus; while Luther, straining the sense, draws that word into the first clause, ein Brandopfer, das ihm von euch angenehm sei. — Anallages of such irregularity as those of this passage — יקריב, נדריהם, יקריבו, and לרצנכם, numbers and persons being applied quite promiscuously — are rare even in Hebrew (comp. Gramm. § LXXVII. 21.). About לִרְצֹנְכֶם *for your acceptance*, see on XIX. 5, p. 408. — לְפַלֵּא נֶדֶר (ver. 21) is literally "to single out" or "to consecrate a vow" (Ebn Ezra explains לפלא by לפרש, and Rashi by להפריש בדבורו; Sept. has simply διαστείλας εὐχήν, Vulg. vota solvens); comp. Num. XV. 2. 3, 8, and in the same sense הפליא נדר XXVII. 2, see notes in loc. — The Sept. adds after לנדבה ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς ὑμῶν (i. e. אוֹ בְחַגֵּיכֶם). — The defects enumerated are for the most part stated as adjectives in the masculine (as עִוֵּר, חָרוּץ, etc.), and once in the feminine (יַבֶּלֶת), probably referring to בהמה, but in two instances nouns are used (עַוֶּרֶת blindness and יַלֶּפֶת scab), so that בה or אשר תהיה בו must be supplied (comp. XXI. 19). — The blemishes here enumerated correspond, to a certain point, with the disqualifications of priests (XXI. 18—20); some are identical, as blindness (עִוֵּר and עַוֶּרֶת), scurvy and scab (גָּרָב and יַלֶּפֶת), and enlarged or superfluous members (שָׂרוּעַ); others are analogous, as broken hand or foot and broken limb (שֶׁבֶר רֶגֶל or שֶׁבֶר יָד and שָׁבוּר), and the imperfect condition of the testicles. Yet in the last respect, the difference is greater than the similarity; the former passage merely declares a priest unfit "whose stones are broken" (מרוח אשך), but ours, to express the same, or nearly the same thing, accumulates the synonyms in a manner surprising in so formal an enactment, and no doubt meant to be emphatic and significant (ver. 24, מעוך וכתות ונתוק וכרות); for the most important and most solemn occasions male animals were expressly prescribed (comp. ver. 19); they were therefore above all to be perfect as males; and the least approach to castration was "a corruption", not only because involving the notion of maiming incompatible with the altar, but because virtually evading a Divine command (comp. Deut. XXIII. 2). — Maimonides (Mor. Nev. III. 49), partially connecting irrelevant ideas with our law, which applies to animals and not to men, remarks that it was intended to inculcate moderation in sexual love; that, while circumcision was meant to weaken the member, our precept forbade its mu-

21. And whosoever offers a thank-offering to the Lord to consecrate *his* vow, or for a freewill offering, *whether* of the herd or of the flock, it shall be perfect,

tilation or destruction, and that, therefore, our desires should be controlled and guarded from excess, but not entirely surpressed. — There is, on the whole, but little uncertainty as to the meaning of the Hebrew terms here employed. For עַוֶּרֶת is, of course, blindness (according to Jewish tradition, of both eyes or of one only), and שָׁבוּר *broken* or *broken-limbed* (comp. Exod. XXII. 9; Ezek. XXXIV. 4, 16; Zechar. XI. 16; Sept. συντετριμμένον, Vulg. fractum, Jon. דתביר גרמא; but Abarbanel too specially "with broken leg", and Bochart (l. II. c. 46, p. 522 fractum, ad ossa refertur, femoris puta aut cruris; De Wette more generally Beschädigtes, and Luther not quite accurately gebrechlich). More disputed is the meaning of חָרוּץ; it seems to be derived from חָרַץ in the sense of *cutting* or *digging* (hence to *decree*, i. e. to engrave a law or edict, Isai. X. 22, 23; XXVIII. 22), and to signify *wounded* or *cut*, whether the animal be injured by a bruise or by the loss of some limb; Onk. has פְּסִיק *cut off*, and similarly Syr. חריז, Saad. مبتورة mutilated, Ar. Erp. مقطوع maimed, Dathe mutilatum, Luther geschlagen; Engl. Vers. maimed; Vulgate cicatricem habens, and De Wette Verwundetes; but with too specific a sense Sept. γλωσσότητμον, others with broken leg (comp. Ebn Ezra in loc.), Bochart capite contusum (حرصة). Jewish tradition connects חרוץ with some disorder of the eyebrows, so Jonath. דְּרִיסוּי לְקָדָן "one whose eyebrows have fallen off", *Mishn*. Bechor. VII. 3, שנשרו ריסי עיניו, and *Talm*. Bechor. 38[a], "the eyebrows or the lips are split or injured": but it is hardly probable that such slight irregularities should have been noticed as disqualifying an animal. — יַבֶּלֶת from יבל *to run, to flow*, seems to denote a beast afflicted with *ulcerous boils* (so Engl. Vers. having a wen, Gesen., De Wette Blattriges, etc.); it has by others been understood to mean one that has *warts* (so Sept. μυρμηκιῶντα, Vulg. papulas habens, Saad. ذات ثولول suffering from warts; Rashi ורדא"ה verrue, Kimchi ורוג"ה Span. verruga or verruca a. o.; comp. *Mishn*. Eruv. X. 13, 14); but it has by some Jewish authorities been taken as a disease of the eyes (Jon. דעינוי לקיין); Ebn Ezra compares it with תבלל בעינו XXI. 20, and adds that we must here apply the rule, "We rely on tradition, and do not trust to our own imperfect knowledge". — On גָּרָב and יַלֶּפֶת *scurvy* and *scabbed*, and on שָׂרוּעַ *having anything superfluous* see on XXI. 16—24, pp. 468, 470. — קָלוּט (from קלט to contract) is *stunted, dwarfish* (comp. Arab. قلطي a dwarf; see *Bochart* l. c. p. 523); it is, therefore, the opposite of the preceding word שָׂרוּעַ, (Ebn Ezra), and like it, must be taken in a general sense, whether referring to the size of the whole animal or of some particular limb; so Onkel. simply דְּזְעִיר, Gr. Ven. βεβραχυμένον, Ar. Erp. ناقص diminutive, De Wette zwerghaft, Engl. Vers. that has anything lacking in its parts, Rosenm. cum una pars justo brevior est; but others define the deficiency, as Sept. κολοβόκερκον stump-tailed, and so Vulg. cauda amputata, Syr., Arab., Ewald, a. o.; or *Talm*. Bechor. 7[a], 40[a], *Siphra in loc.*, פרסותיו קלוטות its hoofs are contracted, that is, not divided, or resembling

for acceptance; there shall be no blemish therein.
22. *An animal that is* blind, or broken, or maimed, or
ulcerous, or scurvy, or scabbed, you shall not offer these
to the Lord, nor make an offering by fire of them upon
the altar to the Lord. 23. Either a bullock or a *beast
of the* flock that has anything superfluous or lacking in
its parts, that mayest thou offer *for* a freewill offering;
but for a vow it shall not be accepted. 24. You shall
not offer to the Lord any *animal whose stones are* bruised,

those of the horse or the ass; or חסיר כוליא one that has one testicle too little. — With respect to the four last epithets מָעוּךְ וְכָתוּת וְנָתוּק וְכָרוּת, Jewish tradition supposes that they are connected with the generative organ (*Siphra* in loc., and *Talm.* Bechor. 39[b]), and there is no reason to doubt the correctness of this view; nor is the meaning of the words obscure; they all involve the notion of *crushing* or *destroying*, and refer to deliberate or accidental castration. Thus Onkelos renders them דִּימְרִיס crushed (comp. מריס פחדין in XXI. 20 for מרוח אשך), דִּרְסִים smashed, דִּישְׁלִיף one with the testicles (or the member) torn from their place, and דִּיגְזִיר cut off; Jonathan דִּמְעִיךְ דִּכְתִישִׁין פַּחֲדוֹי one whose testicles are bruised or crushed, and דִּשְׁחִית וְדִמְרִיס גִּידוֹי one whose member is mutilated or broken; similarly Sept. θλαδίαν crushed, ἐκτεθλιμμένον squeezed out, ἐκτομίαν cutout, and ἀπεσπασμένον torn away; and these terms express indeed the four modes of castration known to the ancients, and fully described by several writers (comp. *Aristot.* Anim. Hist. IX. 37; *Columella*, De Re Rust. VI. 26; VII. 11; *Pallad.* De Re Rust. VI. 7); and more distinctly Vulg. testiculis contritis, tusis, sectis, and ablatis; Dathe, cui testiculi aut compressi, aut contusi, aut abrupti, aut excisi sunt; and analogously nearly all the ancient and modern translators, though many of them do not clearly express in what respect or in which part the animals are bruised or injured. There is a certain gradation in the four terms; for מָעוּךְ is merely *pressed*, while כָּתוּת is *crushed* (Rashi, כתות יותר ממעוך), נָתוּק is *torn out*, and כָּרוּת *cut out* (the Rabbins explain נָתוּק thus — תלושין הביצים ביד ... עד שנפסקו חוטין, and כרות — כרותים בכלי ועדיין בכיס; *Siphra* in loc., *Talm.* Bechor. 39[a]). — We may infer from our passage that the Hebrews kept castrated and uncastrated beasts, like the eastern nations at the present day. "In Abyssinia the he-goats are castrated, in Hauran the stallions, bulls, and rams, and in Arabia it is customary to tie up the scrotum of sheep and goats; but as a general rule bulls are not emasculated in the East, and there are no geldings in Arabia" (*Knob.* Lev. p. 256). — עָשָׂה in the sense of *sacrificing* (vers. 23, 24) is not unusual (comp. XVI. 9; XVII. 9; XXIII. 12, 19; Exod. XXIX. 38; etc.), and the words ובארצכם לא תעשו mean "and in your land, which ought to be hallowed by a perfect worship, you shall not sacrifice such mutilated animals" (so Syriac, Saadiah, Engl. Vers., Knob., a. o.). However, many interpreters, both Jewish and Christian, suppose, against the plain context and against history, that these words prohibit castration — "and in your land you shall not do

or crushed, or torn out, or cut out, and you shall not make *any offering thereof* in your land. 25. Nor from a stranger's hand shall you offer the bread of your God of any of these; because their corruption *is* in them, a blemish *is* in them: they shall not be for your acceptance.

26. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 27. When a bullock, or a sheep, or a goat, is brought forth, then it shall be seven days under the dam; and from the

so"; thus Josephus (Ant. IV. viii. 40, μὴ ἐξεῖναι δὲ ποιεῖν ἐκτομίας, μήτε ἀνθρώπους μήτε τῶν ἄλλων ζώων); and so the Rabbins, who teach, that it is unlawful for the Jews, wherever they may live, either to castrate themselves or any animal, whether clean or unclean; whether they perform the operation themselves or have it performed by non-Jews (comp. *Talm.* Shabb. 111[a]; Chagig. 14[b]; Bab. Mets. 90[b]; *Maimon.* Issure Biah c. 16; *Even Haezer* §. 5; see also *Michael.* Mos. Recht, III. § 168; *Geiger*, Zeitschr. V. 118—120; VI. 37—40). In the time of and after Josephus, the Jews may have considered the gelding of beasts objectionable, and then supported their aversion by interpreting our passage in that sense; but an agricultural people could not afford to lose the services of horses and oxen as beasts of draft and of burden, and they would to a great extent have lost them without castration. The law of our text was not prompted by "a spirit of kindness and morality", but mainly by the principle that the offerings presented to God should be *perfect*. Its object is not to ensure "the propagation of animals called into existence by God", nor to shield them from the infliction of pain; since the Pentateuch freely permits the slaughtering of beasts. Castration may indeed be comprised under the prohibition of "a limb cut out of a living animal" (אבר מן החי), which is one of "the seven laws of the children of Noah"; but these laws were only grouped together in post-Biblical times (see *supra* pp. 9, 10). A command so important for the material interests of the nation would certainly not have been enjoined in a few ambiguous words, and in the midst of sacrificial precepts.

**26, 27.** The reason why no victim should be presented that was not at least seven days old, has no doubt been correctly stated by Maimonides who observes, that "every animal, at the time of its birth, is very weak and extremely delicate, just as if it were still in the mother's womb; and it is only after seven days that it is counted among the creatures which come into contact with the air: before that time it is almost considered as an abortion; and hence children also must not be circumcised before the eighth day from their birth" (Mor. Nev. III. 49; comp. Exod. XXII. 29). It is unnecessary to search for any other reason: that which is offered to the Deity ought to have a well-secured existence and have overcome the first stages of debility and helplessness. Jewish teachers looked upon new-born animals as if affected with a blemish (כבעלי מום; comp. *Talm.*

**eighth day and thenceforth it shall be accepted for an offering made by fire to the Lord. 28. And a cow or female of the flock, you shall not kill her and her young both in one day.**

**29. And when you will offer a praise-offering to**

Zevach. 112^b; Chull. 81^a; *Maimon.* Issure Mizb. c. 3). In the advanced time when these ordinances were compiled, we can not surely suppose the rude and primitive view that animals should not be sacrificed within their first seven days, because within that period "they cannot be eaten" (Rosenm.). The age at which the victims were to be presented for the different classes of sacrifice, was regulated by the Law or by custom, both among the Hebrews and among heathen nations. These and other incidental points have been dwelt upon before (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 98—100). The Chaldee paraphrasts (Targ. Jonath. and Jerus.) insist here with some explicitness, that after the destruction of the Temple, when atonement can no longer be wrought by the altar, it is secured by the merit of "that aged sire", who came from the east, and who was ready to offer up to God his beloved son.

Philological Remarks. — The Vulg. plainly renders the words תחת אמו sub ubere matris suae, Sept. literally ὑπὸ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, Luth. bei seiner Mutter, Engl. Vers. under the dam. In Exod. XXII. 29 we find עִם אמו instead of תַּחַת אמו: the more uncalled for were the discussions which, in later Jewish schools, were carried on with regard to so-called "orphan animals" (יתומים), that is, such as are "not under the dam", but are found in the dam's womb, whether she has died or has been slaughtered. Not only the Samaritans, the Sadducees, and Karaites, but also the earlier Pharisees declared such animals unfit for sacrifice, and decided, moreover, that, to be lawful for food, they must be killed with the usual rituals; while the more consistent later Pharisees were of opinion that those animals might, under certain conditions, yet be used as victims, and that they required no slaughtering, since they are merely parts or "limbs" of their dams (see *Siphra* in loc.; *Mishn.* Bechor. IX. 4; *Talm.* Bechor. 57^a; comp. Zeitschr. der Deutsch-Morgenl. Gesellsch. XXI. 281).

**28.** The motive of the law, which forbids the slaughtering of an animal and its mother on the same day, cannot be doubtful. It is generally supposed that the prohibition was prompted by considerations of humanity, and is therefore by the Targum of Jonathan introduced with these words: "My people of Israel, as our Father is merciful in heaven, so you shall be merciful on earth" (comp. also *Philo*, De Humanit. c. 18). But how can killing the dam and her young "on the same day" — not in sight of each other — be deemed unfeeling or barbarous? Very different is the command "not to see the kid in the milk of its mother"; for it seems like cruel mockery to prepare a young animal for food with that milk which nature has destined for its own sustenance. Our law seems rather to have been suggested by the cosmic reason that it would almost appear like the wanton extirpation of a race or group of animals; and "smiting the mo-

the Lord, offer *it* for your acceptance. 30. On the same day it shall be eaten; you shall leave none of it until the morrow: I *am* the Lord.

31. And you shall keep My commandments, and do them: I *am* the Lord. 32. And you shall not profane My holy name; but I will be hallowed among the children

ther with the children" was a metaphor expressive of utter destruction, such as man ought not to inflict upon any of God's creatures (comp. Gen. XXXII. 12; Hos. X. 14). For an analogous reason, the Law forbade any one finding a bird's nest to "take the dam with the young" (הָאֵם עַל־הַבָּנִים); the latter only may be taken, while the former must be left free (Deut. XXII. 6, 7).

Philological Remarks. — The Rabbinical explanations and expansions of this ordinance may be seen in *Talm.* Chull. 85[b]; *Maim.* Hilch. Shechit. c. 12; *Yor. Deah* § 16. — The noun שׁוֹר is a masculine epicene, while שֶׂה is of common gender (Gram. § 22. 2); hence the masculine suffixes in אֹתוֹ and בְּנוֹ are to be accounted for, since, of course, the *dam* and her young are meant in this law: "bruta enim nullum patrem agnoscunt" (comp. *Siphra*, and *Talm.* Chull. 78[b], "the command applies to the female, which should not be slaughtered on the same day with her male or female young"). — לֹא תִשְׁחֲטוּ signifies here "you shall not *sacrifice*", not only because this entire passage treats of offerings, but because, according to the rigorous law of our Book, all the animals, even those intended for consumption by the proprietors, were to be killed as sacrifices at the national altar (XVII. 3—6). The Vulg. renders plainly non immolabuntur; while Jewish teachers expressly applied the prohibition to slaughtering in general (*Talm.* Chull. 78[b]).

**29, 30.** The last of the miscellaneous laws of sacrifice with which this chapter concludes, relates to the "praise-offerings" (זֶבַח תּוֹדָה), a later and more solemn kind of the "Joy-offering" (שְׁלָמִים); it is here introduced as abruptly as the law regarding the "thank-offering" is found inserted in the midst of precepts of morality and charity (XIX. 5—8), whereas another sacrificial code treats of both classes in connection and with completeness (VII. 11—18; see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 547—549).

**31—33.** A series of ordinances on priesthood and sacrifices is fitly wound up with an exhortation enjoining upon the people ever to "sanctify God's holy name" by a faithful observance of His commands, and to remember that He has released them from Egypt, the land of gross idolatry, with the special object of making them His own people — a nation that should strive after holiness of life manifested through purity of worship (comp. XI. 44, 45; XIX. 36, 37; XXV. 38; Num. XV. 40, 41).—The Rabbins accurately defined the notions of "profanation" and of "sanctification of the Divine name" (חִלּוּל הַשֵּׁם and קִדּוּשׁ הַשֵּׁם), and they declared that an Israelite who, to escape death, committed one of the three chief crimes — idolatry, incest, and murder — profaned God's name; while he who, when in peril of his life for the sake of his religion, imitated the fortitude of Hananiah, Michael, and Azariah, sanctified it.

of Israel: I *am* the Lord who hallow you, 33. Who
brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God:
I *am* the Lord.

Apostasy or even vacillation under such circumstances can neither be expiated by repentance nor by the Day of Atonement, but only by death (comp. *Talm.* Pesach. 25[a]; Yom. 86; Sanhedrin 74[a]; Avodah Zarah 27[b]; *Maimonid.* Yesod. Tor. c. 5; *Yor. Deah* § 157).

# VI.

# THE SABBATH AND THE FESTIVALS.

## CHAPTER XXIII.

**Summary.** — God communicates to Moses ordinances with respect to the Sabbath (vers. 1—3) and the five great annual festivals (vers. 4—43), viz. (1.) Passover (vers. 4—14) in the three divisions of the Pesach (ver. 5), the Feast of unleavened Bread (vers. 6—8), and the firstfruit Sheaf (vers. 9—14); (2.) The Feast of Weeks (vers. 15—21), followed by an injunction of charity in relation to the harvest (ver. 22); (3.) The Day of the Memorial of blowing the Trumpet (vers. 23—25); (4.) The Day of Atonement (vers. 26—32); and (5.) the Feast of Tabernacles (vers. 33—43). — Moses repeats these precepts to the people (ver. 44).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them: The festi-

**1, 2.** All the Hebrew festivals — with the one exception of the Day of Memorial — have before been treated of, and some of them repeatedly; yet the compiler of our Book not unjustly deemed it expedient to review, in one comprehensive and connected sketch, the entire religious year, not only because, in his time, the number of sacred days had been completed and finally fixed, but because, in his age, those days were regarded in a new light and invested with a more profound meaning. An advance had been made from the cosmic and historical to the ethical sphere: the festivals were no longer understood merely as days of thanksgiving for the bounty of *nature*, nor as occasions for tracing, with awe and reverence, in past and present events, the rule of a *Divine Providence*, but as seasons for self-examination and contrition, for the improvement and purification of the *soul* and the *heart*. The three older agricultural feasts had first been expanded, and they were then increased by other solemn celebrations, till at last the system of festivals was, in various ways, associated with the sacred number *seven*: there were *seven* great days of "holy convocation", when the whole community was to assemble, or at least to be represented, at the national Sanctuary; and the five

vals of the Lord, which you shall proclaim *to be* holy convocations — *even* these *are* My festivals.

principal festivals were understood as *seven*, by subdividing the first of them, the Passover, into three — viz. the Pesach (פֶּסַח), the Day of the first Sheaf (עֹמֶר), and the Feast of unleavened Bread (חַג הַמַּצּוֹת). The theory is perfect; but its very completeness and thoughtfulness betray its age and origin.

On all these points, and on several other subjects touched upon in this chapter, we shall be able to be brief, as the festivals, in their development and organic connection, have been discussed in a previous treatise (see *supra* pp. 266—282); while many of the details have been explained in a former volume (Comm. on Exod. pp. 355—353, 453—459).

Philological Remarks. — No important objection can be raised to the place which this chapter occupies in the Book of Leviticus: the laws of sacrifice and priesthood, of purity and morality, or of everything necessary to secure the holiness of the Sanctuary, of the people, and of the land, having been treated of, a survey of the theocratic year in its totality seems appropriate, though it is surprising that the laws of the Sabbatical year and of the Year of jubilee, which embody some of the chief ideas of the festivals, and are in some respects their natural extension, do not follow immediately afterwards, but are separated from our laws by heterogeneous ordinances (ch. XXIV, XXV.). Our chapter itself, though at first glance presenting the appearance of remarkable unity, is not without irregularities which throw a clear light upon the mode in which the final reviser of our Book accomplished his task. We shall at once state the result of a closer examination. The groundwork of the composition is a sketch of the proper or *annual* festivals, which commences with the heading, "These are the festivals of the Lord, holy convocations, that you shall proclaim in their seasons" (ver. 4); and which concludes with the words, "These are the festivals of the Lord, which you shall proclaim to be holy convocations, . . . besides the Sabbaths of the Lord, and besides all your gifts . . . which you give to the Lord" (vers. 37, 38). The arrangement of this list is strictly chronological; and though it connects, therefore, Passover with Pentecost, and New-year with the Day of Atonement, the former two agriculturally, the latter two spiritually allied with each other —; it severs Tabernacles from its natural complements, simply because Tabernacles concludes the agricultural year. The sketch is complete in itself, and its logical consistency is only marred by one verse which has no reference to festivals — "and when you reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly cut the corners of thy field when thou reapest, nor shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest; thou shalt leave them for the stranger; I am the Lord your God" (ver. 22); which words, almost literally borrowed from another composition (XIX. 9), were evidently added by an interpolator, with questionable judgment (see *infra* notes on ver. 22). But our compiler, anxious to surround the Sabbath, for reasons which we shall indicate below, with the utmost possible sanctity, included it in his code, made it the first, because it

is the most frequent, of holy convocations, and introduced it with a special but so comprehensive a heading that the original one (ver. 4) was rendered superfluous, and now reads like a tautology — "Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them: the festivals of the Lord which you shall proclaim to be holy convocations, these are My festivals" (ver. 2). Besides this addition on the Sabbath, another was made, whether by the same or a different hand, with regard to Tabernacles (vers. 39—43); this was written independently of the preceding command (vers. 33—36), from which it is separated by a general conclusion (vers. 37, 38); it begins anew, and is not merely a supplement enjoining additional ceremonials, but has several statements in common with the first law (comp. vers. 34 and 39, 41). — A few words expressing that Moses conveyed the Divine directions to the people, fitly terminate the chapter (ver. 44), and they may possibly have formed part of the original outlines. — Thus all that was essential to guide the Israelites in some of their most important religious duties, was incorporated in the composition which, gradually enlarged, embodies the latest laws and theories of Hebrew festivals. These remarks render it unnecessary to advert to the numerous devices of apologists, often ingenious but uniformly unsuccessful, attempting to prove the unity and continuity of our chapter (see f. i. *Ranke*, Untersuch. II. 101—108; *Hävernick*, Einleit. I. 2, p. 419; *J. Bachmann*, Die Festgesetze des Pentateuchs, pp. 102—138; *Keil*, Levit. pp. 134, 135; and on the other hand, *De Wette*, Beiträge, II. 293, 294; Einleit. pp. 204, 205; *George*, Jüd. Feste, pp. 120—144; *Stähelin*, Untersuchungen, pp. 24, 25; *Lengerke*, Kenaan, pp. 537—543; *Hupfeld*, De primitiva et vera festorum apud Hebraeos ratione etc. II. 1—18; *Knob.* Levit. p. 540; *Graf*, Geschichtl. Bücher, pp. 78, 79; *Künen*, Hist. Crit. I. 50). — The Newmoon, though in the course of time made the subject of precise laws, and distinguished by special public sacrifices (Num. XXVIII. 11—15), is here not noticed, because it is no "holy convocation" (the arguments of Hengstenberg, Tag des Herrn, p. 32, — who tries to prove the contrary, are not conclusive; comp. also *Knob.* Levit. p. 542; *Keil*, Archaeol. I. § 78). — מוֹעֵד, from יָעַד to appoint or to fix, is an *appointed season* of regular recurrence (comp. Gen. I. 14; XVII. 21; XVIII. 14; XXI. 2; Num. IX. 2, 3; Jer. VIII. 7; Ps. CIV. 19; etc.); but as יָעַד has also the meaning of meeting or assembling (whence אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד Tent of Meeting; comp. Comm. on Ex. p. 493), it has the collateral sense of day of public assembly, and is, therefore, analogous to מִקְרָא convocation, by which it is almost explained (מועדי יהוה אשר תקראו אתם מקראי קדש, vers. 2, 4, 37). מִקְרָא, or more frequently מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ, has its name from the congregation being "called together" for the celebration of the festivals by means of two silver trumpets, which were blown by the priests while the public sacrifices were being offered (comp. Ps. XXVII. 6, זבחי תרועה), and the sound of which served as "a memorial before God" (see *infra* on vers. 23—32; comp. Num. X. 1—10; XXXI. 6; Isai. I. 13; Joel II. 15, 16; Ps. LXXXI. 4; also Exod. XII. 16; Num. XXVIII. 25, 26; XXIX. 1, 7, 12); and by way of metonomy מִקְרָא is also the *place* in which festive gatherings are held (Isai. IV. 5). — In the phrase אלה הֵם מועדי, the personal pronoun הֵם serves as copula; comp. Gen. XXV. 16; etc.

3. Six days shall work be done; but on the seventh day *is* the Sabbath of rest, a holy convocation;

**3.** The Sabbath, essentially peculiar to the Hebrews, was no doubt introduced at a very early time; yet it was but gradually understood, and most reluctantly accepted by them, as a day of perfect rest. The teachers were so strongly convinced of its supreme importance both for the physical and the spiritual welfare of the people, and for training them to humanity towards toiling men and beasts, that they availed themselves of every possible opportunity to represent it as a Divine institution. With this object in view, they framed a sublime cosmogony culminating in the rest of the Creator on the seventh day; they included the law of the Sabbath in the sacred and fundamental code of the Decalogue, in which they based it either likewise on the origin of the universe, or on the Israelites' redemption from Egyptian bondage and drudgery; they enjoined it again and again in their laws, and they illustrated it by various historical incidents; they even called in the aid of miracles to impress its paramount sanctity, as for instance, in the account of the manna gatherers; they described it as an eternal "sign" (אוֹת) of the covenant between God and Israel, and insisted that its desecration should unsparingly be punished with death (comp. Gen. II. 2, 3; Exod. XVI. 22—30; XX. 8—11; XXIII. 12; XXXI. 13—17; XXXIV. 21; XXXV. 2, 3; Num. XV. 32—36; Deut. V. 12—15; Ezek. XX. 12, 20; XLIV. 24; XLVI. 3; etc. see Comm. on Exod. pp. 355—363). But their efforts were for a long time all but fruitless. In some manner the day seems indeed to have been kept both in the kingdom of Judah and of Israel (comp. Isai. I. 13; Hos. II. 13; Am. VIII. 5; 2 Ki. IV. 23). But prophets and historians writing during and after the Babylonian exile prove by their exhortations and their narratives, how little the people understood the spirit of the Sabbath. Jeremiah, in a most solemn speech addressed to the assembled multitude, implores them, "Do not carry forth a burden out of your houses on the Sabbath day, nor do any work, but hallow the Sabbath day"; yet "they obeyed not, and inclined not their ear, but were stiffnecked"; then he promised them blessings and wealth and power if they kept the Sabbath in the manner ordained, and concluded, "If you will not hearken to Me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear burdens, entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched" (Jer. XVII. 19—27). Such severe menaces were needed even more than nine centuries after Moses. Jeremiah's younger contemporaries Ezekiel and the second Isaiah, dwell on the same subject in the same strains. The former, full of sorrow and indignation, reproaches both the people and the priests that "they have profaned the Sabbath very much" since the time of the wanderings in the desert down to his own days, so that they would have been destroyed by God's anger, had not His mercy and longsuffering spared them (Ezek. XX. 13, 16, 24; XXII. 8, 26; XXIII. 38). And the later Isaiah, in promising his fellow exiles deliverance from their troubles, almost renders it dependent on their faithful observance of the

**you shall do no work *therein*; it *is* the Sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings.**

Sabbath which they had so constantly and so flagrantly neglected: "blessed is the man", he exclaims, "who does this, . . . who keeps the Sabbath from polluting it, and keeps his hand from doing any evil"; and to the foreigner and the forlorn he announces that "God will give them in His Temple and within His walls, a place and a name better than of sons and daughters", and will "make them joyful in His House of prayer, accepting their burnt offerings and their sacrifices upon His altar", if they will but refrain from desecrating the holy Sabbath (Isai. LVI. 2—7; LVIII. 13). Yet even a century later, Nehemiah, when enforcing the old religious commands, was compelled to adopt most rigorous measures to ensure the observance of the Sabbath. He caused the principal settlers to agree to a covenant by which they pledged themselves, among other duties, that "if the people of the land would bring any wares or victuals on the Sabbath day to sell, they would not buy of them on that holy day". However, the bulk of the colonists persevered in their old practices, and Nehemiah relates: "In those days I saw in Judah some treading wine presses on the Sabbath, and bringing sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day . . . There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, who brought fish and all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath to the children of Judah, and in Jerusalem". Then he argued with them severely, exclaiming, "Did not your fathers do thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet you bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath"; and in order to prevent unlawful traffic, he ordered that the gates of Jerusalem should be kept closed, and be watched by Levites and others, from the eve of the Sabbath till after its conclusion; nevertheless "merchants and sellers of all kind of ware" arrived and remained with their goods during the day without the gates; and the people yielded only to long continued vigilance and rigorous compulsion (comp. Nehem. XIII. 15—21; see also IX. 14; X. 31). We can, therefore, well understand that the levitical authors deemed it necessary to surround the sanctity of the Sabbath with new safeguards; the compiler of our code for the first time included it formally among the days of "holy convocation", though an earlier writer, describing "the new heavens and the new earth", had ideally and prophetically raised it to the same distinction: "It shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before Me, says the Lord" (Isai. LXVI. 23). For the Sabbath, from early times chosen for consulting or listening to "men of God" (2 Ki. IV. 23), had after the exile, when learned scribes taught and exhorted in numerous Synagogues scattered throughout the land, become one of the most powerful means of diffusing and enforcing religious lessons; it proved, moreover, a valuable agency for cementing the unity of congregations and for organizing local centres which, in a different though hardly less efficient manner than the pilgrimages made to the common Sanctuary,

4. These *are* the festivals of the Lord, holy convocations, which you shall proclaim in their seasons.
5. In the first month, on the fourteenth *day* of the

strenghtened the feelings of nationality and increased the people's attachment to their purified faith. Therefore the injunctions with respect to the rest of the Sabbath became more and more rigorous; in another portion of the middle Books of the Pentateuch it is related, as a terrible warning, how a man who had gathered sticks on the Sabbath, was by God's special directions stoned to death by the whole community (Num. XV. 32—36; comp. Exod. XXXV. 3); in subsequent centuries precepts were added to precepts; the spirit of the institution was burdened by minute observances; the day of liberty was made a day of oppressive restraint, until it became necessary to remind the Pharisees that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Mark II. 27, 28; comp. 1 Macc. II. 34—38; 2 Macc. VI. 11; Matth. VII. 8; Luke VI. 5; John V. 10, 16; etc.; comp. *Mishn.* and *Talm.* Tract. Shabb.; *Orach Chay.* §§. 242—395; etc.).

Philological Remarks. — The wording of our law of the Sabbath approaches, among the numerous commands on the same subject, nearest to that of Exod. XXXI. 15 and XXXV. 2; except that here the punishment of profanation is omitted, and the Sabbath is for the first time designated as מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ. — The Sept., reading תֵּעָשֶׂה מלאכה, renders ποιήσεις (comp. Exod. XX. 9 ועשית). — The phrase שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן, which in earlier Books is also used with regard to the Sabbath, and is in Leviticus applied, besides, to the Day of Atonement and the Sabbatical year (see *supra* p. 281 note 10), means the most perfect or absolute rest, the syllable וֹן being an old termination for the superlative (as in רִאשׁוֹן and אַחֲרוֹן); hence even שַׁבָּתוֹן alone involves a greater intensity of the notion, and is employed with emphasis in reference to the Sabbath, the New-Year, Tabernacles, and the Sabbatical year (see l. c.); in שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן it has the force of the plural, which more usually follows the construct state to strengthen the idea; yet we find also רָעַת רָעַתְכֶם (Hos. X. 15) your fearful wickedness: שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּת (1 Chr. IX. 32) is "every Sabbath", like עֹלַת שַׁבַּת בְּשַׁבַּתּוֹ (Num. XXVIII. 10; see Gram. §. 75. 7.b,c). The Sept. adds a synonym σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις.

**4—14.** The list of the annual festivals begins with that which, if it was not the oldest, received the earliest and fullest development; and it is treated of in three distinct divisions, each of which has its own history — the Feast of the Pesach (פֶּסַח), the Feast of unleavened Bread (חַג הַמַּצּוֹת), and the presentation of the Sheaf (עֹמֶר). All of them were, in their first origin, probably pastoral or agricultural — the Pesach being the sacrifice of the firstborn animals, the Unleavened Bread the symbol of the industry and "haste" (חִפָּזוֹן) of the busy harvest season, and the Sheaf the offering of the firstfruit corn. In the course of centuries, the first two lost their natural, and were invested with an historical meaning, while the third became more independent and more solemn. For in the various legislations of the Pentateuch, the ordinances of the Pesach and of the firstborn are almost invariably coupled, and are thus proved to possess an in-

**month towards evening *is* the Lord's Passover. 6. And on the fifteenth day of the same month *is* the Feast of Unleavened Bread to the Lord: seven days you must**

ternal affinity (compare Exod. XIII. 1—16; XXXIV. 18—20; Deut. XV. 19 — XVI. 8; see also Exod. XXIII. 18, 19; XXXIV. 25, 26); but the identity of both is effaced, and the Pesach, almost as enigmatical to us as the word itself, is invariably associated with Egyptian deliverance; the idea of the sacrifice (זֶבַח פֶּסַח) may still be recognised in the blood of expiation that was to be put on the doorposts and lintels of houses which represented the altar; but it is obliterated in the other rites connected with the Pesach — viz. that it was to be roasted in its entirety, without a bone being broken, and completely consumed in the homes of the Israelites, in family or social groups, together with bitter herbs and unleavened cakes: these features, whether partially retained from old customs or newly introduced, were adapted to the historical meaning attributed to Passover, and were intended to symbolise, on the one hand, the bondage and the release of the Hebrews; and on the other hand, their transition into a united and well-organised commonwealth cemented by common convictions, laws, and interests. But such abstract ideas, embodied in elaborate emblems, bespeak a very advanced age, and they gained ground only at a late period of Hebrew history — whether before or after the Captivity, is still a matter of critical discussion. Certain it is, that the laws of the Pesach underwent no unimportant changes; thus the Deuteronomist ordains, "Thou shalt sacrifice the Pesach to the Lord thy God of the flock and the herd" (צֹאן וּבָקָר); whereas the command in Exodus more minute and precise, and reflecting the ceremonial spirit of levitism, prescribes "a lamb, without blemish, a male, one year old, from the sheep or from the goats" (Deut. XVI. 2; Ex. XII. 5). Again, according to Deuteronomy, the Hebrews must sacrifice the Pesach only at the common Sanctuary, whereas the law of Exodus permits it to be killed at any place (Deut. XVI. 5—7; Exod. XII. 24—27); the former mentions as the time simply "the evening" (בָּעֶרֶב) when the sun goes down, the latter more accurately "between the two evenings" (בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם, Deut. XVI. 4, 6; Exod. XII. 6); the one orders that the animal shall be "sodden" (בִּשַּׁלְתָּ), the other that it shall be "roasted with fire" (צְלִי אֵשׁ) and not "sodden with water" (מְבֻשָּׁל בַּמָּיִם, Deut. XVI. 7; Exod. XII. 8, 9; comp. 2 Chron. XXXV. 13, ויבשל באש); and lastly, the one restricts the participation of it to native Hebrews, while the other extends it to foreign slaves and to other circumcised strangers, and this equality is granted to domestics and settlers with that unreserved liberality which was but gradually accorded to them (Ex. XII. 42—49; Num. IX. 14; comp. Lev. XIX. 33, 34; see *supra*, p. 435). Some of the statements in Exodus involve indeed a less developed phase, but their foundation is no doubt older; there is a constant tendency in the sacrificial legislation to concentrate all offerings at the common Temple; and it is impossible to suppose that, after the Deuteronomist had commanded the killing of the Pesach in Jerusalem, a later writer should have allowed it to take

**eat unleavened bread. 7. On the first day you shall have a holy convocation, you shall do no servile work *therein*. 8. And you shall offer an offering made by fire**

place in all towns alike: this would be assuming an anachronism at variance with the whole history of hierarchical institutions. The Pesach was a sacrifice in the stricter sense, and though, as was the case with all sacrifices, any Israelite was allowed to slaughter the victim, the sprinkling of the blood, which was the essential rite, was performed by the priests exclusively (comp. 2 Chr. XXX. 16—18; XXXV. 11; Ezra VI. 20; *Philo*, Vit. Mos. III. 29; Decal. c. 30; De Septen. c. 18; *Jos.* Ant. XVII. ix. 3; *Rashi* in loc. הקרבת קרבן שמטי זבח; see Comm. on Lev. I. 184, 185, 291—293). It was gradually held to be so important that it was to be killed and eaten, with all attendant rites, a month later, by those Hebrews and strangers who had been prevented from offering it at the appointed time; while those who failed to present it in the first month without adequate reason, were rejected from the Hebrew community and menaced with excision (Num. IX. 1—14). When our author wrote, he must have supposed that the precepts of Exodus were familiar to all; for he simply states, "In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month towards evening is the Lord's Passover", without adding any detail or explanation whatever. Ezekiel, living between the time of the Deuteronomist and the compiler of this chapter, retained for his new commonwealth also the Pesach, but proposed that on the same day, the fourteenth of the first month, the "prince" or chief (נָשִׂיא) should present for himself and the whole people a bullock as a sin-offering; because in his time expiatory sacrifices had commenced to be regarded as essential complements of the older holocausts.

We can hardly lay much stress upon the fact that the earlier codes quite generally ordain that the Pesach should take place "in the month of Abib", while the later laws distinctly specify the fourteenth day of that month (comp. on the one hand, Exod. XIII. 4; XXIII. 15; XXXIV. 18; Deut. XVI. 1; and on the other hand, ver. 5; Exod. XII. 6, 17; Num. IX. 3, 5; XXVIII. 16); since the earlier legislators also institute a festival of seven days, and must, therefore, have had in mind a certain day for its commencement. But it cannot be accidental that the one appoint only the seventh day as a festive assembly of the congregation, the others both the first and the seventh day (comp. vers. 7, 8; Exod. XII. 16; Num. XXVIII. 18, 27; and Exod. XIII. 6; Deut. XVI. 8); the celebration became gradually more extended and more formal, and it was deemed desirable to fix *seven* such solemn days in the religious year. On those two chief days of the festival no "servile work" (מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה) was to be done, which is elsewhere explained to mean no work whatever except that which is required for the preparation of food (Exod. XII. 16): there was to be a cessation from all business and all the labour it renders necessary; yet there needed to be no "perfect Sabbath", and fire might be lighted for the purpose mentioned. The beginning of the festival and its conclusion were in two ways to be marked as belonging together — by special sacrifices, and by the eating

to the Lord seven days. In the seventh day *is* a holy convocation; you shall do no servile work *therein*.

9. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 10. Speak

of unleavened bread, during the whole of the seven days. But in the former respect, the mode of the ceremonial, in the latter its meaning was changed in the course of time. Ezekiel ordains that during the seven days of the festival the chief of the people shall "present a burnt-offering to the Lord, seven bullocks and seven rams without blemish daily the seven days, and a kid of the goats daily for a sin-offering"; and, besides, a bloodless offering of "an ephah for each bullock, and an ephah for each ram, and a hin of oil for each ephah" (Ezek. XLV. 23, 24). Our text contents itself with briefly prescribing, "And you shall present an offering made by fire to the Lord seven days" (ver. 8). Are here the same sacrifices meant as those set forth by Ezekiel? Probably not; for in the Book of Numbers very different burnt-offerings are commanded, viz. on each of the seven days two young bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs of the first year; and as an accompanying bloodless oblation three tenths of an ephah of fine flour mingled with oil for each bullock, two tenths for each ram, and one tenth for each lamb (Num. XXVIII. 13—15). This was probably the latest injunction on the subject, for nowhere else is the quantity of the flour for the *minchah* so nicely graduated according to the value of the animal sacrifice with which it is coupled (see Comm. on Lev. I. 217).

The "unleavened cakes" (מַצּוֹת), the common accompaniment of all sacrifices, and therefore also of that of the firstborn and of the Pesach, formed originally a feature so little conspicuous that it was eclipsed by the public sacrifices, and that one of the earlier authors wrote: "*Six* days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh day there shall [moreover] be a solemn assembly to the Lord thy God" (Deut. XVI. 8). But in the course of time, they were connected with the history of the exodus, which was accomplished "in haste" (בְּחִפָּזוֹן), and did not allow of the baking of leavened bread (Deut. XVI. 3; Exod. XII. 34, 39; comp. ver. 11). And this view was soon enlarged by explaining the unleavened cakes, or the "poor bread" consisting of nothing but flour and water, as "bread of misery" (לֶחֶם עֹנִי); and then they were raised to one of the distinctive and most important characteristics of the festival, which was currently called "Feast of unleavened Bread"; like the bitter herbs, they were to remind later born Hebrews of the providential release of their forefathers from oppressive bondage, and thus to strengthen those feelings of gratitude and of pious submission which were fostered by so many doctrines and striking symbols as one of the great ends of a religious life. Then anyone eating leavened bread with the flesh of the Pesach or during the whole period of the festival, was threatened with the dread punishment of excision; leavened food of any kind was proscribed with the same severity; the stranger was included in the prohibition like the Hebrew; nay even keeping leaven in the houses within that time was forbidden with equal rigour, not only in order to remove every occasion and

**to the children of Israel, and say to them, When you come into the land which I give to you, and shall reap its harvest, you shall bring the firstfruit sheaf of your**

temptation for transgressing the command, but because leaven, resulting from corruption, was then understood as an emblem of sin and degeneracy, and was, therefore, like honey, strictly excluded from the altar as unfit for "a sweet odour" (II. 11, 12; Comm. on Lev. I. 133—135). When this idea was attached to leaven, the *Mazzoth* may well have been understood as the "pure or holy bread", and conceived as emblems of that purity and holiness after which the Hebrews were to strive as God's redeemed and chosen people. Thus the old forms and customs were rendered more and more fruitful for religious sentiment and contemplation, and were employed to enforce the new ideas suggested by advanced experience and more matured thought (see Exod. XII. 15, 18—20; XIII. 6, 7; XXIII. 15, 18; XXXIV. 18, 25; Num. XXVIII. 17; Deut. XVI. 3, 4).

Our imperfect sources do not permit us to determine with any degree of certainty whether, in remote times, the Passover was really celebrated as the corn harvest; a statement in an early composition renders this at least doubtful; for the "Book of the Covenant" in Exodus (XXIII. 16) describes *Pentecost* quite generally as "the feast of harvest, the firstfruits of thy labours which thou hast sown in thy fields"; as if meaning both the earlier and the later grain, both barley and wheat. In the oldest documents, Passover is always described either as the Pesach or as the Feast of unleavened Cakes, and is, in both respects, associated with the Egyptian redemption; it is only in this code of Leviticus distinctly represented as the beginning of the corn harvest, and marked as such by a peculiar rite to take place on the sixteenth day of the first month, that is, on the day following the first convocation of the festival (ממחרת השבת; see Phil. Rem.). Not even the Deuteronomist makes any allusion to a firstfruit sheaf (עֹמֶר) to be presented with a prescribed ceremonial and sacrifice; he indeed also calls Pentecost the "Feast of Weeks" (חַג שָׁבֻעוֹת); but instead of counting the seven weeks from a particular day, the sixteenth of Abib, as our text enjoins, he prescribes: "Seven weeks shalt thou number to thee; begin to number the seven weeks from such time as thou beginnest to put the sickle to the corn" (Deut. XVI. 9) — which is so vague as a measure of time that it gives some countenance to the opinion above alluded to that at first no regular day was fixed for the beginning of Passover, provided only that the whole festival was celebrated in the first month. The religious institutions were, after the exile, regulated with increasing precision; individual option was more and more restricted, and finally replaced by uniformity and compulsion. It was considered appropriate to signalise the commencement of reaping by some act of grateful devotion; therefore the first sheaf of the new crop was fitly consecrated by a rite which stamped it, and with it the whole harvest, as the gift of the Lord of heaven and earth, the Bestower of all human blessings (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 199—201); and moreover, the bloodless oblation which accompanied the animal sacrifice offered on the same

**harvest to the priest; 11. And he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord for your acceptance; on the morrow after the rest-day the priest shall wave it. 12. And**

day, was to consist of double the usual quantity of flour—two omers instead of one—, in thankful aknowledgment of the abundance vouchsafed anew by God's bounty; and because the Sheaf was itself regarded as a sacrifice requiring its *minchah* (see Comm. on Lev. I. 222): the drink-offering, confined to the usual fourth part of a hin, was not enlarged, in order to render the increase of the flour the more conspicuous (comp. *Talm.* Menach. 89[b]). It was only when these acts of devotion had been performed, that the people were allowed to use the new corn as food in whatever form of preparation (comp. Josh. V. 11; *Mishn.* Menach. X. 5—7; *Talm.* Kidd. 39[a]; Menach. 70[b]; *Orach Chay.* § 489; *Yor. Deah* § 296). But not even in this respect did the law at once assume a definite form. From the Book of Joshua (V. 11), which must be read in connection with Deuteronomy, it appears indeed that the new produce was not permitted to be eaten before a particular day; but in Joshua this is not, as in Leviticus, the sixteenth, but the fifteenth day of the first month, or "the morrow after the Pesach" (ממחרת הפסח; comp. Num. XXIII. 3): the offering of the first-fruit sheaf was not yet instituted; and therefore the earlier and significant ritual of the Pesach was taken as a distinct epoch.

At last the Passover was developed in its three chief directions, the agricultural, the historical, and the spiritual; and then it was celebrated in accordance with all the combined precepts of the Pentateuch, as is confirmed by the testimony and the allusions of Josephus (Ant. II. XIV. 6; XV. 1; III. X. 5; Bell. Jud. V. III. 1; VI. IX. 3): but that it was imperfectly solemnised "from the days of the Judges who judged Israel and in all the days of the kings of Israel and of Judah", is admitted in the Books of Kings and Chronicles (2 Ki. XXII. 23; comp. 2 Chr. XXX. 5, 26; XXXV. 17, 18). King Josiah kept it in harmony with the commands of Deuteronomy; but how much these fall short, in strictness and precision, of those of the middle Books of the Pentateuch, will be evident from the preceding remarks (comp. Num. IX. 5; Josh. V. 16; Ezra VI. 19, 22).

The ideas of presenting the first-fruits of the harvest to the deity, and of not enjoying the new crops before that act of gratitude and homage has been performed, are so natural that they are met with among many ancient and eastern nations (see Comm. on Exod. p. 440, and on Lev. I. 613; *Knobel*, Lev. p. 546; comp. esp. *Virg.* Georg. I. 347–350, Neque antea falcem maturis quisquam supponat aristis etc.; *Plin.* XVIII. 2, ne degustabant quidem novas fruges aut vina, antequam sacerdotes primitias libassent; *Diod. Sic.* I. 143; *Censorin.* De Die Nat. c. 1, cum perciperent fruges, antequam vescerentur, deis libare instituerunt; *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. III. I. 9).

It would be an endless and an unprofitable task to enumerate the Rabbinical ordinances with respect to the Pesach and the Unleavened Cakes; but we shall briefly advert to the precepts of the Mishnah in reference to the firstfruit Sheaf. That a sheaf of *barley* is meant, was believed to be a tradition dating from the time of Moses, the Bible being silent on the matter. Now at dusk on the fifteenth day of Nisan, even if

you shall offer on the day when you wave the sheaf a he-lamb without blemish, one year old, for a burnt-offering to the Lord. 13. And the bloodless offering thereof *shall be* two tenths *of an ephah* of fine flour

this was the eve of the Sabbath, delegates from the ecclesiastical Court went out to a field in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and tied together the tops of ripe barley ears, in order to render the cutting more easy. This was done as publicly as possible, in the presence of a large concourse of people, in order to show that the "morrow of the Sabbath" (vers. 11, 15) was understood to mean the day after the first day of Passover, and not, as the Sadducees and Boëthusians supposed, the day after the next weekly Sabbath. Then three ephahs of barley were cut, and brought into the Court of the Temple. Here the grains were beaten out gently to prevent their being crushed, roasted in a perforated vessel, and then spread out on the floor to be winnowed by the wind. After having been ground in a coarse mill, a tenth of an ephah of the flour was taken and sifted through thirteen sieves; oil and incense were added to it; thus it was "waved"; a handful was burnt on the altar as a memorial, and the rest was eaten by the priests (comp. *Mishn.* Menach. X. 1—9).

Philological Remarks. — The Pesach and its history have been differently viewed by others; Graf, for instance, supposes that, before the exile, the Hebrews commonly killed the animal in the Temple, as ordained in Deuteronomy; but that during the exile, when they lived in dispersion, they accustomed themselves to slaughter it in their own houses, as described in Exodus; and that this custom was, after the reorganisation of the commonwealth, legalised and represented as the earliest command on this subject (comp. *Graf*, Geschichtl. Bücher, pp. 34, 35; *George* l. c. pp. 237, 238). However, this view is opposed to all historical probability, and is unsupported by any Biblical allusion. Nor should we be inclined to assume, without further proof, the exact identity of the Pesach and the firstling offering, since to either of them a distinct character may well be assigned (comp. *Baur*, Tübing. Zeitschr. I. pp. 48. *sqq.*; *George*, l. c. p. 112, 223; *Riehm*, Gesetzgebung im Lande Moab, pp. 52 *sqq.*; *Hupfeld*, l. c. II. pp. 8—11, 17, 22 *sqq.*; *Graf*, l. c. p. 33; a. o.). — The discrepancy between ver. 14 and Josh. V. 11, to which we have above alluded, has been accounted for by the unfounded assumption of a twofold Pesach — "a Pesach of the Lord and a Pesach of the Israelites", the former being offered in the evening of the *fifteenth* day of Abib (comp. *Ebn Ezra* on ver. 11). — On the term בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם (ver. 5.), lit. "between the two evenings", i.e. the time between the decided decline of the sun and his setting, see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 171. Rashi explains in our passage from the sixth hour and upwards, fixing the commencement probably too early. — מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה, distinct from מְלָאכָה, is work connected with toil and anxiety, and with the ordinary business and occupation of life; De Wette aptly Geschäftsarbeit; other translators more literally, as Sept. ἔργον λατρευτόν; Vulg. opus servile, Engl. Vers. servile work, Rashi a. o. such labours the omission of

**mingled with oil, an offering made by fire to the Lord of a sweet odour; and the drink-offering thereof *shall be* wine, the fourth *part* of a hin. 14. And you shall eat neither bread, nor roasted *grains*, nor early corn, until the self-**

which involves a pecuniary loss; etc.; the term occurs only in our chapter (vers. 7, 8, 21, etc.) and in the parallel sections of Numbers (XXVIII. 18, 25, 26; XXIX. 1, 12, 35: such passages as Exod. XXXV. 24; XXXVI. 1, 3; 1 Chr. IX. 13, 19, are not analogous); it was evidently not chosen before the Sabbath and the festivals were each invested with a clearly marked character; and the Deuteronomist still ignored the distinction, as he simply forbade מלאכה on the seventh day of Passover (Deut. XVI. 8). The rules, set down on the subject by the Rabbins, are extremely elaborate (comp. *Talm.* Bez. 8[b]; Macc. 21[b]; *Orach Chay.* § 495).—If the portion with regard to the Sheaf (vers. 9—14) were "an early fragment" here inserted by our compiler (so *George*, l. c. 226), it would be strange and almost unaccountable, why not even Deuteronomy and the Book of Joshua make any allusion to that ceremony. — On the meaning of מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת (vers. 11, 16) see Comm. on Exod. p. 455; comp. also *Grätz*, Geschichte, V. 503; *Fürst*, Geschichte des Karäerthums, I. p. 136, note 77; *Cassel*, Sunem, I. 34—36; *Frankel*, Vorstudien zur Septuaginta, p. 190; Einfluss der Palästinensischen Exegese etc. p. 136; *Rappoport*, Erech Millin, p. 256[b]; *Bähr*, Symb. II, 620, 621; *Geiger*, Urschrift, pp. 138, 139; Zeitschr. 1863, p. 52; *Rudelbach und Guericke*, Zeitschrift, 1859, pp. 151, 152; *Wieseler*, Chronol. Synopse, pp. 348—354; *Bachmann*, Festgesetze, pp. 116—119; *Keil*, Archaeol. I. 393, 394; Levit. pp. 136, 137. The various opinions on the subject are briefly these: (1.) The "Sabbath" is the weekly Sabbath in the Passover week (so the Sadducees, Boëthusians, and Karaites, and many later expositors; comp. *Talm.* Menach. 65[b]; *J. Meyer*, De festis Hebr. pp. 295—300; *Lightfoot*, Hor. Hebr. ad Act. II. 1; etc.); (2.) It is the seventh day of Passover, that is, the twenty-first day, or the third Sabbath, in the first month, since every new year, as is asserted, commenced with a Sabbath (so Hitzig, Hupfeld); (3.) It is the fourteenth day or the second Sabbath in the first month, and therefore the "day after the Sabbath" is the first day of Passover (Knobel); and (4.) It is the rest-day or the "holy convocation" of the fifteenth day of the first month, so that the offering of the Sheaf took place on the sixteenth of Abib, the first busy work-day of the harvest, in relation to which the preceding day might well be called a "Sabbath" or rest-day, though not all labour was prohibited. This, the oldest and the traditional view of the Jews, is alone compatible with the context, and is free from the objections to which all the other opinions are open (comp. *Talm.* Menach. 65[b], 66[a]; etc.; *Ebn Ezra* on ver. 11). — On בֶּן־שְׁנָתוֹ (ver. 12), an expression occurring only in later works, see p. 213. — From the sixteenth day of the month, "bread" (לֶחֶם) was permitted (ver. 14), that is, unleavened bread; for לֶחֶם is food in general; or if leavened bread be understood, the permission could only take effect after the conclusion of Passover: the use of that term offers, therefore, no difficulty (comp. *Hupfeld*, l. c. II. 4). — On קָלִי and

same day that you bring the offering to your God: *it shall be* a statute for ever throughout your generations in all your dwellings.

15. And you shall count to you from the morrow after the rest-day, from the day that you brought the

כַּרְמֶל, which we render *roasted grain and early corn*, see notes on Lev. II. 14, pp. 486, 487. In our passage the two words are interpreted by the Sept. πεφρυγμένα χίδρα νέα (new roasted groats), Luth. Sangen and Korn, Engl. Vers. parched and green ears, De Wette geröstete und gestossene Körner, etc., which translations are partially incorrect or inaccurate. Rashi explains קלי "flour made of tender ears dried in an oven" (comp. *Virg.* Georg. I. 267, nunc torrete igni fruges), and כרמל by "parched corn called גרינ״ליש" i. e. grénailles, grains; but it is more than doubtful whether קלי applies to *ground* corn; though this view has been taken by others also (comp. Vulg. polenta et pultes; *Jon.* Ruth II. 14, קמח קלי; *Buxt.* Lex. Talm. p. 2547 sub שְׁתִיתָא). —

**15—21.** The second great festival is so clearly defined in its character, and so important in itself, that it hardly changed in the course of many centuries, and was, in the Biblical times, not associated with any historical event. It was simply the "Feast of Harvest" (חַג הַקָּצִיר, Exod. XXIII. 16), or "the Day of the Firstfruits" (יוֹם הַבִּכּוּרִים, Num. XXVIII. 26), that is, as it was subsequently defined, "of the firstfruits of the wheat harvest" (Exod. XXXIV. 22), since among the common grains, wheat is the last that attains maturity, and the firstfruits of wheat include or pre-suppose the firstfruits of other crops. As to the date of its celebration, it was, rather vaguely, ordered to take place seven weeks from the period that "the sickle is put to the corn" (Deut. XVI. 9); and then it was termed the "Feast of Weeks" (חַג שָׁבֻעֹת, Exod. XXXIV. 22; Deut. XVI. 10); it was a time of gladness and gratitude, which were to be evinced at the common Sanctuary by free-will offerings and by social feasts to be shared by all the members of the household and by needy guests, such as the Levite and the stranger, the orphan and the widow (Deut. XVI. 10—12). But when the peculiar rite of the firstfruit Sheaf was instituted and sanctioned, the seven weeks were more accurately counted from the day on which that Sheaf was offered, that is, from the sixteenth day of the first month, and then the two festivals of Passover and Pentecost were regarded as so closely united—the one being the commencement, the other the completion of the harvest — that the latter was subsequently termed the Feast of Conclusion (עֲצֶרֶת), as if it had hardly an independent existence of its own; and it always remained limited to a single day, as the culminating point of the harvest season. Therefore, in our section, the injunctions with respect to Pentecost were, under the same heading, coupled and closely connected with those on the first Sheaf (vers. 9, 15). Now the "seven weeks" (שבעה שבעות) were more exactly defined as "seven complete weeks" (שבתות תמימות), in order to point emphatically to the significance of the number seven, the holy foundation of all the festive seasons; and then the free-will offering of former days (Deut. XVI. 10) was replaced by a public ritual of thanksgiving precise

**sheaf of the-wave offering; seven weeks shall be complete; 16. Until the morrow after the seventh week shall you number fifty days; and then you shall offer a new bloodless offering to the Lord. 17. You shall bring out of your dwellings two wave-loaves of two tenths *of an***

in every detail, and evidently chosen with close reference to the Passover Sheaf: two leavened wheaten loaves were to be "waved" and presented to God, together with an ample burnt-offering, a sin-offering, and a thank-offering. The act of "waving" was common to both ceremonials, because in both instances the new produce was in the most impressive manner possible to be acknowledged as the gracious gift of the God of the universe (see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 228). But in all other respects the two rituals were clearly and judiciously made distinct. Only one Sheaf was offered, but two loaves, because the beginning of the harvest represents abundance in a less degree than its conclusion. The Sheaf was of barley, the loaves of wheat, not only because barley ripens first, and wheat three or four weeks later, in the second part of May (comp. Exod. IX. 31; Ruth I. 22 and II. 23), but because the superior grain was deemed more suitable at the end of the harvest, when its entire wealth was secured (comp. Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 120, 121). The one was presented on a work-day, the other on a day of rest and of festive recreation, which reached its climax, at the end of the agricultural year, in a celebration extending over a full week. On Passover, the produce was laid before God in its original, on Pentecost in a prepared state and as usually consumed, in harmony with the relation of the two festivals as beginning and completion. The Sheaf was of course accompanied by unleavened cakes, but the loaves were leavened to make them more strikingly represent the common and ordinary food of the people, which had again been provided by God's blessing: it was only in these loaves and those eaten with the praise-offering (VII. 13), that leaven was admitted in the sacrificial service (comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 459). And lastly, the animal sacrifices were, at least according to our section, much more numerous on the second than on the first festival, for the reason already referred to, because the happy conclusion of the harvest particularly prompts the feelings of gratitude and religious submission (comp. vers. 12, 18, 19). But these sacrifices afford a clear proof, if one were needed, of the very late introduction of this ceremonial of the "Wave-loaves", or of "the new oblation" (מנחה חדשה), which is nowhere adverted to except in this chapter and the corresponding part of Numbers (XXVIII. 26). For our passage prescribes as a holocaust seven lambs. *one* young bullock, and *two* rams (ver. 18); whereas the law in Numbers demands seven lambs, *two* young bullocks, and *one* ram (Num. XXVIII. 27), or exactly the same species and numbers of animals as for the accompaniment of the Sheaf; and it makes no mention whatever of a thank-offering, for which our author ordains two additional lambs, likewise to be "waved", but to be given over to the priests in the manner of all thank-offerings (ver. 20). Tradition could find no other mode of overcom-

*ephah*; they shall be of fine flour; they shall be baked with leaven; *they are* the firstfruits to the Lord. 18. And you shall offer with the bread seven lambs without blemish, one year old, and one young bullock, and two rams: they shall be *for* a burnt-offering to the Lord, with their blood-

ing this difficulty than by summing up the numbers given in the two Books; thus Josephus states that on Pentecost the congregation offered "three bullocks for a burnt-offering, and two [three] rams, and fourteen lambs" (Ant. III. x. 6). But the Mishnah (Menach. IV. 2) considers the animals in our passage as being presented with the loaves, those in Numbers as "additional sacrifices" of the day (אלו קרבו בגלל הלחם ואלו למוסף; and so modern apologists, as Bachmann, Keil, a. o.): but it cannot be proved that the compiler of our chapter understood the subject in a similar manner (comp. *Maimonid.* Hilch. Tamid. c. 8). Even for generations after the Babylonian exile, when the principles of public worship had been agreed upon by the priests and the leaders of the people, fluctuations were inevitable in many details, and they left their traces in the latest portions of the Pentateuch. — It is well known that, from comparatively recent times, Judaism, guided by uncertain computations, celebrates the Feast of Weeks as the day of the revelation of the Decalogue; this meaning of the festival was still unknown to Philo and Josephus; and was, even in the middle ages, a matter of dispute among learned Jewish authorities. Abarbanel (on our passage, fol. 57[b] ed. Amsterd.) observes, "There is no doubt that the Law was given on Pentecost, but this festival was not instituted in commemoration of that event"; for "the Divine Law which is in our hands, and the prophecy which is in our hands, are witnesses in themselves, and there is no need to set apart and to hallow a day as a memorial" (see *supra*, p. 274; comp. *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 43; *Cuzri* III. 10; *Orach Chay.* §. 494; *Lundius*, Heiligthümer, p. 1151; *Meuschen*, Nov. Test. ex Talm. illustr. pp. 737 *sqq.*; *Meyer*, De Festis, pp. 292 *sqq.*; *Herzog*, Real Encyclop. XI. 482—484: the arguments in favour of the antiquity of that meaning, derived from 2 Chr. XV. 10 and John V. 1, 39, are quite untenable). The firstfruit-offerings of the Greeks also, in some cases, included bread (ἄρτος θαλύσιος, or θάργηλος *Athen.* III. 80).

Philological Remarks. — To what extent, and up to what time, Pentecost was a variable feast, celebrated on different days in different years according to the state of the crops and the progress of the harvest, cannot be ascertained from our preserved documents; the positive deductions that have been ventured appear certainly artificial and inconclusive (comp. f. i. *George*, l. c. pp. 264—267, starting from the assumption that vers. 9—22 are "an earlier fragment", the true purport of which was misunderstood by later compilers and readers of the Book). It is indeed surprising that Ezekiel, in his summary of festivals (XLV. 18—25), makes no mention whatever of Pentecost; but it would be rash to conclude from this circumstance that the festival was by the prophet deemed unimportant, or that it had not been regularly kept even in the last periods of the monarchy; the prophet's summary is brief and rapid; and though very momentous in-

**less offering and their drink-offerings, *as* an offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to the Lord. 19. And you shall sacrifice one kid of the goats for a sin-offering, and two lambs one year old for a thank-offering. 20. And the priest shall wave them with the bread**

ferences are suggested by his statements, caution is necessary in drawing conclusions from his silence. Nor need we, after our previous observations (p. 499), remark that Pentecost, according to our text, was not meant to take place always on the first day of the week: the term ממחרת השבת denotes here as above (ver. 11) the morrow after the first rest-day or holy convocation of Passover; Josephus, in a passage which has been quoted in support of the former opinion, says (Ant. XIII. viii. 4), "The festival which we call Pentecost, did then fall (ἐνέστη) to be the next day to the Sabbath"; which implies that the festival may also fall on other days of the week. — Since the שַׁבָּת recurs every seven days, the word took not only the meaning of week, and became a synonym of שָׁבוּעַ, as in our passage (ver. 15, שבע שבתות תמימות, Sept. ἑπτὰ ἑβδομάδας ὁλοκλήρους, Vulg. septem hebdomadas plenas; comp. Deut. XVI. 9, שִׁבְעָה שָׁבֻעֹת; ver. 16 השבת השביעית, Sept. τῆς ἐσχάτης ἑβδομάδος, Vulg. hebdomadae septimae, Onk. and Jon. שְׁבוּעֲתָא שביעיתא, etc.; comp. *Talm.* Nazir 6[b]; *Ideler*, Chronol. I. 481), and like σάββατον in the New Testament (Matth. XXVIII. 1; Luke XVIII. 12; Mark XVI. 9; etc.), but it was also applied to any heptad of periods of time, as of years, *e. g.* שבע שבתות שנים seven heptads of years, i. e. forty-nine years (XXV. 8; Sept. ἑπτὰ ἑβδομάδες ἐτῶν, Vulg. septem hebdomadas annorum, Germ. sieben Jahrwochen). — In עַד מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁ׳ (ver. 16) the preposition מִן *from* is properly superfluous, and seems incompatible with עַד *until*; but ממחרת which occurs immediately before was taken as one notion — "the following day": double prepositions, occasionally very divergent in meaning, are not rarely joined with the same noun (Gramm. §. 69. 2). — The Hebrews were commanded, "You shall bring two wave loaves out of your dwellings" (ממושבתיכם, ver. 17), that is, you, the people, shall bring, from your own property and produce, "loaves baked for the daily food of the household, not loaves purposely prepared for holy use" (*Keil*, Lev. p. 138, Arch. §. 83): the word ממושבתיכם may seem unnecessary; but it certainly does not warrant us to suppose that *every Israelite* had to offer two such loaves (so some Karaites, as David ben Boaz — see *Fürst*, Karäerthum, I. 95 —, Calvin, and some modern critics, as *Graf*, l. c. p. 38); for if so, every Israelite would also have been obliged to present from his own means two lambs (ver. 20), which is an impossible assumption, as the command could not have arbitrarily been restricted to the "prosperous" among the people. Josephus also (Ant. III. x. 6) speaks only of one public offering; but he strangely mentions *one* loaf (ἄρτον). According to the Rabbins, the word intimates that the oblation was only to commence after the subjection of the Holy Land, and was not to be presented elsewhere. — The א in תביאו (ver. 17) has in the Masoretic text a dot which is probably not dagesh forte, but mappik (see Gramm. Part II. § vi). —

of the firstfruits *for* a wave-offering before the Lord,
with the two lambs; they shall be holy to the Lord for
the priest 21. And you shall proclaim on the selfsame
day, it shall be a holy convocation to you; you shall
do no servile work *therein*; *it shall be* a statute for ever
in all your dwellings throughout your generations. —
22. And when you reap the harvest of your land, thou
shalt not wholly cut the corners of thy field when thou
reapest; nor shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest; thou shalt leave them for the poor and for the
stranger: I *am* the Lord your God.
23. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 24. Speak

על־הלחם (ver. 18) is *together with the bread*, not "on account of the bread, or owing to the bread" (Rashi; see p. 415). — Knobel (Levit. pp. 547, 548) and some others (as *Vaihinger* in Herz. Real-Encycl. XI. 480, 481), consider the words from שִׁבְעַת (ver. 18) to לְחַטָּאת (ver. 19) as an interpolation of the Jehovist who, finding the statement in one of his documents, is supposed to have inserted it here as strictly belonging to the wave-loaves, in order to remove the contradiction with Num. XXVIII. 27: but that scholar ascribes our chapter essentially to the old Elohist; and his criticisms start therefore from unfounded premises (comp. also *Bachmann* l. c. pp. 119, 120). Some Jewish expositors curiously maintained, that the officiating priests were free to offer the sacrifices either as prescribed in Leviticus or in Numbers (comp. *Ebn Ezra* on ver. 17). — קָרָא (ver. 21), used absolutely, means to proclaim a מקרא or convocation (comp. vers. 2, 37).

**22.** A special precept of charity is hardly expected in a survey of annual festivals; it would the less have been missed in this place, as it occurs before in almost identical terms (XIX. 9); but our compiler deemed the law of the harvest feast a welcome opportunity for inculcating once more kindness to the poor in the season of reaping; he, therefore, repeated the former injunction, but judiciously omitted that part of it which relates to the ingathering of fruit (XIX. 10).

Philological Remarks. — The efforts made to prove that this verse stands here appropriately, have not been successful (comp. f. i. *Bachmann*, l. c. p. 115; see also *Rashi* in loc.). The wording of the command in this passage is easier, and seems therefore of later date, than in the previous chapter: the anallage of the plural בקצרכם and the singular תכלה is indeed reproduced, but instead of לא תכלה . . . לקצר we have here the more regular construction בְּקֻצְרֶךָ.

**23—32.** The chronological arrangement observed by our author now brings him to two new festivals, which are only mentioned in Leviticus and Numbers, and which, unlike the former annual celebrations, have no reference to the produce of the soil, but, in harmony with the people's advanced culture, relate to the Divine government of human destinies and to man's aspirations after purity and peace of mind.

to the children of Israel, saying, In the seventh month on the first *day* of the month, shall you have a day of rest, a memorial of blowing of trumpets, a holy convocation. 25. You shall do no servile work *therein*; and you shall offer an offering made by fire to the Lord.

26. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 27. Also on the tenth *day* of this seventh month *there shall be* the Day of Atonement; it shall be a holy convocation to you; and you shall afflict yourselves, and offer an offering made by fire to the Lord. 28. And you shall do no work on that same day; for it *is* a day of atonement for you before the Lord your God. 29. For who-

This is the import of those two new festivals — the Day of blowing the Trumpet (יוֹם תְּרוּעָה) and the Day of Atonement (יוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים): the former was instituted when, after the exile, the Jews, adopting the custom of east-Asiatic nations, began the year, not as before, at the vernal, but at the autumnal equinox, and were anxious to mark its commencement by some solemn ceremonial calculated to prove how deeply they felt that their prosperity and happiness depended entirely on God's power and mercy; and the latter was introduced when that growing consciousness of human guilt and that yearning for expiation, which led to the development of the sin-offerings and the establishment of the office of High-priest, prompted them to set apart periodically seasons for penitence and self-castigation. Ezekiel, in his ideal reorganisation of the theocracy, ordained impressive ceremonials for the first day of the year, to be repeated on the seventh day, and designed "to cleanse the Sanctuary" and "all who have sinned from error or simplicity". But his proposals did not prevail; for after his time the first day of the year was no longer in the first month Abib, but in the seventh month called Tishri; it was deemed expedient to associate with the holiest festival of the year another significant number, and hence the *tenth* day of the month was fixed for the Day of Atonement; and then the suggestions of Ezekiel were deemed far too simple; not only were the sacrifices multiplied, but an imposing ritual was devised, which combined nearly all the symbols that had gradually been worked out, which, however, borrowed from the Persians, under whose rule the Jews were then living, the mythological element of the sin-laden goat sent to Azazel, a chief of demons. This was not accomplished before the latter part of the fifth century. Such, in brief outline, were the nature and origin of the two spiritual festivals of the Hebrews, which have been more fully described in a treatise devoted to the subject (pp. 266—282).

Though the trumpets were sounded on all solemn days (p. 489), the New-year's day was more particularly to be a "Day of blowing the Trumpet" or "a Memorial of blowing the Trumpet" (זִכְרוֹן תְּרוּעָה). Parallel passages render this term more intelligible: the blasts of the instruments sounded

soever *it be* that shall not afflict himself on that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people. 30. And whosoever *it be* that does any work on that same day, him will I destroy from among his people. 31. You shall

on the festivals while the burnt and the thank-offerings were being presented, were promised to be "to the Israelites for a memorial before God"; or more distinctly still, when they marched against the enemy, those sounds were to "cause the Hebrews to be remembered before God", who would grant them victory (Num. X. 9, 10). Thus on the day when they naturally looked with anxiety into the uncertain future, the loud notes, probably more frequent and more awe-inspiring than on other festivals, were meant to rouse God's mercy in their favour, who would remember His people and grant them His blessing and protection in the coming year. Those who deem this conception too rude for so advanced an age, should bear in mind, that it was familiar to the Hebrews from early times, and was repeatedly applied by their religious legislators. On two onyx-stones upon the shoulder-pieces of the High-priest's ephod, the names of the twelve tribes of Israel were engraven; the stones were called "stones of memorial" (אַבְנֵי זִכָּרֹן), and the High-priest was thus "to bear the names of the children of Israel before the Lord upon his two shoulders for a memorial" (לְזִכָּרֹן, Exod. XXVIII. 12). In the same manner, he was to carry their names "upon the Breast-plate of decision upon his heart, when he went into the Sanctuary, for a memorial (לְזִכָּרֹן) before the Lord continually" (Exod. XXVIII. 29). When the census was taken, every Israelite had to give half a shekel, which contribution was applied for the service of the Tabernacle, "that it might be a memorial to the children of Israel before the Lord, to make an atonement for their souls" (Exod. XXX. 16). After the successful war against the Midianites in the time of the wanderings, Moses and Eleazar brought portions of the spoil as an offering into the Tabernacle "for a memorial" (לְזִכָּרוֹן) for the children of Israel before the Lord" (Num. XXXI. 54). On the other hand, the widow of Zarephath, alarmed at the dangerous illness of her son, said to the prophet Elijah, "Art thou come to me to call my sin to remembrance?" (לְהַזְכִּיר את עֲוֹנִי, 1 Ki. XVII. 18); for she believed that his presence had directed God's closer attention upon her house. Such simple notions gave also rise to the holy Shew-bread, that is properly, "Bread of the Countenance" (לחם הפנים): twelve cakes were placed "before the Lord" (לפני יהוה) to serve as a memorial for the tribes of Israel when they offered up to Him their prayers for their daily sustenance; and in nearly all cereal oblations, the incense, together with a handful of flour mingled with oil, was burnt upon the altar as a "memorial" (אַזְכָּרָה). However, these and similar arrangements were in the course of time understood in a more refined or more spiritual sense (comp. Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 206, 226, 484). With regard to New-year, Philo observes that the trumpets were blown "in commemoration of the marvellous revelation of the Law, when a voice of the trumpet sounded from heaven, which it is natural to suppose reached to the very extremities of the universe"; and, besides,

do no manner of work: *it shall be* a statute for ever throughout your generations in all your dwellings. 32. It *shall be* to you a Sabbath of rest, and you shall afflict yourselves: on the ninth *day* of the month, in the even-

"the trumpet being the proper instrument of war, it was blown in order to show gratitude to God, the Giver of peace and plenty and prosperity" (*Philo*, De Septenar. c. 22). The Synagogue, carrying out the Biblical commands as much as feasible, has retained the rite: on the New-year, except when it falls on a Sabbath, a number of different sounds (called תְּקִיעָה the long sustained, שְׁבָרִים the broken, and תְּרוּעָה the tremulous blast), is given forth with a *shofar* (שׁוֹפָר), the curved horn of the ram, in remembrance, it is said, of the ram which was sacrificed instead of Isaac. In the time of the Temple, the mouth-piece was set in gold; and while the *shofar* sounded prolonged blasts, two trumpets gave forth short and shrill tones; but on the other festivals two *shofars* sounded short, and two trumpets prolonged notes. On all these points, on the time and mode of blowing, and on the persons qualified for the task, the Talmud and the Rabbins give ample instructions (comp. *Mishn.* Rosh Hash. III. 2—7; IV. 1, 2, 8, 9; *Maimon.* Hilch. Shofar c. 1; *Orach Chayim* §§ 585—590; see also *Hieron.* ad Hos. V. 8: "Buccina pastoralis est et cornu recurvo efficitur, inde et proprie hebraice *sophar*, graece κερατίνη appellatur"; *Lund.* Jüd. Heiligthümer, Book V, c. 17, pp. 1157 *sqq.*).—Ezekiel appoints for the first day of the year only one young bullock as a sin-offering; but the levitical legislator commanded, as special sacrifices, no less than ten animals — for a holocaust a young bullock, a ram, and seven lambs; and for a sin-offering a kid of the goats; to these were, moreover, added the daily sacrifices and those fixed for the day of the New-moon, which raised the number of sacrificial animals to twenty-three.—Yet though the day is a holy convocation, it is no absolute rest-day; it is inferior in sanctity to the great Day of Atonement, on which the people, dismissing all worldly thoughts, pray for pardon and expiation of sins, and which they are entirely to devote to holy meditation and severe self-affliction. On these points our author insists indeed with great emphasis, and menaces with excision those who desecrate the day by any kind of work or by partaking of food; but he gives no details with respect to its public celebration; he merely enjoins, "You shall offer an offering made by fire to the Lord"; for he deemed it unnecessary to describe again that grand and complicated ceremonial so fully set forth in a preceding section (ch. XVI). To our remarks on that section we may here refer for the illustration of the rituals of the Day of Atonement (pp. 321 *sqq.*).—According to the Rabbins, all labour forbidden on Sabbath is also unlawful on the Day of Atonement; but wanton transgression of this command is in the one case punished with lapidation, in the other with excision (comp. in general *Orach Chay.* §§ 604—624). While Talmudical authorities ordered that, on the three agricultural festivals, in all countries except Palestine, two successive days of convocation should be celebrated where the Bible institutes one, on account of the uncer-

**ing, from evening to evening, shall you celebrate your Sabbath.**

**33. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 34. Speak to the children of Israel, saying, On the fifteenth day**

tainty of the day of the New-moon, they decreed that even in Palestine New-year should be kept for two days; but that the Day of Atonement should everywhere be confined to the tenth day of the seventh month.

Philological Remarks. — The fact that the first month of the new calendar was the *seventh* of the old, probably rendered the introduction of the Day of Memorial more acceptable; but it is not likely that a festival should have been established without any other reason or motive than the desire of embodying the holiness of the number seven; national institutions are not solely built on abstract principles; even the Sabbatical year and the Year of jubilee were not entirely the result of such a theory; having been deemed advisable for certain practical and religious ends, they were connected with the number seven in order to enhance their significance (comp. *George*, l. c. pp. 217, 218). Nor can the Day of Memorial have been designed merely as an anniversary of the restoration of the sacrificial service in the time of Ezra (III. 6), which took place on the first day of the seventh month (so *Graf* l. c. p. 41); though that event may have materially helped to secure the recognition of the Day (see *supra* p. 271). Philo (De Septen. cc. 2, 22) calls it aptly σαλπίγγων ἑορτή or ἱερομηνία, the holy New-moon or the New-moon κατ' ἐξοχήν; but neither he nor Josephus describes the New-year and the Day of Atonement as days of judgment. — אַךְ (ver. 27) seems merely to introduce a new subject with some distinctness or emphasis (comp. ver. 39); the Sept. translates the word by καί; the Vulgate omits it here, but renders ergo in ver. 39; the Engl. Vers. has also; De Wette, perhaps too strongly, ja; and Gesenius prorsus hoc die, eo statim die (see on ver. 39). "Wherever the words אך or רק occur in the Law", observes Rashi, "they are meant to intimate that forgiveness is granted to those who repent, but not to those who do not repent".—The phrase עִנָּה נֶפֶשׁ to fast, for the older צוּם, is peculiar to compositions of the Babylonian and later periods (vers. 27, 29, 32; XVI. 29, 31; Num. XXIX, 7; XXX. 14; Isai. LVIII. 3, 5; comp. Ezra VIII. 21 התענות; Ps. XXXV. 13, עניתי בצום נפשי). — The two terms "he shall be cut off (ונכרתה) from his people" and "I will destroy (והאבדתי) him from among his people" (vers. 29, 30), seem to be synonymous; which explains the often menaced punishment of כָּרֵת or excision (comp. *Rashi* and *Ebn Ezra* in loc.). — שָׁבַת שַׁבָּת (ver. 32) is to keep rest, to celebrate a rest-day (comp. XXV. 2; also XXVI. 34; comp. צום צ׳ם to keep a fast; see Gramm. § 102. 7); and therefore תשבתו שבתכם you shall keep the rest-day that has been enjoined upon you.

**33—36.** The storing up of the various fruits, the pride and wealth of Palestine's soil, was for the habitants an occasion of even greater gladness and gratitude than the increase of their flocks and the reaping of their corn; for to the necessaries of life it added its comforts and luxuries. It gave, therefore, rise to a third festival, "the Feast of Ingathering" (חַג הָאָסִף), at which the

of this seventh month *shall be* the Feast of Tabernacles *for* seven days to the Lord. 35. On the first day *shall be* a holy convocation; you shall do no servile work *therein*. 36. Seven days you shall offer an offering made

people might all the more give themselves up to merriment and rejoicings, as it took place "at the revolution" or "the end" of the agricultural year, when they had brought in all their produce and were free from care and anxiety. It became, therefore, soon the chief festival of mirthful recreation; the families repaired to the common Sanctuary, joyously presented their "gifts, and all their vows, and all their free-will offerings", and shared their abundance with the less prosperous (comp. Judg. IX. 27; XXI. 19, 21; 1 Sam. I. 3, 21; Isai. XXX. 29). And the septennial recital of the Law could not have taken place at a more appropriate time (Deut. XXXI. 10; comp. Neh. VIII. 18).

As at first neither public nor private ceremonials were prescribed for the festival — no offering of first-fruits and no characteristic sacrifice — the time of its commencement was probably not fixed; it was sufficient to command, that it should be celebrated "at the end of the year" when "the corn and the wine have been gathered in" (see *supra*, pp. 273, 275). One point, however, seems to have been adhered to, namely that, like Passover, it should begin with the full moon, or on the evening of the fourteenth day of the month (comp. 2 Chr. VII. 9—11). Many other ancient nations also paid homage to the second great luminary by keeping their festivities when it is in its full splendour; thus the Egyptians, and many northern and western tribes, offered to some of their chief deities sacrifices accompanied by games and dances; the Romans considered the full moon holy; others regarded it as auspicious; the Spartans, following the injunctions of Lycurgus, would not set out on a military expedition at any other time; the Olympic games always began on the day following the first full-moon after the summer solstice; the old Germans held their public assemblies either on the day of the new or the full moon; and others kept a fast on both days (comp. *Herod.* II. 47; VI. 106, 120; *Pind.* Olymp. III. 35, 36; *Plut.* De Is. 8; Quaest. Rom. 24; *Strab.* III. IV. 16; *Pausan.* I. XXVIII. 4; *Ael.* Nat. An. X. 16; *Lucian*, De Astrol. 25; *Tacit.* Germ. 11; Ps. LXXXI. 4; *Philo*, De Septen. cc. 10, 24, ἵνα μὴ μεθ' ἡμέραν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ νύκτωρ πλήρης ὁ κόσμος ᾖ τοῦ παγκάλου φωτός κτλ.; *Knob.* Exod. p. 102; Lev. p. 532; *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 355).

As regards the *month*, the custom wavered between the seventh and the eighth of the year, corresponding generally with our September and October; and this fluctuation was natural, as the various kinds of fruit ripen in Palestine earlier or later in different years and in different districts, the grapes and olives hardly ever earlier than in the first part of September, the pomegranates and dates hardly ever later than in the second part of October. Therefore, when Jeroboam desired to bind his new subjects more closely to his rule, we are told that "he ordained a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, like the feast that is in Judah (כחג אשר ביהודה), and he offered upon the altar" (1 Ki. XII. 32). It is not to the purpose to urge that

**by fire to the Lord; on the eighth day shall be a holy convocation to you, and you shall offer an offering made**

the ingathering of the fruits is finished later in the northern provinces, since it varies in the southern parts also: if Jeroboam wished to gain his object, his policy must have been to retain in his kingdom as much as possible the institutions to which the people had been accustomed under his predecessors; he would certainly not have chosen for the most popular festival the eighth month, if it had invariably taken place in the seventh (comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 2). However, when after the exile the seventh month became the beginning of the year, and was hallowed by such solemn celebrations as the Day of blowing the Trumpet and the Day of Atonement, it was permanently chosen for the Feast of Ingathering also (vers. 34, 39; Num. XXIX. 12); it became the festive, and because it was the seventh, the holy month; and there was not even a "second Tabernacle" permitted in analogy to the "second Passover", to be kept a month after its regular date (p. 494).

Similar fluctuations are traceable in the *duration* of the festival. The Deuteronomist (XVI. 13, 15), the first legislator who states a time, prescribes that it should be observed *seven* days, like Passover. Thus Solomon also, when he consecrated the Temple, according to the older account in the Books of Kings (2 Ki. VIII. 65), solemnised the festival *seven* days, and on the next day the people returned to their homes. But in the Persian period, when the calendar was arranged on clear and definite principles, it was deemed advisable to mark the conclusion of the year's festivals by a separate day not indeed invested with quite the same solemnity as the festive week, yet to be kept as a rest-day and a holy convocation; thus in our section of Leviticus, an *eighth* day is ordained as the termination both of the Feast of Ingathering and of the festive cycle of the year (ver. 36); and it was observed as a binding ordinance (כַּמִּשְׁפָּט) in the time of Nehemiah (comp. Num. XXIX. 35—38; Neh. VIII. 18; Ezra III. 4; 2 Macc. X. 6). Therefore the later Chronist states that Solomon, on the memorable occasion referred to, dismissed the people on the twenty-third day of the seventh month, that is, on the *ninth* day after the beginning of the festival; and the historian thus represents the eighth day, or the supplement of the Feast, which was kept in his own time, as having already been celebrated in the age of Solomon (comp. 2 Chr. VII. 10, 11; see Philol. Rem.).

When the festival, which in the mean time had taken the name of Feast of Tabernacles (חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת), was thus fixed and developed, it was above all others distinguished by sacrifices so numerous and so liberal that its importance and joyful character were strikingly apparent; in the eight days were presented no less than 71 bullocks, 15 rams, 105 lambs, and 8 kids of the goats, or together 199 animals, besides the daily holocausts and those for the incidental Sabbath or Sabbaths: the spirit of a later time is manifest in the systematic distribution of the sacrifices; for while the number of the rams, the lambs, and of the kids of the goats remain the same on each of the seven principal days, the number of the bullocks decreases by one each

by fire to the Lord; it *is* a solemn assembly, *and* you shall do no servile work *therein.*

day, from thirteen to seven; and to show the inferior sanctity of the eighth day, and as a proof of its subsequent introduction, it received only a sacrifice of ten animals, while even the seventh day was honoured with twenty-four victims. Compared with these directions, how simple are those of Ezekiel, who merely prescribes, for each day of Tabernacles alike, a holocaust of seven bullocks and seven rams, and a sin-offering of one kid of the goats (Ezek. XLV. 25) — a sufficient proof that, before the exile, the ritual of the festival was not finally settled.

Philological Remarks. — Of the two statements above referred to, from which a change in the duration of Tabernacles may be deduced (1 Ki. VIII. 65 and 2 Chr. VII. 9), that of the Chronist is more intelligible and more probable; he simply remarks, "On the eighth day they made a solemn assembly; for they kept the dedication of the altar seven days, and the Feast (הֶחָג) seven days"; but in the first Book of Kings we read that Solomon "held the Feast (הֶחָג) seven days and seven days, fourteen days; on the eighth day he sent the people away": which is so illogical that the words "and seven days, fourteen days" appear like an interpolation founded on the parallel passage of the Chronicles (see *supra* p. 272 note 3; comp. *George* l.c.pp. 155—158; *Graf*, l. c. p. 39). — Maimonides (Mor. Nev. III. 43) curiously suggests that the eighth day was appointed in order to enable the Hebrews to complete those rejoicings for which small booths are insufficient, and which require spacious dwellings and large edifices.—עֲצֶרֶת (ver. 36; Num. XXIX. 35; Neh. VIII. 18; 2 Chr. VII. 9; from עָצַר in the sense of bringing together or gathering), employed in reference to the seventh day of Passover also (Deut. XVI. 8, Cod. Sam. חג ליהוה), is *assembly* (Jer. IX. 1, Sept. σύνοδος), festive or religious *meeting* (Sept. in Am. V. 21 πανήγυρις; Onk. כְּנִישָׁא which is assembly, as *Targ.* Esth. II. 3,8, Syr. כנושתא, Ar.Erp. جمع, Vulg. here coetus atque collectae, Luth. Versammlung, Engl. Vers. solemn assembly; comp. 2 Ki. X. 20; Isai. I. 13; Joel I. 14; and Arab. جمعة "assembly" for the weekly holiday, or Friday); though we might well be induced to take the word as *conclusion* (from עָצַר in the meaning of shutting up, Sept. ἐξόδιον), and so it was indeed in later times applied to Pentecost as the conclusion of Passover (p. 500; comp. *Jos.* Ant. III. x. 6, Ἀσαρθά ... σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο Πεντηκοστήν; *Onk.* Num. XXVIII. 26; *Mishn.* Rosh Hash. I. 2; Moed Kat. III. 6; Chag. II. 4; *Talm. Jer.* Pesach. X, fol. 37^b ed. Krotosch. עד עצרית until Pentecost). The meanings of "keeping or detaining in the Sanctuary another day" (Saadiah, Rashi, a.o.), and of "abstention from labour and worldly occupation" (Ebn Ezra, Rashb., Kimchi, Michael., and partially Knobel), are out of the question.

**37, 38.** That these verses probably formed the original termination of the laws on the five *annual* festivals (vers. 4—36), and that they were by the compiler of this chapter made to comprise the Sabbath likewise, although they expressly exclude it (ver. 38), has above been explained (on vers. 1, 2).

Philological Remarks.—The term עֲדָה embraces here, as it frequently

37. These *are* the festivals of the Lord which you shall proclaim *to be* holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire to the Lord, burnt-offering and bloodless offering, sacrifice and drink-offerings, every thing upon its day. 38. Besides the Sabbaths of the Lord, and besides your gifts, and besides all your vows, and besides all your free-will offerings, which you give to the Lord.

39. Also on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when you gather in the fruit of the land, you shall

does, the two later classes of animal sacrifice, the thank- and the sin-offerings, the older holocausts (עֹלָה) being named separately (see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 74 note 6). — דבר יום ביומו, literally, "the thing of *every* day on its day", that is, every thing as it has been appointed for each day (see notes on Exod. V. 13).—The מתנות holy *gifts* not intended for the altar, include especially the firstlings and tithes set apart for the priests (comp. Num. XVIII. 11, 29).

**39—43.** The "Feast of Ingathering" (חַג הָאָסִיף) became gradually a "Feast of Tabernacles" (חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת), because fruit-gatherers and vinedressers, leaving their towns and villages, lived for the time, as many still live, in booths near their orchards and vineyards; and probably also because the multitude of pilgrims, larger than at any other season of the year, who flocked to the holy towns, to Shiloh, Bethel, and Gilgal, and later to Jerusalem, could not possibly be lodged in the houses, and stayed during the festive week in temporary huts or tents (comp. Hos. XII. 10). These two circumstances, incidental to the ordinary life of the people, very naturally gave rise to a custom, which imparted to the festival a distinctive character. Yet a similar usage was not unknown to other nations: the Syrians celebrated every three years in honour of the gods of wine and love, a merry "booth-festival" (ἑορτὴ σκηνική); from remote times the Hindoos have kept, in the later part of the summer, a feast of nine days, during which they erect before the temples and in the streets tents from canvas and the branches of trees; and in the Roman festival of Anna Perenna, on the Ides of March, "leafy bowers" (frondeae casae), and somewhat later, in the rites of the ambarvalia, or purification of the fields, "huts made of twigs" (virgae) formed a prominent feature. Nor is it impossible that the feast of *Sakea* (ἡ τῶν Σακαίων ἑορτὴ or τὰ Σακαῖα) celebrated by the Babylonians and Persians, in honour of Anitis and other deities, with rites similar to those of the Roman Saturnalia, helped to render popular the Jewish *Succoth* (סֻכּוֹת), just as the Persian festival of *Pur* influenced the character of the Jewish *Purim*, if it did not give rise to it (comp. *Ovid*, Fast. III. 523—528; *Tib.* II. I. 24; *Athen.* XIV. 44; *Strab.* XI. VIII. 5; comp. also *Athen.* IV. 19, describing the nine days' festival of the κάρνεια, at which the Spartans, in commemoration of their old camp life dwelt in pavilions — σκιάδες — and tents; *Movers*, Phoeniz. I. 480 *sqq.*; *Knob.* Lev. p. 551). Certain it is, that the custom was, in the time after the exile con-

**keep the Feast of the Lord seven days: on the first day *shall be* a Sabbath, and on the eighth day *shall be* a Sabbath. 40. And you shall take for yourselves on**

sidered an essential part of the religious celebration of the Feast. For we read in Nehemiah (VIII. 13—18), that during his first governorship, the chiefs of the people and the priests, applying to Ezra for instruction, "found it written in the Law which God had commanded by Moses, that the children of Israel should dwell in booths on the Feast in the seventh month; and that they should publish and proclaim in all their cities and in Jerusalem, saying, Go forth to the mount, and fetch olive-branches (עֲלֵי זַיִת), and branches of the wild olive tree (עֲלֵי עֵץ שֶׁמֶן), and myrtle branches (עֲלֵי הֲדַס), and palm branches (עֲלֵי תְמָרִים), and branches of thick-leaved trees (עֲלֵי עֵץ עָבֹת), to make booths as it is written" (כַּכָּתוּב). We are then told that the people did as they had been directed, and that they kept the Feast for seven days, concluding with a solemn assembly on the eighth day "according to the law" (כַּמִּשְׁפָּט); and the historian adds that "since the days of Joshua, the son of Nun, to that day had not the children of Israel done so". Yet in the Pentateuch we find no injunctions precisely like those referred to in the Book of Nehemiah. Those approaching nearest to them are the commands of our section (ver. 40): "And you shall take for yourselves (וּלְקַחְתֶּם לָכֶם) on the first day the fruit of a beautiful tree (פְּרִי עֵץ הָדָר), branches of palm-trees (כַּפֹּת תְּמָרִים), and the boughs of thick-leaved trees (וַעֲנַף עֵץ עָבֹת), and willows of the brook (וְעַרְבֵי נָחַל); and you shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days". It is unnecessary to point out the differences in the two passages (comp. p. 275 note 15); it is even doubtful whether the objects mentioned were in both cases intended to serve the same purpose; that they were meant, in Nehemiah, for the construction and adornment of booths, is unquestionable; but is this equally clear with respect to our verse? This neither mentions booths, nor is it connected with the command regarding them (vers. 42, 43); for it prescribes, "You shall take to yourselves" the boughs and the fruit, and "rejoice before the Lord", as if the Hebrews were to use those objects as religious symbols forming part of their holiday service. As such they were certainly understood by the later Jews, except the Sadducees (comp. *Ebn Ezra* in loc.). In the time of the Maccabees already we hear that "the people bore (ἔχοντες) on the Feast of Tabernacles branches (θύρσους) and fair boughs (κλάδους), and also palms (φοίνικας), and sang hymns in praise of God" (2 Macc. X. 7). Josephus, describing the practice of the second Temple, states that, while the sacrifices were being offered, "every one of the worshippers carried in his hands (φέροντε ἐν ταῖς χερσίν) a branch of myrtle and willows joined to a bough of the palm tree, with the addition of a pome-citron" (Ant. III. x. 4; XIII. xiii. 5); and in exact agreement with this description are the Talmudical regulations with respect to the *lulav* (לולב) — a fresh palm branch, not less than a hand-breadth long, together with willows and myrtle-twigs, to be held during prayers in the right hand, while the *ethrog* (אֶתְרוֹג), that is, a citron or orange, is held in the

**the first day of the fruit of a beautiful tree, branches of palm-trees, and the bough of a thick-leaved tree, and willows of the brook; and you shall rejoice before**

left (comp. *Mishn.* Succ. III. 4, etc.; *Maimon.* Hilch. Lulav, cc. 7, 8; *Orach Chay.* §§. 645—658). It can hardly be doubted that our law must be taken in this sense; and the custom was meant by the thoughtful author to typify the wealth and the beauty of nature, which man, by God's grace and mercy, is permitted to enjoy: in harmony with the festive cheerfulness of the season, he mentions "the fruit of the beautiful tree" first; the palm-tree, of which the present Arabs ingeniously enumerate as many uses as there are days in the year, is to the Eastern mind the most perfect emblem of sustenance and comfort (see Comm. on Exod. pp. 282, 283); the willows of the brook recall the delightful banks of rivers and rills with all their freshness and coolness; and the "thick-leaved trees" are themselves products of rich and luxuriant growth (see Philol. Rem.). Nor is it difficult to explain how, in the Persian period, such a custom could arise among the Jews. For it is well known that the Persians "during their sacred songs held bundles of tamarisk twigs in their hands", the so-called holy *barsom* (bareçma), in imitation of which the Hebrews also "put the branch to their nose" (Ezek. VIII. 17); and we need scarcely refer to the olive branch (εἰρεσιώνη)—covered with all kinds of first-fruits, which the Greeks carried during their autumnal festivities of the Pyanepsia; or to the waving of the ivy- and vine-wreathed thyrsus in the processions of Bacchus, as the devotees of whom the Jews were indeed represented, especially on account of the analogous custom (comp. *Plut.* Sympos. IV. vi. 2, ἔστι δὲ καὶ κραδηφορία τις ἑορτῇ καὶ θυρσοφορία παρ' αὐτοῖς — the Jews —, ἐν ᾗ θύρσους ἔχοντες εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν εἰςίασιν; see *infra*; *Yaçna* LVI. 2; *Spiegel*, Avesta, II. 178; *Suidas* sub εἰρεσιώνη; Comm. on Levit. I. p. 362). We must, therefore, suppose that the latest revisers of the Hebrew Scriptures, in order to veil the discrepancy between our command and the narrative in Nehemiah, added in the latter passage "as it is written" (כַּכָּתוּב), as if desirous to make it appear that both accounts essentially agree — an expedient to which they resorted to remove another and a similar difficulty (*supra* p. 493: in 2 Chron. XXXV. 13 וַיְבַשְּׁלוּ בָּאֵשׁ is intended to signify *they roasted* the Pesach, so as to be in harmony with the command that it should be צְלִי־אֵשׁ).

For many centuries, the chief festival of the year related merely to agriculture, and especially to the produce of vineyards and fruit-trees; but with this meaning the advanced culture of the nation could not rest satisfied; and the next step was to attribute to the Feast a *historical* significance. The usage which had become common of dwelling in booths, offered a welcome suggestion; and the people were now ordered, as a religious obligation, to live in booths (סֻכּוֹת) during the seven days of the festival, that "their generations might know that God caused the children of Israel to dwell in booths when He brought them out of the land of Egypt" (ver. 43). At the time when their store-houses and granaries were filled with every

**the Lord your God seven days. 41. And you shall
keep it *as* a Feast to the Lord seven days in the year:
*it shall be* a statute for ever in your generations; you**

wealth and blessing, they were to leave their convenient abodes, and stay in fragile huts, reflecting on the perils and the precarious existence of their forefathers in the desert, lest anyone in the pride of his heart should imagine, "My own strength and the power of my hand have acquired for me this abundance" (see *Rashbam* on ver. 43; comp. Deut. VIII. 10—18); or, as Philo explains (De Septen. c. 24), they were to be taught "equality, the first principle and beginning of justice", since all alike were for a time to dwell in slight and frail habitations. But this view was only taken at a very advanced period, and was carried out somewhat timidly. We find it mentioned and acted upon for the first time during the rule of Nehemiah; while it was raised into a permanent law by the latest levitical legislators. Yet even these imposed the duty of passing the Feast in booths upon native Hebrews only (הָאֶזְרָח, ver. 42), and not upon strangers. In both respects a strong contrast is manifest with the unleavened cakes of Passover, which were historically associated with the Egyptian redemption at a comparatively remote time, and which were rendered obligatory on the stranger and the Hebrew alike under the punishment of excision. However, Tabernacles became now even more decidedly than before *the* festival (הֶחָג); it was simply "the Festival of the Lord" (חַג יְהוָה, ver. 39; 1 Ki. VIII. 2, 65; XII. 32, 33; Ezek. XLV. 25; Zech. XIV. 16, 18, 19; Neh. VIII. 14; 2 Chron. V. 3; VII. 8, 9.

Later Judaism advanced another stage. Rightly judging that the reason assigned in our passage for the booths centres in the idea of Divine providence and government, the Rabbins brought Tabernacles into connection with the two earlier celebrations of the seventh month; and working out a peculiar theory they maintained, that on the three successive festivals the destinies of men were, respectively, written down sealed, and finally ratified. Then the Feast of Tabernacles comprised every important element — the natural, the historical, and the spiritual; it was accordingly solemnised with a spirit, a splendour, and an exuberant merriment, that far eclipsed all other festive seasons; and a proverb passed current that "he who has not seen the joy of the libations of Tabernacles (שמחת בית השואבה), has never in his life witnessed joy" (comp. *Mishn.* Succ. IV. 9 — V. 4). In conclusion we may quote the curious account which Plutarch gives of our festival, and which proves again in what distorted forms information on Jewish institutions reached even the best of heathen writers: "The greatest and holiest festival of the Jews corresponds, both in the time and mode of celebration, with the attributes of Bacchus. For after the so-called fast (νηστεία), when the vintage is at its height, they place in tents and huts, mostly consisting of ivy and vine leaves, tables covered with summer fruit of every kind; and indeed they call the day before the festival 'Tabernacles' (σκηνή). A few days later, they keep another festival which really, not conjecturally, has derived its name from Bacchus. There is also among them

**shall celebrate it in the seventh month. 42. You shall dwell in tabernacles seven days, all that are Israelites born shall dwell in tabernacles; 43. That your genera-**

a feast called 'the bearing of fig-tree branches', and another 'the bearing of the thyrsus', on which they enter the Temple with thyrsi in their hands. What they do in the holy place, I do not know; but it is probable that they perform some Bacchic rites; for, like the Argives on the Dionysia, they use small trumpets, in order to call upon their God; they have, besides, harp-players, whom the Jews themselves call Levites, whether this name is derived from Lysius, or rather from Euius" (*Plut.* Sympos. IV. vi. 2).

Philological Remarks. — It requires no additional proof that this portion was composed without reference to the preceding commands on Tabernacles; it mentions again the time, the duration, and the most solemn days of the festival, as if these points had not been explicitly stated before; it has by the compiler of our chapter been inserted unabridged on account of the two fresh subjects it includes — the instructions on the vegetable products, and the new reason assigned for the booths; and it evidently imparts to the chapter a fragmentary character. — The particle אַךְ (ver. 39) is used when new matter is introduced (comp. *supra* ver. 27). Ebn Ezra supposes that it places the Day of Atonement in juxtaposition with Tabernacles, the one being a time of fasting, the other of feasting (with reference to Deut. XVI. 15, והיית אך שמח); but another section and a general conclusion (vers. 33—38) intervene between the laws of the Day of Atonement and this conjunction אַךְ. Josephus (Ant. III. x. 4) supposes, without probability, that as the Feast of Ingathering is kept "when the season of the year is changing for winter", tabernacles were to be erected as a protection against the cold: it is unnecessary to seek another reason besides the thoughtful one given in the text. — The speculations of the Rabbins and of later Jews on the meaning of "the four kinds" of products here mentioned, are numerous and often ingenious; let it suffice to give one specimen: the willow represents the plants that have neither blossom nor fruit; the myrtle those that have blossoms but no fruit; the palm those that bear fruit but have no blossoms; and the citron or orange those that have both blossom and fruit; thus, the four together call to mind vegetation in all its varied forms (comp. *Midr. Rabb.* Vayikr. Sect. XXX.; *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 43; *Arama*, Aked. ch. 67; etc.). — The word בְּאָסְפְּכֶם (ver. 39) *when you gather in*, refers to the earliest meaning of the festival as the "Feast of Ingathering" (Exod. XXIII. 16; XXXIV. 22), and being characteristic, it is seldom omitted (comp. Deut. XVI. 13, בְּאָסְפְּךָ מִגָּרְנְךָ וּמִיִּקְבֶךָ); for though אָסִף is sometimes distinguished as *fruit* harvest from בָּצִיר as *vintage* (Isai. XXXII. 10; Mic. VII. 1), it includes a collection of any kind, and אֲסֻפִּים is a general store-house (1 Chr. XXVI. 15, 17). — If the Jewish interpretation of the use of the four products be correct, that is, if these were to be *held in the hand* during prayer, the principal nouns ought to be in the singular; we might indeed so take the first, "the fruit (פְּרִי) of a beautiful tree", and the third, "a bough of a

**tions may know that I caused the children of Israel to dwell in tabernacles, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt: I *am* the Lord your God.**

thick-leaved tree" (עֲנַף עֵץ עָבֹת), but not the two others, for כַּפֹּת תְּמָרִים cannot be translated otherwise than by "branches of palm-trees", and עַרְבֵי נָחַל otherwise than by "willows of the brook". Therefore, everything considered, it appears, that the plants enumerated in the 40th verse were, in their original context, intended to be employed for the tabernacles, as in the corresponding verses in Nehemiah; but that they were inserted by our compiler in this passage so as to convey the sense attached to them by his later readers. The Rabbins explain that כַּפֹּת is written defectively, without י, to intimate that one branch only is required (comp. *Rashi* in loc.); to obtain this meaning, we might rather read כִּפַּת (comp. Job XV. 32); but the following plural תְּמָרִים is opposed to any such acceptation. In fact, the 40th verse has every appearance of a later interpolation; for, interrupting the context, it renders especially the first אֹתוֹ in ver. 41 difficult and irregular, as this refers to חג יהוה in ver. 39. — From the circumstance that כַּפֹּת is without the conjunction ו it has been concluded, that the words פרי עץ הדר imply the general notion, which is specified by the three following plants (so *Keil* in loc.); but "branches" and "twigs" cannot be described as "fruit" (פְּרִי), as this word is not so wide in meaning. — "The fruit of the beautiful tree" (פרי עץ הדר) is by Jewish tradition understood as the pome-citron (comp. *Joseph.* Ant. III. x. 4, ὁ μῆλος ὁ τῆς Περσέας, which is a larger kind of citron, almost of the size of a melon, and is said to weigh sometimes thirty pounds; XIII. xiii. 5, κίτριον; *Mishn.* Succ. III. 5—7; and Ebn Ezra, "there exists indeed no tree-fruit more beautiful than the citron"); but we have no means of testing the correctness of this view; and the Talmud (Succ. 34[b], 35[a]) explains that it is "a tree the wood and fruit of which have the same taste", or one "which remains (הַדָּר) on its tree from year to year" (comp. also Rashi). The other ancient translations render the words literally (Sept. καρπὸν ξύλου ὡραῖον, Vulg. fructus arboris pulcherrimae, etc; comp. *Cels.* Hierob. I. 251, 252; *Dachs et Cramer*, Succah, pp. 207 *sqq.*; *Cleric.* in loc.). — עֵץ עָבֹת, literally "a thick" or "thick-leaved tree" (comp. Ezek. VI. 13; XX. 28), is by tradition taken as *myrtle* (הֲדַס), "the twigs of which are twisted like cords עבותות and ropes" (Rashi; comp. Neh. VIII. 15; Isai. XLI. 19; LV. 13; Zech. I. 8; etc.; Onk. and Jon. הֲדַסִּין, etc.). — סֻכָּה (from סכך to plait, to interweave, especially foliage and boughs) is indeed properly booth made of branches and leaves, to serve as cattle folds (Gen. XXXIII. 17), as a protection against a fierce sun (Jon. IV. 5) or showers of rain (Isai. IV. 6; comp. Ps. XXXI. 23), or to be used by persons watching in vineyards and orchards (Isai. I. 8; Job XXVII. 18); but though the word involves the notion of *frail* and *perishable* (Job XXVII. 18; Am. IX. 11), it is also applied, almost as a synonym of אֹהֶל, to permanent dwellings and every habitation (Ps. XVIII. 12; Job XXXVI. 29), the tents of encamping soldiers (2 Sam. XI. 11; 1 Ki. XX. 12, 16), and the Tent of Meeting (2 Sam. l. c.). We cannot, therefore, agree with

**44. And Moses told to the children of Israel the festivals of the Lord.**

those who consider the reason here assigned for the booths of Tabernacles as "little appropriate" (Hupfeld, Graf, a. o.): the Hebrews dwelt during their journeys in סֻכּוֹת, though these were perhaps more frequently made of canvas than of foliage and branches, and in the former case were more properly אֹהָלִים *tents*, which are frequently mentioned in the history of the Hebrew wanderings in the wilderness (comp. Exod. XVI. 16; XVIII. 7; XXXIII. 8, 10; Num. XI. 10; XVI. 26, 27; XIX. 14; XXIV. 5; Deut. I. 27; V. 27; XI. 6). The Talmud understands the booths figuratively as "the protecting clouds of Divine glory" (ענני כבוד; comp. Isai. IV. 6), and extends the obligations of our law to the strangers also, supporting this view by the word בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל (ver. 42), which, it is argued, cannot refer to the same persons as the preceding הָאֶזְרָח (comp. *Talm.* Succ. 1[b], 27, 28; Zevach. 37[b]). — The Rabbinical regulations with regard to the *lulav* and "the four kinds" in general, and on the construction and use of the tabernacles, are very minute, and may be seen in *Mishn.* Succ. I. 1—IV. 8; *Talm.* ad ll. cc.; *Maimon.* Hilch. Succah and Hilch. Lulav; *Orach Chay.* §§ 625—658; and the commentaries on these authorities.

VII.

# MISCELLANEOUS LAWS.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

SUMMARY. — God gives to Moses instructions with regard to the lights of the Candlestick and to the Shew-bread (vers. 1—9). — The son of an Egyptian father and a Hebrew mother publicly blasphemed the name of God. Moses ordered that the offender should be kept in custody, and he was directed by God to cause him to be stoned to death without the camp by the whole congregation (vers. 10—15). At the same time, God imparts some general commands on blasphemy, on slaying a man or a beast, and on bodily injuries inflicted upon another (vers. 16—22). — The judgment on the blasphemer was duly executed (ver. 23).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Com-

**1.** When the laws on the priesthood (ch. XXI. XXII.) and on the holy seasons to be celebrated at the common Temple (ch. XXIII.) had been set forth, it was deemed appropriate to add some of the chief regulations concerning the sacerdotal service of the Sanctuary, and hence commands on the perpetual light of the Candlestick and on the perpetual Shewbread of the golden Table were here inserted: they had indeed, at least partially, been enjoined before, when the whole Tabernacle was described, but it was held that they ought to be enforced again after the installation of Aaron and his sons in their holy offices.

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — These *may have been* the guiding principles of the final reviser of our Book; and they seem to be the most logical that can be discovered; yet they are far from satisfactory if viewed in connection with the economy of the Pentateuch. For the command on the lights of the Candlestick occurs before, in nearly identical terms, in Exodus (XXVII. 20, 21), and there is really no cogent reason why it should have been repeated; especially as it was before referred to as a

**mand the children of Israel that they bring to thee pure oil of the olive beaten for the light, to put on the lamps continually. 3. Without the vail of the testimony, in the Tent of Meeting, shall Aaron arrange it**

well known ordinance (Exod. XXX. 7, 8; XL. 4), and had already been acted upon by Moses at the erection of the Tabernacle (Exod. XL. 25.) In the former Book, it occupies indeed an isolated position, for it is there separated from the description of the Candlestick itself and the other implements of the Holy, and is placed between the law of the brazen Altar and of the priestly garments; but its position is no less isolated in our section, which does not attempt a systematic survey of the Temple service, but is confined to two single rites selected at random or at least without appreciable motive, since not even the daily holocausts are mentioned. If, therefore, the introduction of the two commands in this place does not illustrate the fragmentary character of the Book of Leviticus, they bespeak that of the Pentateuch: and when subsequently the execution of the command is related, the command itself is partially given in a different form (Num. VIII. 1—4; comp. IV. 7; Exod. XXV. 37). Even Bertheau states, as the result of a careful analysis, that the whole of the twenty-fourth chapter cannot originally have formed part of the collection of the Sinaitic laws (Gruppen, pp. 220—223). The perplexity of apologists is instructive. The repetition of the two ordinances, it is presumed, was occasioned "by some historical event" (*Ranke*, Untersuchungen, I. 109): but the Law is generally very exact in relating such historical events, whereas, in this instance, there is not the remotest allusion (comp. vers. 10—14; X. 1—7; Num. IX. 6—14; XV. 32—36; etc.). Again, the olive-oil and the Shew-bread, it is asserted, representing the choicest productions of the Holy Land in corn and fruit, were intended to serve in the Temple as perpetual gifts of gratitude for God's unceasing mercy, just as the chief festivals were seasons of gratitude, and this constitutes the internal connection with the preceding chapter (*Ranke*, l. c. II. 110, 111): however, the principal object of the first command is not an offering of *oil*, but the perpetual *light*; and the Shew-bread does not so much symbolise gratitude as supplication (see *infra* on ver. 2—9). Another and more mystical interpreter declares that "the oil of the seven-branched Candlestick burning before the Lord represents the Israelites as the community which makes its light shine into the darkness of this world; and the Shew-bread symbolises a spiritual sacrifice which they offer to God, and which consists of the fruits of their labours in the kingdom of heaven" (*Keil*, Comm. in loc. p. 144; Archaeol. § 21 note 3): but if our commands have such typical meaning, they have little in common with the preceding laws which refer to the practical life and the atonement of the nation; the oil, however, is not meant as an emblem of the activity of the Israelites, but of watchfulness; and the Shew-bread has reference to the people's daily life and material prosperity. Jewish commentators, well aware of the anomalous position of this section, contend that it had been revealed to Moses when he received the Divine instructions concerning the sacred im-

**from evening to morning before the Lord continually: *it shall be* a statute for ever to your generations.
4. He shall arrange the lamps upon the pure Candlestick before the Lord continually.**

plements, but that he now only communicated it to the Israelites (comp. *Rashi* on ver. 1; see also Comm. on Lev. I. pp. XXI, notes 11 and 12).— We lay no stress on the circumstance that our chapter would more appropriately have followed after the twenty-second, which also explains the functions of the priests; by this transposition, moreover, the laws of the festivals (ch. XXIII.) would have been connected with the laws of the Sabbatical year and the Year of jubilee (ch. XXV.), which belong to the same system and are built upon the same ideas.

**2—9.** When the leaders of the colony returning from Babylon reorganised the commonwealth, their attention was mainly directed to the restoration of public worship; their first care was not to re-build the capital and its walls, but the Temple; and they eagerly searched the annals of the past for precedents and sanction. Therefore, they either adopted or developed anterior ordinances, and embodied them, as eternal statutes, in the Book of the Law, which was now uniformly stamped as "the Book of the Law of Moses". The directions with respect to the golden Candlestick were almost literally taken from an older Book, which had gained high authority (Exod. XXVII. 20, 21); but as regards the Shew-bread, a brief and incidental injunction previously given was more clearly defined and more fully worked out (Exod. XXV. 30; comp. XXXIX. 36; XL. 4, 23). Hence there is little to be added in explanation of the holy lamps and their service (see Comm. on Exod. p. 522); only our section points out with even greater emphasis that the light should be "perpetual" (תָּמִיד, ver. 3); it demands indeed also that it should burn "from evening to morning", as was ordained in the earlier code (Exod. XXVII. 21; XXX. 7, 8), and as seems to have been the practice of the Tabernacle (comp. 1 Sam. III. 1); but it soon became customary to let at least one lamp burn during the day, not only because the priests required light to perform the fumigations, the sprinkling of the blood of sin-offerings, and other rituals, but because the golden Candlestick and its lamps were, with increasing distinctness, taken as symbols of that Divine truth and enlightenment which were to be diffused among the Hebrews, and through them among all the nations of the earth.

In reference to the Shew-bread, only these brief injunctions had previously been given, "Thou shalt put upon the Table Shew-bread (לֶחֶם פָּנִים) before Me always" (Exod. XXV. 30; XXXV. 13; XXXIX. 36); and "Thou shalt arrange on the Table the things that are to be arranged on it" (Exod. XL. 4 וְעָרַכְתָּ אֶת־עֶרְכּוֹ; comp. ver. 23). A certain usage was indeed established in remote times; but it was vague and without significance. We learn that during the reign of Saul, in Nob, one of the priestly towns, "Shew-bread" (לחם הפנים) or "holy bread" (לחם קדש) was, at intervals, "put before the Lord" (לפני יהוה), taken away, and replaced by "warm bread"; that this bread was only eaten by persons being in a state of purity, though not necessarily by priests; and

**5. And thou shalt take fine flour, and bake twelve cakes thereof: two tenths *of an ephah* shall be in one cake. 6. And thou shalt place them *in* two sets, six *in* a set, upon the pure Table before the Lord. 7. And**

that in Solomon's Temple "the Shew-bread" was on the Table in the Holy, was also called "the continual sets" (המערכת) or "the sets of bread" (מערכת לחם), and was by pious kings attended to with great care (comp. 1 Sam. XXI. 4—7; 1 Ki. VII. 48; 2 Chr. II. 3; IV. 19; XIII. 11; XXIX. 18; Neh. X. 34). The levitical legislator, however, deemed precise injunctions on the subject the more desirable as he hoped he might render the ritual more fruitful for religious training, and bring it in harmony with his more developed system. It cannot be doubted that the Shew-bread, like the offerings in general, which were called "the food of God" rising up to Him "for a sweet odour", primitively originated in notions similar to those which gave rise to the repasts or *lectisternia* spread out before the heathen deities; it was necessary that such gross conceptions, which took deep root among the Hebrews in spite of the exalted teaching of their prophets, should be combated and banished. Therefore, our legislator not only fixed the ceremonial in every detail, prescribing *twelve* cakes in accordance with the twelve tribes of Israel, of *two* omers of fine flour each, or double the quantity of that deemed sufficient for the daily sustenance of one person (comp. Exod. XVI. 16, 22), directing that they should be uniformly arranged in *two* rows of six, similar to the two onyx-stones on the High-priest's ephod with the names of six tribes engraven on each (*supra* p. 506), and ordering that the cakes should be regularly renewed every Sabbath, to secure for this day increased solemnity; but he commanded the priests to add to them pure frankincense, which was to the Hebrews a well-understood symbol of prayer, and to burn it, no doubt on the Sabbath, as a fire-offering (אִשֶּׁה) to God, and as "a memorial" to Him, by which He might be induced to listen to the supplications of the house of Israel. To mark the importance of the Shew-bread, the author described it, like circumcision and the Sabbath itself, as "an eternal covenant between God and Israel", between the Bestower of all material blessings and their humble recipients; and he enjoined that the loaves should not be burnt, but be eaten by the priests in the holy place. He could not have devised more effectual means of spiritualising, for the consciousness of the Hebrews, the old custom of presenting "Shew-bread" or properly "Bread placed before the countenance" of God (לֶחֶם פָּנִים): he even avoided the use of this word, lest it yet mislead to anthropomorphic errors. In his time at least, ideas like the following were completely discarded: "He who gives to another bread to eat and receives him as his guest, enters with him into friendly intercourse, and makes him his ally and associate; thus the Hebrew people, by placing before God the daily bread, proved their close alliance with Him, and their devotion and fidelity"(*Knob.* Lev. p. 554). As if to obviate such misconstructions, the author insisted, that no portion of the cakes should be burnt on the Altar. That the Shew-bread was unleavened, has been pointed out in previous obser-

**thou shalt put pure frankincense upon *each* set, that it may be on the bread for a memorial, an offering made by fire to the Lord. 8. Every Sabbath he shall arrange it before the Lord continually, on behalf of the**

vations which treat of the subject in its various aspects (comp. Comm. on Exod. pp. 481, 506; on Levit. I. 7—9, 226, 227). — In the second Temple, the commands here enforced were strictly adhered to; and Nehemiah is related to have imposed a tax of one third of a shekel to be applied, like the half-shekel paid at the taking of the census, for the support of the Temple service (Neh. X. 34; comp. Exod. XXX. 11—16). It is not surprising that the Chronist, writing a considerable time after the promulgation of the Pentateuch, should state that our commands were carried out even by the earlier kings (comp. 1 Chr. IX. 32; XXIII. 29).

Philological Remarks. — The Hebrews themselves were to supply the oil for the lamps and the flour for the Shew-bread, for they were to be reminded that they must take an active part in obtaining enlightenment and sustenance, and that the priests were only their mediators before God. — The Candlestick was "pure" (טהורה), because it was made entirely "of pure gold" (זהב טהור), and the Shew-bread Table (הטהר), because it was overlaid with "pure gold", and had a golden wreath around (Exod. XXV. 24, 25, 31; XXXI. 8; comp. 2 Chr. XIII. 11). Jewish expositors, however, explain thus— "he shall arrange the lamps upon the *pure* Candlestick", that is, after having cleansed it and removed all cinders; and the cakes shall be "placed upon the *pure* Table", that is, upon the table itself, and the golden prongs (כאזן) shall not raise them above its surface, hollow golden rods being put between the cakes to allow the air to pass through, and thus to prevent them from becoming mouldy within the week (comp. *Mishn.* Menach. XI. 6; *Talm.* Menach. 97ª; *Siphra* in loc.; *Rashi* on vers. 4, 6). — On the oil to be used, and here explicitly described as שמן זית זך כתית, see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 104. — The cakes were to be put "in two dispositions" or "sets" מַעֲרָכוֹת (ver. 6), and hence, in later Books, the Shew-bread is also called לֶחֶם הַמַּעֲרֶכֶת (1 Chr. IX. 32; XXIII. 29; Neh. X. 34), מַעֲרֶכֶת לֶחֶם (2 Chr. XIII. 11), or simply מַעֲרֶכֶת (2 Chr. II. 3), and the Table שֻׁלְחַן הַמַּעֲרֶכֶת (2 Chr. XXIX. 18), although it is likewise termed שֻׁלְחַן הַפָּנִים (Num. IV. 7), that is, "the Table of the Countenance" placed before God to bear the לחם הפנים (comp. *Pfeiffer*, Dub. Vex. pp. 273, 274; *Deyling*, Observat. Sacr. II. 160—166). In 1 Chr. XXVIII. 16 mention is made of *two* שֻׁלְחֲנוֹת הַמַּעֲרֶכֶת, which statement it is difficult to account for, since the Chronist himself speaks elsewhere of *one* such Table only (2 Chr. XXIX. 18), though he also alludes to *ten* Tables which Solomon caused to be made (2 Chr. IV. 8), corresponding to as many golden Candlesticks (1 Ki. VII. 49; comp. *Jos.* Ant. VIII. iii. 7, μίαν μὲν μεγάλην χρυσίαν τράπεζαν, ἐφ' ἧς ἐτίθεσαν τοὺς ἄρτους τοῦ θεοῦ κτλ; see also *Mishn.* Menach. XI. 7, שני שלחנות היו באולם מבפנים וכ'. — The Shew-bread was to be prepared ביום השבת ביום השבת, *every Sabbath*, for which in 1 Chr. IX. 32 שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּת is said, the first noun being in the construct state, on account of its close connection with the second

children of Israel *by* an everlasting covenant. 9. And it shall belong to Aaron and his sons; and they shall eat it in the holy place; for it *is* most holy to him of the offerings of the Lord made by fire, *by* a perpetual statute.

10. And the son of an Israelitish woman, whose

(see Gramm. §§ 75. $7^d$; 87. $8^b$). — It would be hazardous to assert, in opposition to direct testimonies of Jewish writers who had themselves witnessed the practice of the Temple, that the Shew-bread was leavened; nor are the arguments adduced in support of this view plausible (comp. f. i., *Knobel*, Lev. pp. 554, 555). The two new loaves of Pentecost were leavened for intelligible reasons (*supra* p. 501). No part of the Shew-bread was burnt, as has been suggested above, lest they appear as "food of God"; nor was any portion of the unleavened cakes and wafers that accompanied a praise-offering burnt on the Altar (Comm. on Lev. I. 225, 226 note 1). — Though unleavened bread was perhaps more commonly eaten by the Hebrews, leavened cakes, which keep much longer, were not unusual, and were deemed preferable for the Altar, because they were looked upon as "pure bread" (see supra p. 496). — The incense was not burnt on the golden Altar, but on the Table, near or upon the Shew-bread, probably in a golden bowl set apart for the purpose (comp. Comm. on Lev. I. 226 note 5); for the incense and the Shew-bread belonged inseparably together, the one typifying prayer, the other the things prayed for (comp. loc. cit. pp. 118—120); moreover, as the cakes were entirely given over to the priests, the incense formed the אִשֶּׁה or the portion devoted to God, which was indispensable in every offering, and was therefore the אַזְכָּרָה, or the means of bringing the wants and supplications of the Hebrews before God or to His remembrance (והיתה ללחם לאזכרה; see Comm. on Lev. I. 206, 484; *supra* p. 506; comp. *Jos.* Ant. III. x. 7; *Mishn.* Menach. XI. 4—9).— The Septuagint adds after λίβανον καθαρόν the words καὶ ἅλα; Philo also (Vit. Mos. III. 10) states that salt was offered with the cakes; and this was the opinion of Jewish tradition in general (comp. also *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 37): whether our legislator held this view, and merely refrained from mentioning salt as a matter of course (comp. II. 13, and notes in loc.), or whether he deemed salt in this instance unnecessary because nothing of the bread was burnt to God, cannot be decided; yet the opinion of the Rabbins is supported by general analogy (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 852, 109). — יַעַרְכֶנּוּ (ver. 8) *he* (Aaron) *shall arrange it* (the bread הלחם ver. 7, hence the suffix of the masculine, לֶחֶם and חַלּוֹת being here used promiscuously; comp. Comm. on Lev. I. 104); the feminine וְהָיְתָה (ver. 9) has the force of a neuter *it*, or *the whole*, *shall belong*, and is yet followed by the suffix of the masculine in ואכלהו (comp. *supra* p. 517). Rashi supplies המנחה הזאת before והיתה, "since any vegetable offering belongs to the class מנחה".

**10—23.** Now follows one of those narratives which give to our Book such an appearance of reality, and impart to it so faithful a colouring of time and place. Like the narrative of the sudden death of

father *was* an Egyptian, went out among the children
of Israel; and this son of the Israelitish *woman* and a
man of Israel quarrelled together in the camp; 11.
And the Israelitish woman's son cursed the Name *of the*
*Lord*, and reviled *it*. And they brought him to Moses (and
his mother's name *was* Shelomith, the daughter of Dibri,

Aaron's two eldest sons on account of a priestly trespass (X. 1—7), that of the blasphemer brings vividly before us the camp life of the Israelites in the desert. A Hebrew woman of the tribe of Dan, had married an Egyptian, of course when both were still in Egypt; they had a son who, it appears, like the "mixed multitude" of pagans who followed the Hebrews in their wanderings (Exod. XII. 38), lived, separated from the holy community, without the precincts of the camp. Little sympathy seems to have existed between persons in his position and the Israelites; and once when he came into their camp, it may be to visit his mother's relations, or to pitch his tent among the Danites, a quarrel arose between him and a Hebrew. In the heat of the altercation he reviled and cursed the name of God — of that God who made such marked distinctions between His own privileged people and other nations, a descendant of an Egyptian being received in the community only in the third generation (Deut. XXIII. 9, 10). Moses, informed of the offence, and uncertain how to act in the matter, ordered the man to be detained in custody. A former law had indeed forbidden, "Thou shalt not revile God" (Exod. XXII. 27); but it had not fixed the punishment in case of transgression; moreover, that law, forming a part of the "Book of the Covenant" between God and Israel, might possibly not apply to strangers and to the offspring of mixed marriages. Moses appealed, therefore, for directions to God, who commanded that the blasphemer should be stoned to death by the whole congregation; thus the Hebrews should act in all similar cases, whether the offender was an Israelite or a stranger; and ordinances were added on some other crimes to be visited upon all alike. Then the prisoner was led to a place without the camp, and there suffered death in the manner prescribed.—It will be admitted that the narrative, though abruptly introduced, admirably portrays the scenery of the time when Moses, in constant intercommunion with God, was the central figure of the Hebrew hosts. And yet, whether it has a foundation in fact or not, it shows, in its present form, traces of a very different age. It alludes to God twice by an appellation — הַשֵּׁם *the Name* (vers. 11, 16) — which became usual only at a very late time, and which was currently adopted by the Rabbins instead of the tetragrammaton that was deemed too awful to be pronounced. And the duties and obligations of Hebrews and non-Hebrews were so completely equalised as is done in this section not earlier than the re-organisation of the commonwealth in the Persian period (vers. 16, 22, see *supra* p. 435). It was then that general commands of former times were more precisely defined (see *supra*), and then the sole sovereignty of the God of Israel was insisted upon with a rigour unknown in the earlier days of multifarious idolatry.

**of the tribe of Dan). 12. And they put him in ward, that he might direct them according to the command of the Lord. 13. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 14. Bring forth him that has reviled without the camp; and let all that heard *him* lay their hands**

The holy community was defiled by the presence of a blasphemer; all were, therefore, obliged to execute judgment upon him, both to show their detestation of the crime, and to take part in the work of expiation; yet the chief reponsibility fell upon those who had come forward as accusers and professed to have heard the impious words; they were therefore bound to lay their hands upon the offender's head, and thereby to intimate that they were more particularly concerned in the fate he was about to suffer; and they had to throw the first stones (Deut. XVII. 7; see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 176; comp. on Exod. p. 439; and on the mode of lapidation see *supra* p. 442). The Rabbins ordered, moreover, that the judges also should impose their hands upon the culprit's head, which was done in no other case of capital execution. However, they decreed that the blasphemer should only be put to death if he had made use of the "specific name" of God (שם המיוחד or שם המפורש), that is, the holy tetragrammaton (יהוה), but not if he had employed some such appellative term (כינוי) as "the Merciful" (חנון) or "the Almighty" (שדי); a restriction analogous to that made by Jewish tradition in the case of children cursing their parents (XX. 9, *supra* p. 446; comp. *Targ. Jon.* "he pronounced and reviled the great and glorious name of manifestation — שמא רבא ויקירא דמתפרש — that had been heard on Sinai"; *Targ. Jer.* the holy name — שמא קדישא; *Mishn.* Sanh. VII. 4; *Talm.* Sanh. 56, 87ª; *Maimon.* Hilch. Sanhedr. c. 26).

Among the Mohammedans, blasphemy, whether uttered against God and Mohammed, or against Moses and Christ, is punished with instantaneous death; it can not even, like apostacy or infidelity, be atoned for by repentance and contrition, since it is considered to arise from utter depravity.

The question addressed by Moses to God not only elicits His decision on the immediate case, but calls forth ordinances on other subjects in no way connected with the present one, and treated of elsewhere in more suitable contexts. However, our enactments appear to imply a most important modification of former laws; for they declare, "You shall have one manner of law, the stranger shall be as the native" (ver. 22), and therefore, we must conclude, the slave also as the freeman: the progress is immense; it removes an anomaly which has always been regarded as a stain upon the earlier legislation, and which is hardly in unison with its general spirit of humanity; it amounts to a repeal of those odious provisions that a man who smites his slave so that death ensues only after a day or two, shall not be punished because the slave "is his money"; and that a master who ill-treats his slave so as to cause the loss of an eye or tooth, suffers no other penalty than the forfeiture of that servant who is his property (Exod. XXI. 21, 26, 27; see notes in locc.). Our author propounds the broad principles, "He that kills any man (כל נפש אדם) shall surely be put to death", and "If a man causes

upon his head, and let all the congregation stone him.
15. And thou shalt speak to the children of Israel,
saying, Whosoever reviles his God, shall bear his
sin; 16. And he that curses the name of the Lord,
shall surely be put to death, all the congregation shall

a blemish in his neighbour (בעמיתו), as he has done, so shall it be done to him" (vers. 17, 19, 21); the former command almost recalls that given to Noah when mankind consisted of a single family, "Whoso sheds man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God made He man" (Gen. IX, 6); and the latter is akin to the maxims, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour (לרעך) as thyself", and "Thou shalt love the stranger as thyself" (XIX. 18, 34). Our laws might, therefore, well conclude, "I am the Lord your God" — the God of all, of all Hebrews whatever their station, and of all men whatever their race; and the author might have joined in the utterance of a near contemporary, "Have we not all one Father, has not one God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother?" (Mal. II. 10). When the Jews returned from their captivity, a small and needy band, they felt charitably disposed towards their few slaves, especially as they had been well treated by their Babylonian masters, and had experienced the clemency of the Persian conqueror. The times of Egyptian cruelty were forgotten; feuds and conflicts with the heathen tribes of Canaan would have been fatal; and therefore a more lenient and more sympathetic spirit in the laws of strangers was possible and derisable (comp. XIX. 34; Num. XV. 14—16, 26, 29; and *supra* p. 435).

Yet the principle which pervades all these commands is still the old "law of retaliation", or jus talionis, which has given rise to so many discussions, and which has been so differently viewed and estimated in the New Testament and by Josephus, by the Pharisees and Sadducees, by later Jewish and Christian writers (comp. Exod. XXI. 23—25; Deut. XIX. 16—21). But the matter may be briefly summed up. Like many ancient legislations, that of the Hebrews sanctioned actual retaliation for bodily injuries inflicted upon others — "breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth"; but as other nations, so the Hebrews, perceiving that this mode of retribution, apart from its cruelty, is often most unjust, seem, at a comparatively early time, to have commuted it, in all except rare cases of fierce vindictiveness, into a pecuniary compensation agreed upon by the two parties themselves or fixed by the judges; this practice was certainly prevalent in the time of Josephus (Ant. IV. viii. 35); it was adhered to by the later tribunals of the Pharisees, though the earlier ones, represented by Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, restricted it to unintentional injuries; and it was advocated by all subsequent Jewish authorities. The Sadducees and Karaites alone insisted upon the literal interpretation of the text, and had on that account constantly to bear the attacks and taunts of their opponents. Nor ought it to be forgotten that this is intended as a civil or penal, not as a moral law; and it would, therefore, be unjust to infer from it the ethical principles which guided the Hebrews, the chief of which were,

**certainly stone him; as well the stranger as the native, when he curses the Name *of the Lord*, shall be put to death.**

"Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart," and "Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people" (comp. Matth. V. 38, 39, *supra* p. 415; see also *Tertull.* Adv. Marc. IV. 16). The subject has been fully discussed before (Comm. on Exod. pp. 403—407), and we shall below give a few additional references.

Philological Remarks. — It would be idle to conjecture from what source or document the laws of this portion were derived (comp. *De Wette*, Beiträge, II. 299, 307—309; *Knob.* Levit. p. 556; *Nöldeke*, Untersuchungen, p. 62; a. o.); they are, for the greatest part, and in some instances almost literally, found in the old "Book of the Covenant" also (Exod. XX. 19—XXIII. 33), which no doubt, from early times, stood in high authority, and was constantly enlarged and commented upon (comp. also Exod. II. 11, 13). But we should remember that the story in Numbers (XV. 32—36) of the man who gathered sticks upon the Sabbath, strongly resembles ours in form and tendency: the Israelites, "brought the man to Moses and Aaron and all the congregation, and they put him in ward (וינִּיחוּ אתו במשמר) because it was not declared (פֹּרַשׁ) what should be done to him. And the Lord said to Moses, The man shall surely be put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died, as the Lord commanded Moses." We seem, therefore, to have two different accounts of the same event, whether tradition wavered on the subject, or one account is an imitation of the other (compare the three versions of the same incident in Genes. XII. 10—20; XX. 1—18; XXVI. 1—11). Such narratives were framed in later times in order to impress the chief commands in the most striking manner, by attributing the judgment of offenders to Moses and to God Himself. — The cause of the quarrel here alluded to can of course not be ascertained, and it would be useless to mention the speculations in which earlier and later writers have indulged both on that and on other incidental points (comp. f. i. Siphra, Targ. Jon., Rashi and Ebn Ezra on ver. 10; *Philo*, Vit. Mos. III. 24, 25). — ויצא ··· בתוך וכ' (ver. 10), literally "he went out... into the midst of the children of Israel," which implies that he lived apart from them. — אִישׁ יִשְׂרְאֵלִי is "a man of Israel", while אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל is used collectively for "men of Israel" (Josh. IX. 6, 7; X. 24). — According to Hebrew or rather ancient conceptions generally, the *name* of a thing expresses its *essence*, and was often employed as its equivalent; Adam, we are told, "gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field, but for himself he did not find a help meet for himself", that is, he, the אִישׁ or man, found no creature fit to bear the name of אִשָּׁה woman, or companion of man (Gen. II. 20, 23). The name of a person was, therefore, no matter of indifference; it was deliberately chosen, and it was altered when a crisis in their lives had taken place or was expected (Comm. on Gen. p. 114). When Moses was entrusted

**17. And he that kills any man shall surely be put to death. 18. And he that kills a beast, shall make it good, beast for beast. 19. And if a man causes a**

with his mission to Pharaoh, he asked God by what name he should announce Him to the Israelites, and he received the answer, By the name *I am that I am* (אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה) or *The Eternal* (יְהוָֹה), which had not been known to their forefathers; and this, God said, "is My name for ever and My memorial (זִכְרִי) to all generations" (Exod. III. 13—15; VI. 2, 3; Comm. on Exod. pp. 51 *sqq.*). Lofty assurances or predictions are often concluded with "The Lord" or "The Lord of Hosts is His name" (יהוה צבאות שמו; Am. V. 27; Jer. X. 16; etc.); and in a glorious future "the Lord will be one and His name one" (Zech. XIV. 10). Thus Name (שֵׁם) became synonymous with fame, glory, and every greatness; and God was the Name of Names, or the Name κατ' ἐξοχήν (הַשֵּׁם), at first still described by epithets like "this glorious and awful Name, the Lord thy God" (Deut. XXVIII. 58); and then without any qualifying attributes, as in our passage (vers. 11, 16), in the first Book of Chronicles (XIII. 6, אֲשֶׁר נִקְרָא שֵׁם), and quite currently in later writings of Talmudists and Rabbins (comp. *Buxtorf*, Lex. Chald. pp. 2432—2438). Tablets found at Palmyra bear this and similar inscriptions, "To the blessed Name reverence for ever". — The man both "cursed" (וַיִּקֹּב) and "reviled" (וַיְקַלֵּל) the name of God (ver. 11); the former was the graver offence; for while the מקלל, or he who speaks slightingly or disrespectfully (as Pharaoh and Rabshakeh did, Exod. V. 2; 2 Ki. XVIII. 30, 35), merely "bears his sin" (ונשא חטאו), that is, is punished as the judges may deem fit; the נוקב suffers the death of lapidation (vers. 15, 16); the man is here briefly called הַמְקַלֵּל (vers. 14, 23), since it is understood that he was at the same time נוֹקֵב. For although נָקַב (properly to bore, to puncture) means to designate and specify in general, or with distinction (see Gen. XXX. 28; Num. I. 17; Isai. LXII. 2; etc.), it signifies here, as elsewhere, to mention with words of reviling or imprecation, and is, therefore, used as a synonym of ארר *to curse* (Num. XXIII. 7, 8), or as the opposite of ברך *to bless* (Prov. XI. 26; comp. XXIV. 24; Job III. 8; V. 3); thus the Vulgate (cumque blasphemasset nomen), Saadiah, and nearly all modern translators. But the Septuagint and most of the Jewish interpreters render נקב simply *to name* or *to pronounce* (Sept. καὶ ἐπονομάσας ... τὸ ὄνομα, Onk. יְפָרֵישׁ, Jon. פָרֵישׁ וְחָרֵיף (Jerus. only וחרף); similarly the Samaritan version in ver. 11 (ואגה ית השם; but in ver. 16 ומקסם שם יהוה and בקסומה, that is, probably, he who tries to oppose God by means of sorcery; see *Talm.* Sanh. 81[a], המקלל בקוסם; comp. *Kohn*, Samar. Stud. pp. 75, 76), Philo, the Syriac translation, Ar. Erp., Rashi, Ebn Ezra, Rashb. הזכיר את השם ואח"כ ברכו, Kimchi, s. v. פירש השם באותיותיו, that is, the tetragrammaton, and some others, as Grotius, Cleric., Michael., and Rosenm.; hence Jewish authorities prohibited the pronunciation of God's holy name יהוה as a crime (though not punishable with death; comp. *Talm.* Sanh. 56[a]); this was the case already in the time of Philo and Josephus. "Thou alone, thou all-wise legislator", exclaims Philo, "hast seen that it is worse to name God than even to curse Him" (τοῦ

**blemish in his neighbour, as he has done so shall it be done to him; 20. Breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth: as he caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be done to him *again*. 21. And he that kills a beast,**

καταρᾶσθαι χεῖρον τὸ ὀνομάζειν ὑπείληψας); and he adds, "and if any one were, I will not say, to blaspheme against the Lord of gods and men, but were even to dare to utter His name unseasonably (ἀκαίρως αὐτοῦ φθέγξασθαι τὸ ὄνομα), he must undergo the punishment of death" (Vit. Mos. III. 25, 26; comp. *Joseph*. Ant. II. xii. 4). The Egyptians considered it impious to name a certain god (*Cic*. Nat. Deor. III. 22 or 55; *Arnob*. Adv. Gent. IV. 14, quartus suboles Nili est, cujus nomen Aegyptia gens horret et reveretur expromere); the ancient Athenians took oaths without mentioning the god himself (ἐλλειπτικῶς); and the Romans never referred to their chief tutelary deity even in conversation, nor were they permitted to enquire whether that deity was a god or a goddess (*Plut*. Quaest. Rom. 61; *Macrob*. Sat. III. 9; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 352—355; comp. however, *Hom*. Il. III. 365, Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὔτις σεῖο θεῶν ὀλοώτερος ἄλλος; 399, Δαιμονίη — Aphrodite — τί με ταῦτα λελαίεαι ἠπεροπεύειν; *Theocr*. Id. I. 99, 100, Κύπρι βαρεῖα, Κύπρι νεμεσσατά, Κύπρι θνατοῖσιν ἀπεχθής). But as we have pointed out, נקב involves a more serious offence than פָּרַשׁ (ver. 12) *to declare* or *to say distinctly*, a word which, in the Pentateuch, occurs only in this and the parallel passage of Numbers (XV. 34, see *supra*), and besides in some other compositions of a later date (comp. Nehem. VIII. 8; Ezra IV. 18). — Some interpreters (as Rashi, Hofmann, Keil, a. o.) contend, that the witnesses, by imposing their hands on the criminal's head, meant to declare, that "his blood was on his head, and that they deprecated all reponsibility since he had brought death upon himself" (comp. Susann. 34): but "the imposition of hands symbolises connection and close relationship, rather than separation and removal; it is, therefore, in meaning the opposite of the washing of hands prescribed for the expiation of a murder, the perpetrator of which is unknown (Deut. XXI. 6, 7), or performed by those who desired to declare, that they were "innocent of the blood of some just person" (Matth. XXVII. 24). Others curiously explain that by the imposition of hands the offender was solemnly dedicated to death by the accusers, or "was treated as an expiatory victim loaded with the entire burden of the crime for which he was executed" (*Kurtz*, Opfercult. § 46, p. 76; *Kitto*, on ver. 14; comp. also *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 45; and *Grotius* in his notes on ver. 14, quia populus ejus morte tamquam victima expiatur): but the circumstances and the proceedings have no analogy whatever with a sacrifice. The holy community was indeed considered as defiled by the crime; yet it is probably too subtle to explain, "those who had heard the blasphemy imposed their hands upon the offender, and thus transferred their involuntary guilt by a free act upon the head of the sinner" (*Baumgarten* in loc., p. 230) — so that this would be an analogy to the goat sent to Azazel! "The punishment of stoning," says Philo (Vit. Mos. III. 25), "was a suitable and appropriate punishment for a man who had a stony and hardened heart" (ἀνδρὸς λιθίνην κα

**shall restore it; and he that kills a man, shall be put to death. 22. You shall have one manner of law; the stranger shall be as the native: for I *am* the Lord your God. 23. And Moses spoke to the children of Israel, and**

ἀπόκροτον ψυχὴν ἔχοντος), especially as it afforded to all the members of the congregation an opportunity of sharing its infliction. — יַכֶּה (vers. 17, 18, 21) means here of course *killing* (comp. Exod. II. 11, 12; Deut. XXXV. 24; etc.), though הִכָּה alone is often simply *beating* (Exod. XXI. 15, 17, etc.), and beating to death is expressed by some addition as הִכָּה אִישׁ וָמֵת (Exod. XXI. 13, 18, etc.). Some suppose that הִכָּה in vers. 17 and 18 means killing, but in ver. 21 *wounding* (comp. *Rashi* on ver. 21; *Rashb.* on ver. 16); and others have pointed out still less probable distinctions (comp. *Ebn Ezra* on ver. 20): the 21st verse might indeed have been omitted; but similar repetitions are frequent in the levitical codes. — נֶפֶשׁ אָדָם (vers. 17), literally, the life of a man, that is, *a living man*, or simply *a man* (comp. Num. XXXI. 35, 40, 46, etc.), as נֶפֶשׁ בְּהֵמָה is simply *a beast* (comp. vers. 18 and 21): נפש alone is, however, also used of *departed* life, and means a dead man (XIX. 28; XXI. 1, etc.; *supra* p. 430; comp. Num. XIX. 11). — With respect to the *jus talionis* we may further refer to *Talm.* Sanh. 87b, ממין אתה אומר וכ׳; Bab. Kam. 84a; *Mechilta*, Mishpatim c. 8, fol. 91 ed. Weiss; *Yalk. Shim.* § 338, ר׳ אליעזר אומר עין תחת עין ממש; *Fürst*, Karäerthum, I. 9, referring to the stricter view of the Karaites; *Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. IV. 111, dwelling upon the different decisions of the earlier and the later Halachah; *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. III. 41, where, after quoting ver. 20, he observes, "You must not be surprised that we inflict in such cases only a pecuniary fine; for my present object is to elucidate the text of the Bible, and not to account for the traditional interpretation; moreover, I have on this tradition an opinion which I can only communicate verbally": Maimonides evidently intimates that he considers bodily retaliation, not its conversion into a fine, to be the intention and meaning of the Biblical command; *Aristot.* Ethic. Nic. V. v. 3, quoting a maxim attributed to Rhadamanthus, "If a man suffers what he has done, even justice will take place (εἴκε πάθοι τά κ' ἔρεξε, δίκη κ' ἰθεῖα γένοιτο), but on his own part opposing retaliation, which, he says, "neither squares with the idea of distributive nor of corrective justice (ἐφαρμόττει οὔτ' ἐπὶ τὸ διανεμητικὸν δίκαιον, οὔτ' ἐπὶ τὸ διορθωτικόν), and is in many cases at variance with it; as for example, if a man in authority has struck another, it is not right that he should be struck in return; and if a man has struck a person in authority, it is right that he should not only be struck, but punished besides" etc.; *Demosth.* Adv. Timocr. p. 744 (p. 43 ed. Becker), relating, that "there was a law among the Locrians, that if anyone knocked out the eye of another, he should lose his own without paying a pecuniary penalty; now a man having an enemy with only one eye, threatened to knock it out; the one-eyed man, alarmed at this threat, . . . ventured to introduce a law that whosoever knocked out the eye of a one-eyed man, should lose his own two eyes, so that both might suffer the same affliction" (comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 706); *Diod. Sic.* XII. 17, re-

**they brought forth him that had reviled out of the camp, and stoned him with stones. And the children of Israel did as the Lord commanded Moses.**

lating the same with regard to Thurium; *Gell.* XX. I. 14, criticising the *jus talionis* as established by the Twelve Tables, and stating that, as a rule, the offender paid a fine fixed by the judge (hanc quoque ipsam talionem ad aestimationem judicis redigi necessario solitam, etc.); *Manu* VIII. 279—283, "If a common person inflicts an injury upon a noble, he shall have the same limb cut off which he has destroyed, or such a part of it as he has injured; he who lifts up his hand or stick against another, shall have his hand cut off; and anyone who in a passion kicks another with his foot, shall have a cut made in that foot", etc.; *Yâjnav.* II. 215—220, where, however, instead of bodily retaliation, a fine is prescribed, except "if a non-Brahman injures any limb of a Brahman; in this case the same limb of the offender shall be cut off" (comp. *Strab.* XV. I. 55, "In India, he who has maimed another not only suffers in return the loss of the same limb, but his hand also is cut off; anyone who causes a workman to lose his hand or his eye, is put to death"); *Vendid.* farg. IV, ordaining for violence stripes, or, in some cases, money instead of them; *Lane*, Modern Egypt, I. 145, "Retaliation is in Egypt allowed for intentional wounds and mutilations, like as for murder, 'eye for eye', etc. (*Koran* V. 49); but a fine may be accepted instead, which the law allows also for unintentional injuries; the fine for a member that is single (as the nose) is the whole price of blood. as for homicide; for a member of which there are two and not more (as a hand), half the price of blood; for one of which there are ten (a finger or toe), a tenth of the price of blood", etc. — The terms כל נפש אדם (ver. 17) and בעמיתו (ver. 19), as well as the tenour of the entire passage, prove that the "stranger" (גֵּר) here referred to (ver. 22) is any non-Hebrew, and not merely "the stranger of justice" (גֵּר צדק), as has often been supposed (see, f.i., *Selden*, De Jur. Nat. et Gent. p. 468). — Rabbinical interpreters found in the words כן יֵעָשֶׂה בּוֹ (ver. 19) the injunction of punishment in general, and in כן יִנָּתֶן בּוֹ (ver. 20) the intimation of a pecuniary fine, since if retaliation were meant, עליו would have been employed instead of בּוֹ (see Comm. on Exod. p. 465), and the verb נתן refers to monetary transactions or to money changing hands (*Rashi* on ver. 20, דבר הניתן מיד ליד). — The construct state מִשְׁפַּט before the adjective אֶחָד is a peculiarity not rare in Hebrew (comp. Gramm. § 87. 8[c]).

# VIII.

# THE SABBATICAL YEAR AND THE YEAR OF JUBILEE.

## CHAPTER XXV.

SUMMARY.—Every seventh year is to be kept as a Sabbatical year to the Lord, when fields and vineyards are not to be cultivated, and their spontaneous produce is to belong to the poor and the beasts as well as to the proprietors (vers. 1—7). — Every fiftieth year, on the Day of Atonement, liberty shall be proclaimed throughout the country, and then all Hebrew servants are to be released, and all fields that had been sold shall be restored to their former owners. This is the Year of Jubilee, during which the land shall rest as in the Sabbatical year (vers. 8—13). — The purchase price of fields is to be equitably regulated according to the number of years still remaining to the next jubilee (vers. 14—17).— The people are exhorted faithfully to keep the Sabbatical year, and God promises in the sixth year such plentiful harvests, that they will suffice for the seventh and eighth year (vers. 18—22). — The land is not to be sold for ever, and may be redeemed (vers. 23, 24). — Then follow provisions (1.) about Hebrews who, from poverty, are compelled to sell their land (vers. 25—28), or (2.) their houses (vers. 29—31); (3.) on the houses of the Levites and their fields in the suburbs of levitical towns (vers. 32—34); (4.) on loans to be granted to poor Hebrews (vers. 35—38); (5.) on the treatment of Hebrew slaves (vers. 39—43); (6.) about perpetual bondmen taken from heathen nations (vers. 44—46); and, lastly, about Hebrews sold as slaves to resident strangers (vers. 47—55).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses in Mount Sinai, saying,

1. *General Survey.* — There are perhaps in the whole ancient world no institutions bearing comparison with the Hebrew Year of release and of jubilee, either in comprehensiveness or in loftiness of principle. It is impossible to appreciate too highly the wonderful consistency with

which the Sabbath was made the foundation of a grand series of celebrations extending from the Sabbath-day to the Sabbath-month and the Sabbath-year, and lastly to a great Sabbath-period of years. And all these institutions were associated with ideas admirably calculated to foster both a sense of dignity and humility, both zeal in practical pursuits and spiritual elevation, both prudence and charity. — As God, the Creator of heaven and earth, rested after the completion of His works, and as He delivered the Hebrews from Egyptian bondage, the Sabbath rest was to be hallowed both by feelings of awe and gratitude. — Having formed man after His own similitude, and having granted him the rule over the earth and the enjoyment of its treasures, He charged him to preserve his Divine attributes by labour and self-control; therefore the first day of the Sabbath-month, or the New-year's day, ushered in a season of penitence culminating in the Day of Atonement, when by the forgiveness of sins, the Israelites were restored to their original purity; and then only were they permitted to keep a week of rejoicing tempered by humble submission. — Assigning abodes to all the nations of the earth, He gave to the Hebrews the land of Canaan, which His aid enabled them to conquer; therefore every returning Sabbatical year was to remind them that it was not by their own strength that they had obtained so beautiful and so fertile a territory; it was to proclaim to them in the name of their God: "This land is Mine, and you are only strangers and sojourners with Me" (ver. 23); and as a visible token of God's sovereignty, the soil was in that year to remain entirely uncultivated; it was "to keep a Sabbath to the Lord"; fields were not to be sown, nor vineyards pruned, and that which grew spontaneously was not to belong exclusively to the proprietors, but to all alike, to servants, to strangers, and the poor, even to the cattle and the free beasts of the field: so entirely was the Hebrew to divest himself from the pride of wealth. — All men being the children of the same God. and all bearing the seal and stamp of His Divinity, they are equals, and have the same rights of freedom and of property; therefore it was ordained that, as the years rolled on, and a period of seven Sabbatical years was completed, the primitive state of Hebrew society should be re-established, as it had been sanctioned by God's will after the conquest and the distribution of the Holy Land under Joshua; and the Israelites were commanded, "You shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty in the land to all its inhabitants, .... and you shall return every one to his possession, and you shall return every one to his family" (ver. 10); no one was really to own more than any of his neighbours, and the slave was to regain his modest heirloom and his independence; for, says God, "To Me the children of Israel are servants; they are My servants whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; I am the Lord" (ver. 55; comp. ver. 42).

Thus the great chain from the seventh day to the end of seven times seven years was completed; and it encompassed in its widening circles the sanctification of the individual Hebrew and of the Hebrew nation, the protection of every citizen and of the commonwealth, the relation of God to the holy land and the holy people. It is the most perfect system of theocracy that has ever been devised. If we could prove that it was originated in all its parts by one mind or at one epoch, it would

be without parallel or analogy in all history as a work of largely conceived legislation. But no such proof can be produced. On the contrary, we have ample means to show that it grew but very gradually, and that it was hardly consummated within a thousand years. Its foundation is indeed the Sabbath, the antiquity of which is undoubted, and which may be safely referred to the Mosaic age. Even at so early a date, the number seven, representing one phase of the moon, was held sacred, and was associated with religious institutions, and especially the festivals. It was indeed so constantly and so ingeniously employed as a measure of time that, in some degree, it appears like the principle from which many laws were evolved. Thus we find in the old "Book of the Covenant" in Exodus this injunction: "Six years shalt thou sow thy land, and shalt gather in its produce; but in the seventh year thou shalt let it lie and leave it, that the poor of thy people may eat; and what they leave the beasts of the field shall eat" (Exod. XXIII. 10, 11). This was the next step in the development of the system. Looking at the context in which that command is introduced, it appears to be an injunction referring either to charity or to agriculture; for it occurs in the midst of precepts on the poor and the stranger, and the celebration of the agricultural festivals; it may have been intended to secure to the needy, at fixed intervals, crops which they could claim as a right, or it may have been designed to increase the fertility of the soil by periodical rest (see *infra* Phil. Rem.). The command certainly makes no allusion whatever to a theocratic or any other higher principle; it has no spiritual stamp; it was suggested by benevolence or expediency. The law of the Deuteronomist, promulgated centuries later, bears also the character of humanity. With his usual and kindly solicitude for the needy and the suffering, he provided that every seven years "a release" (שְׁמִטָּה) should be made, which he explained thus: "Every creditor shall release the loan which he lends to his neighbour; he shall not press his neighbour or his brother, because a release to the Lord has been proclaimed; the foreigner thou mayest press, but that which is thine with thy brother thou shalt release"; and he ordered, moreover, that on the Feast of Tabernacles in that year, when the anxieties of the harvest and the vintage were over, the Law should publicly be read and explained at the national Sanctuary to the assembled people, men, women, and children, and even the strangers (Deut. XV. 1—3; XXXI. 10—13). But by no word did he refer to the agricultural bearing of the seventh year; it was to him "a Year of release" and not a Sabbatical year. Why did he ignore an arrangement which had been enforced many generations before him, and which, from its charitable tendency, must have been particularly congenial to him? The answer is — because, up to his time, the seventh year had never been kept as a Sabbatical year. This is testified in the Book of Leviticus; for describing the period and misery of the Babylonian exile, of course in the form of prophecy, the author declares: "Then shall the land pay off its Sabbaths as long as it lies desolate, and you are in your enemies' lands; then shall the land rest, and pay off its Sabbaths; as long as it lies desolate, it shall rest; because it did not rest in your Sabbaths when you dwelt upon it" (XXVI. 34, 35, 43); and a still later writer, the

Chronist, one of those indulging in combinations popular in his time, declared that the Hebrews had to suffer seventy years of captivity on account of seventy neglected Sabbatical years (2 Chr. XXXVI. 21; comp. Jer. XXV. 11, 12). Therefore the Deuteronomist, seeing that the old law of the seventh year found little favour among his countrymen, and yet anxious to signalise the conclusion of so significant a period, associated with it another ordinance, which, however, was even more impracticable than the earlier one. For while we find that, in the fifth century, in Nehemiah's time, the people pledged themselves to keep the seventh year, and that thenceforth both Jews and Samaritans seem faithfully to have carried out their promise; the periodical remission of all debts proved so unfair and so unacceptable that it was not enforced again by the levitical writer, who confined himself solely to the territorial arrangements (comp. vers. 2—7), and that a later authority, the great Hillel, found it necessary, as he dared not repeal the Biblical command, at least to annul its operation by introducing the so-called *Prosbul* (פרוזבול προςβολή or προβουλή), a declaration duly signed by witnesses, which the creditor handed over to the judges, and in which he reserved to himself the right of demanding back debts due to him at any time he might choose; or by a title-deed according to which he surrendered his claim in the seventh year to the civil authorities, and empowered them to exact it from the debtor: and not long afterwards, even the formality of the *Prosbul* was declared unnecessary (comp. Neh. X. 32; 1 Macc. VI. 49, 53; *Jos.* Ant. III. xii. 3; XI. viii. 6; XIII. viii. 1; XIV. x. 6; XVI. i. 2; Bell. Jud. I. ii. 4; *Tacit.* Hist. V. 4; *Mishn.* Sheviith X. 3, 4, where the form of the Prosbul is thus given: "I N. N. deliver to you, the judges in the town N. N., the declaration that I shall exact any debt due to me at any time I like, שכל חוב שיש לי שאגבנו כל זמן שארצה; and the judges or any other witnesses then sign this declaration"; Kethuv. IX. 9; Gitt. IV. 3; *Talm.* Gitt. 36, 37; Pesach. 52[b]; *Buxt.* Lex. Talm. pp. 1806, 1807; *Löw*, Beitr. II. 89; see *infra* on vers. 2—7).

So far had the matter advanced, when the misfortunes of the Babylonian exile and the feelings of gratitude at the unexpected deliverance gave a fresh impulse to religious life. It was then that the seventh month was truly made the Sabbath-month. It had indeed from immemorial times been distinguished by the third and greatest harvest festival lasting seven days; but not before the fifth century did it receive its full importance through the Day of Memorial, and especially through the Day of Atonement, which was, above all other days of the year, "a Sabbath of rest". In the mean time, the theocratic theory had been worked out to the very verge of speculation. Its beginnings reach back at least into the time of the Judges; it is expressed, with some distinctness, in the reply made by Gideon to the people when they offered him the hereditary crown: "I will not rule over you, nor shall my son rule over you; the Lord shall rule over you" (Judg. VIII. 23); it is implied in the words which God addressed to Samuel when the Hebrews had asked for a king: "Hearken to the voice of the people in all that they say to thee; for they have not rejected thee, they have rejected Me that I should not reign over them"; and to this request Samuel himself, reproaching

the people, subsequently referred: "When you saw that Nahash the king of the Ammonites came against you, you said to me, Nay, but a king shall reign over us" (1 Sam. VIII. 7; XII. 12; comp. X. 19; Hos. XIII. 10, 11). The same idea was clothed in a more imaginative and more lofty form, when God was declared to have borne the Hebrews on eagles' wings and to have brought them to Himself, because they were a peculiar treasure to Him above every other people, and were intended to be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation (Exod. XIX. 4—6). With increasing force the idea was now insisted upon that, by redeeming the Hebrews from Egyptian oppression, and by allowing them to settle in Canaan as free citizens, God had become the king and lord of the Hebrews not merely as He is the king and lord of the whole earth and all its inhabitants, but in a manner more direct and more personal (see *supra* p. 184, and *infra* Phil. Rem.). He could not suffer that any of His Hebrew subjects should be in permanent bondage, nor could He allow that any portion of His own chosen land should for ever be wrested from the family to which He had assigned it. And thus, by reflection, close reasoning, and by logical conclusions drawn from an abstract principle, the great Sabbath period of the Jubilee was at last instituted with its twofold provision of the restoration of all Hebrew slaves to liberty, and the restoration of all sold lands to their original proprietors. This step was reserved for the levitical legislator, and is explained in our chapter with great minuteness. It is alluded to neither in any part of Exodus nor of Deuteronomy. It was one of the latest measures proposed by Hebrew teachers within the Biblical times; it was suggested even later than the Day of Atonement with which the Jubilee was brought into connection (ver. 9). That it was, in this form, unknown in the earlier part of the Babylonian exile, we have historical evidence to prove.

First, as regards the Hebrew slaves, an ancient law embodied in "the Book of the Covenant", as is well known, enforced their gratuitous release after six years of servitude, and it enacted that, if they renounced liberty, they should be marked in the ear with a sign of dependence, and should then "serve their masters for ever" (לְעֹלָם, Exod. XXI. 1—6). The same law was repeated, in similar terms, by the Deuteronomist, who, however, extended it to the Hebrew maid-servants also; he urged the masters, with his usual benevolence, to dismiss the slaves with rich presents of cattle, corn, and wine; and, what is more significant, he added this exhortation, "And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee; therefore I command thee this thing to day": which words, though also appealing to feelings of goodwill, form a transition to the principles of theocracy (Deut. XV. 12—18). But even these laws had up to the time of Jeremiah been all but ignored. For when in the reign of king Hezekiah, the chiefs and the people had temporarily dismissed their servants, but had soon afterwards forced them back into bondage, the prophet, in his rebuke, exclaimed: "Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel — I made a covenant with your fathers when I brought them out of the land of Egypt, saying, At the end of seven years you shall let go every man his Hebrew brother who has been sold to thee; and when he has served thee six years, thou shalt let him go free from thee; but

your fathers hearkened not unto Me, nor inclined their ear" (Jer. XXXIV. 8—16). From these words it appears also that, in the time of Jeremiah, no other slave laws were current or accepted but those fixing either a six years' or a perpetual servitude. But our section prescribes: "If thy brother becomes poor by thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant; but as a hired servant and as a sojourner he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee to the Year of jubilee; and then shall he go out free from thee, both he and his children with him, and shall return to his own family, and to the possession of his fathers shall he return; for they are My servants whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen are sold" (vers. 39—42). The differences between the earlier and these later enactments are evident: the former make no mention of a jubilee, the latter none of a six years' term; the former only care how to secure the servant's liberal treatment after the termination of his short period of involuntary dependence, the latter are anxious to define his position, and to protect his privileges, as a Hebrew citizen during his compulsory, and it may be very protracted, connection with his master; and the one leave him the option of remaining a slave his whole life-time, the others force him to return to liberty in the Year of jubilee: for the earlier provisions contemplate rather the rights of the theocratic citizen, the later laws the duties of the theocratic community; the one view more particularly the slave in his relation to his master, the other the master in his relation to God. It was at first deemed sufficient to found a commonwealth on equity and charity; later thinkers desired to establish a holy polity on abstract principles of spiritualism: it was a fine and lofty aspiration, but it could not possibly be made a reality.

Similar was the case with respect to the Hebrew *territory*. It was the intention of the early legislators, as much as possible to secure equality for all Hebrew citizens, to guard against the extinction of families, which would have disturbed the organism of the community, and to prevent the co-existence of excessive wealth and helpless destitution. With this view the laws of territorial distribution and of inheritance were framed (comp. 1 Ki. XXI. 3, 4; Num. XXVII. 1—11; XXXVI. 1—11). Yet the accumulation of vast lands in the same family was not prevented, and the prophet Isaiah complained: "Woe to them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there is no room, and you [they] remain alone placed in the land" (Isai. V. 8; comp. 1 Ki. XXI. 2, 16; 2 Sam. XVI. 4; Mic. II. 2; Ezek. XLV. 8). It appears that even before the exile some law or custom existed regulating the periodical restoration of lands, and that the year in which this took place was called "the year of liberty" (שְׁנַת הַדְּרוֹר); but of this arrangement we have hardly any information except that given in one passage of Ezekiel, who mentions rather than explains it: "Thus says the Lord God, If a prince give a gift to any of his sons, the inheritance thereof shall be his sons'; it shall be their possession by inheritance; but if he give a gift of his inheritance to one of his servants, then it shall be his to the year of liberty (עַד־שְׁנַת הַדְּרוֹר), and afterwards it shall return to the prince; only to his sons shall his inheritance belong" (Ezek. XLVI. 16, 17). At what intervals and how this "year of liberty" was kept, we are

unable to ascertain, as no allusion whatever to such an institution or its celebration is found in any of the ante-Babylonian Books. The more elaborate are the directions given by the levitical author in our chapter. He combines full details with the enunciation of distinct principles. His account is indeed so specified and so matured, it discusses the subject so systematically from every point of view and for all possible emergencies, that it cannot be a first sketch or a primitive law; and it reflects a theocratic organisation balancing the rights and claims of all, of the rich and the poor, the people and the priests, the natives and the strangers.

Therefore, to sum up, the successive phases were these — first the Sabbath, next the Sabbatical year, then the Sabbath-month, and finally, late in the Persian period, the Jubilee. So normal was their development, and so logically were they unfolded from identical principles, that, in the same order, two and two of them correspond with each other in nature and meaning — the weekly Sabbath or perfect rest with the Sabbatical year, and the Sabbath-month or the restoration to moral purity with the Jubilee or the complete renewal of the commonwealth; and in each case, the one might be called the prototype of the other. Hence both the Sabbatical year and the Jubilee are peculiar to the Hebrew Law, and have elsewhere hardly an analogy; for they are founded on the Sabbath, to which there exists no complete parallel.

Philological Remarks. — The ordinances of this chapter unfolding, as we have pointed out, the ideas of the Sabbath and the festivals, are directly connected with those of the twenty-third, but have no affinity with the twenty-fourth chapter (see *supra* p. 488). To account for this irregularity, Ebn Ezra has recourse to the Rabbinical principle, that "there is no strict sequence in the Law" (אין מוקדם ומאוחר בתורה), and he suggests, besides, that our section, though properly belonging to the laws of the "Book of the Covenant" (Exod. XX—XXIII), has been inserted in this place in order to connect it with the menaces of punishment in the next chapter (XXVI. 34, 35, 43); while modern apologists as precariously urge, that the thread by which this portion is joined with the preceding commands is "the unity of place", since it is marked as having also been revealed on Mount Sinai (*Ranke*, Untersuchungen, I. 109); but that unity is not complete; in some passages the communications are stated to have been made to Moses on Mount Sinai, in others from the Tabernacle; and it is difficult to harmonise the various statements on the subject (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 472, 474, 556, 557; the passages referred to are Exod. XIX. 3; XXIV. 16; XXXI. 18; XXXIV. 29, 32; Lev. I. 1; VII. 38; XXV. 1; XXVI. 46; XXVII. 34; Num. I. 1; III. 1; XII. 5). — It has been observed, that "the Sabbatical year and the Year of jubilee were distinguished by no religious ceremonies, were accompanied by no act of religious worship", and that "there were no sacrifices, nor holy convocations belonging to them"; and this circumstance has been assigned as a reason why our chapter was separated from the twenty-third (*Cook's* Holy Bible, Lev. p. 630): but either year was throughout and in itself one continuous act of religious worship, the one being altogether "a Sabbath to the Lord", the other "sanctified" for the recognition of His sole sovereignty (vers. 2, 4, 10); in the one, the land was withdrawn from its cosmic relations, in the other

the community renounced its usual social condition, in order to belong entirely to God; the repose of the soil, the restitution of fields, and the liberation of slaves, were truly "sacrifices"; and both institutions do not chiefly rest "on moral", but pre-eminently on religious grounds. — It has been contended that our law of the Sabbatical year arose partially from an erroneous interpretation of the commands in Exod. XXIII. 10, 11, the verbs שמט and נטש having been understood *to let the soil rest*, whereas they mean *to leave* or *to surrender*, and the suffixes in תִּשְׁמְטֶנָּה and וּנְטַשְׁתָּהּ having been referred to the land (אַרְצֶךָ), whereas they ought to be referred to its produce (תְּבוּאָתָהּ), so that the sense would be, that the Hebrews should during six years gather in the crops for themselves, but should in the seventh year leave them for the poor and the beasts (comp. *Hupfeld*, De primitiva festor. apud Hebr. ratione, III. 10, 11; *Graf*, Geschichtl. Bücher, p. 79). But it cannot be supposed that the legislator meant the proprietors to cultivate their land in the seventh year as usual, and then give over the produce to the needy and the animals (ἄτοπον γὰρ ἦν, observes Philo — De Humanit. c. 11 — ἑτέρους μὲν πονεῖν, ἑτέρους δὲ καρποῦσθαι); and he distinctly states, "Six years thou shalt sow thy land," which implies that in the seventh it should not be sown, that is, it should enjoy "a Sabbath of rest". The idea of letting the soil lie fallow in the seventh year, seems to date from early times, and the advance later made in this respect was this that, at first, the custom was prompted by practical or humane motives, but that subsequently it was supported by spiritual principles (see *supra*). — The passage in Jeremiah above commented upon (XXXIV. 8—16) neither refers to a Year of jubilee then already regularly kept, nor to one then first instituted; it mentions a special arrangement or "covenant" (בְּרִית) entered into between king Zedekiah and the people of Jerusalem to proclaim "liberty" (לִקְרֹא דְּרוֹר) to their Hebrew slaves; and the prophet relates: "Now, when all the princes and all the people who had concluded the covenant, heard that every one should let his man-servant, and every one his maid-servant, go free, that none should make them serve any more, then they obeyed and let them go" (*ibid.* ver. 10). If our law of the jubilee had existed in Zedekiah's time, no such exceptional agreement or pledge would have been required; nor would the masters have had the power to force back the dismissed servants into subjection, since these would have claimed their release as their legal right, and not as a favour capriciously to be granted or withdrawn. But we can well understand how such a precedent helped to settle the custom of periodically "proclaiming liberty" to the Hebrew slaves (ver. 10); and when Ezekiel also (XLVI. 16—18), in speaking of a "year of liberty", advocated a regular return of landed property to its original possessor, everything was prepared for the introduction of a Year of jubilee such as the levitical author delineated in harmony with his own peculiar theories of theocratic government. — Equally inconclusive are other passages which have been adduced to prove the earlier origin of the law of the Jubilee, as Isai. XXXVII. 30 and LXI. 1; or Ezek. I. 1; VII. 12, 13; XLVI. 16, 17; Ruth IV. 3; which passages it is impossible fully to discuss in this place, but none of which contains any distinct allusion to our subject (see *supra* p. 538; comp. *Ideler*, Chronologie, I. 536;

*Hitzig* in locc.; *Kranold*, De Anno Hebraeorum Jubilaeo, p. 80; *Ewald*, Alterth. pp. 388, 399, where the opinion is expressed that the law of the Year of jubilee "was, in earlier periods, carried out for centuries in the national life of the Israelites"; but that opinion, stated without a proof, is derived from the assumptions that that law forms part of the old "Book of *Origines*", and that it fell into disuse at the time of the Deuteronomist, after it had long before been enacted in Leviticus). — Jeremiah writes: "I made a covenant with your fathers ... saying, At the end of seven years (מִקֵּץ שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים), you shall let go every man his Hebrew brother who has been sold to thee; and when he has served thee six years (שֵׁשׁ שָׁנִים), thou shalt let him go free from thee" (l. c. vers. 13, 14): the words "at the end of seven years" are at variance not only with the commands in Exodus (XXI. 2) and Deuteronomy (XV. 12), but more strangely still with the prophet's own explanation; yet they occur also in the law of the Deuteronomist on the release from debts, which indeed took place precisely "at the end of seven years" (Deut. XV. 1, מִקֵּץ שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים; comp. XXXI. 10): considering the many fluctuations which the law of the "seventh year" underwent in the course of time, and how uncertain it still was in Jeremiah's own age, such an inaccuracy is not surprising. (The difference of terms in Deut. XIV. 28 and XXVI. 12 is not analogous to that alluded to.) — The passages describing God as the theocratic lord of the holy land and the holy people are numerous; the principal ones are these: *Canaan* is called "the land or soil of God" (ארץ יהוה, אַרְצִי, אַרְצְךָ, or אדמת יהוה, אַדְמָתִי; Deut. XXXII. 43; Isai. XIV. 2, 25; Jer. II. 7; Ezek. XXXVI. 5, 20; XXXVIII. 16; Hos. IX. 3; Ps. X. 16), or "His inheritance" (נחלתו, Jer. II. 7), or "possession" (ארץ אחזת יהוה, Josh. XXII. 19; comp. Lev. XXV. 23 כי לי הארץ); "the glory of all lands" (צבי היא לכל הארצות, Ezek. XX. 6), upon which "His eye rests from the beginning of the year to the end of the year" (Deut. XII. 12), which "He espied" for the Israelites (אשר תרתי להם, Ezek. XX. 6); "the land in which He dwells" (אשר אני שכן בתוכה; Num. XXXV. 34; Josh. XXII. 19), therefore the "holy soil" (אדמת הקדש, Zech. II. 16), or "His holy abode" (נוה קדשך; Exod. XV. 13, 17); "the land which He gave to the children of Israel as a possession" (אשר אני נותן לכם לאחזה or לרשת אתה or נחלה; Exod. XX. 12; Lev. XIV. 34; XX. 24; XXIII. 10; XXV. 24; Num. XIII. 2; XV. 2; XXXII. 7, 11; XXXIII. 52—54; XXXIV. 2, 13; Deut. I. 8, 21; II. 29; III. 20; IV. 1, 10, 22, 38, 40; XXIV. 4; XXVI. 1, 3; etc. etc.), which is, therefore, indeed temporarily "the land or soil of Israel" (ארץ ישראל or אדמת ישראל; 1 Sam. XIII. 19; Ezek. XI. 17; XII. 19, 22; XL. 2; 2 Chr. XXXIV. 7; etc.), and from which He removes them if they defile it by their iniquity (Num. XXXV. 33, 34; Deut. IV. 26; XI. 17; XXIV. 4; XXVIII. 63; XXIX. 27; Isai. XXIV. 6; Ezek. XXXVI. 17; Hos. IX. 3; Mich. II. 10).

Quite analogous are the designations of the *Israelites*. They are "the people of God" (עמך, עמי, עם יהוה; Exod. XV. 16; Num. XVII. 15; Deut. IX. 26, 29; XXXII. 36, 43; 1 Ki. VIII. 51; Ezek. XXXVI. 20; Ps. XXVIII. 9; CXXXV. 14), whom He "has chosen" (בחר) from all other nations, "loved above all" (אהב, חשק; Deut. IV. 37; VII. 6—8; XIV. 2; Ps. XXXIII. 12), and "brought to Himself" (Exod. XIX. 4, ואבא אתכם אלי), but not on account

2. Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them, When you come into the land which I give you,

of their multitude, for they are "the fewest among all nations" (Deut. VII. 7), nor on account of their piety and righteousness, for their rebellion against God is incessant (Deut. IX. 4—8); they are "His inheritance" (עם נחלה, נחלתו; etc. Deut. IV. 20; IX. 26, 29; 1 Ki. VIII. 51, 53; Isai. XIX. 25; Ps. XXVIII. 9; XXXIII. 12) or His "property" (סְגֻלָּה; Exod. XIX. 5; Deut. VII. 6; XIV. 2; XXVI. 18), which "He has acquired" (עם זו קנית, Exod. XV. 16); they are, therefore, on the one hand, "His servants" (עבדי; Lev. XXV. 42, 55; Deut. XXXII. 36, 43; 1 Ki. VIII. 36; Ps. CXXXV. 14), and on the other hand, a "holy people" (עם קדוש, Exod. XIX. 6; Deut. VII. 6; XIV. 2, 21; XXVI. 19; XXVIII. 9), whom "He has distinguished from all nations" (Lev. XX. 24, 26; 1 Ki. VIII. 53). — The other appellations of Israel occurring in the Old Testament, have been enumerated in the Comm. on Exod. p. 332, where the Hebrew theocracy also is briefly characterised.

**2 — 7.** The provisions of the Pentateuch with respect to the seventh year have before been considered in detail (comp. Comm. on Exod. pp. 448 — 452), and it will suffice in a few words to point out again that the ordinances of Exodus, Deuteronomy, and Leviticus represent three different aspects of the institution — the first viewing it as a measure of agriculture, or of humanity in connection with the land, the second as one of consideration in reference to debtors, and the third as a solemn duty of religion: in the first respect it is merely a year of "surrendering and giving over" (שמט and נטש), in the second "a year of Release" (שְׁמִטָּה), but in the third a "Sabbath of rest" (שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן) or "a Sabbath to the Lord" (שַׁבָּת לַיהוָה; comp. vers. 2, 4; Exod. XXIII. 11; Deut. XV. 2). Neither the law of Exodus nor our portion makes any allusion to remission of debts, because when "the Book of the Covenant" was compiled, the enactment of Deuteronomy was not yet framed or acknowledged, and at the time of the levitical legislator it had again been abandoned (see on ver. 1). Therefore, what at first glance might appear a great discrepancy, is in reality the organic development of an arrangement proposed, tested by experience, and exchanged for another which promised to be more practical. Our author indeed makes no reference to the public recital of the Law recommended in Deuteronomy, but it accorded well with the sacred and spiritual character attributed by him to the seventh year, which, though a time of rest, was not to be spent in idleness, as heathen historians tauntingly observed (*Tacit.* Hist. V. 4), but was to be zealously devoted to intellectual and religious training. With regard to the spontaneous growth of the Sabbatical year, he was less exacting than his predecessor, the compiler of the fundamental laws embodied in Exodus; for while he permitted a share of the free produce of fields and vineyards to their proprietors with their households and dependents (ver. 6), the earlier writer assigned the whole to the "needy of the people" and to the beasts, and expressly included in his law the olive gardens (Exod. XXIII. 11): thus, whereas he refined the institution by an

**the land shall keep a Sabbath to the Lord. 3. Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou**

idealism unknown before, he was compelled to relax its practical demands, because in his time of limited prosperity even proprietors could not bear great burdens; and their harvests were probably in many cases not large enough to enable them periodically to forego all increase. — The Rabbins, in expounding our law, decided that the owner is allowed to bring home from the field only a little at a time, just as all others, but not more than is necessary for his immediate wants (comp. ver. 12, מן השדה תאכלו), and that he commits a grave offence, unfitting him to be a witness, if he sells the fruits beforehand or during the year. As may be imagined, they fully worked out those Biblical commands which make the seventh year "a Sabbath of rest", and which are indeed emphatic (comp. ver. 4); they declared them obligatory in the Holy Land, whether in the times of the Temple or after its destruction, and extended them, with modifications, to some neighbouring countries; they interdicted — according to some also to strangers — any agricultural labour whatever, even if its object is not to secure crops in the same year, such as digging, ploughing, removing stones, or manuring, planting or grafting trees; in fact, in their zeal they went so far as to forbid the Hebrews "to eat any portion of the spontaneous produce, because, if this were allowed, many would secretly sow, and declare the crops to be spontaneous produce"; thus, as in other instances, in their anxiety to "fence round" the Law, they annulled it; and with respect to the seventh year, they besides destroyed its character as a "Year of release" from debts by introducing the *Prosbul* above referred to, and by several other devices. Some High-priests, as John Hyrcanus, seem to have insisted that the Jews should in the Sabbath-year rest from warfare (*Jos.* Ant. XIII. viii. 1; Bell. Jud. I. ii. 4), but their example was not frequently followed (comp. *Mishn.* Sheviith X. 1—9; *Talm.* Gitt. 36, 37; Sanh. 24b; Macc. 3; Shevuoth 48; *Geiger*, Lesestücke aus der Mischnah, pp. 4, 77; *Saalschütz*, Mos. Recht, p. 164; see also *Maimon.* Hilch. Sheviith and Shemittah).

It cannot be doubted that the Sabbatical year began in the seventh month, or in the autumn; its commencement in the first month (Abib), or in the spring, would have greatly increased the loss and inconvenience it occasioned, without in the least promoting its charitable or religious objects; for the people would in the preceding autumn hardly have cultivated their lands, or sown seeds the crops of which they were not to enjoy; and as they were not permitted to perform agricultural labours in the autumn of the Sabbatical year, they would have been without harvests for two years more, which no legislator, however enthusiastic, could have ventured to propose: the Sabbatical year was evidently meant to entail the sacrifice of one crop and no more. Besides, the public reading of the Law on the Feast of Tabernacles in every seventh year, and the analogy of the Jubilee, which was proclaimed on the Day of Atonement (ver. 9), prove that the Sabbatical year was counted

**shalt prune thy vineyard, and gather in its fruit; 4. But in the seventh year shall be a Sabbath of**

from autumn to autumn, and was probably also heralded in on the tenth day of the seventh month, since the Jubilee was immediately to follow each seventh Year of release (comp. vers. 21, 22; see also *Talm*. Rosh Hash. 2ª, 8ᵇ).

It is well known, that in fertile countries the spontaneous growth (סָפִיחַ) of fields is often so abundant that two or even three harvests are obtained from one sowing; this was the case in Numidia, Albania, and Hyrcania; and is still usual in many districts of Palestine, as in the highlands of Galilee and in the valley near Bethlehem (Wadi Urtas), the "Gardens of Solomon", where the corn sows itself from the ripe ears, and grows without cultivation of the soil, twenty ears of barley and thirty of oats from one grain, and especially in the most beautiful and most fertile plains of Jezreel, which are "like fields of corn sown by no human hand, cut by no reaper"; and there the wheat grows of itself so high that mules are nearly concealed in the ears. Well, therefore, might the legislator ordain, "The Sabbath of the land shall be food for you; for thee, and for thy servant, and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant, and for thy sojourner that dwells with thee, and for thy cattle, and for thy beasts" (vers. 6, 7); though of course, the main sustenance in the Sabbatical year was derived from the stores of preceding harvests (vers. 20—22; comp. 2 Ki. XIX. 29; Isai. XXXVII. 30; *Hom*. Od. IX. 109; *Strab*. XI. IV. 3, p. 502; *Schubert*, Reise, III. 115, 166, 201; *Ritter*, Erdkunde, XVI. 283, 482, 693).

The principal object of the Sabbatical year, at least in the eyes of the levitical legislator, was not its economic usefulness in invigorating the soil, or any other of the many material advantages which have been attributed to it (see *infra* Phil. Rem.), but its spiritual significance as a general Sabbath devoted to God; for as the week is a complete cycle for the labour of man, so is the year for the cultivation and produce of the land; and man was to rest every seventh day, and the land every seventh year, in order that, by sacrificing one day's labour and one year's produce, the Israelite might express his gratitude to the mercy of God who blesses his works, and who sustains him during the temporary suspension of his efforts. He was to be reminded that the treasures of the earth were indeed created for the benefit of man, but that he should not use them selfishly and greedily; and on the other hand, that the soil had indeed been laden with God's curse, but that His bounty gives abundance and grants respite from wearying toil. Who will assert that these and similar abstract ideas, which underlie the Sabbatical year, were conceived in the early Mosaic age, or could be profitably conveyed to the untutored people who meant to worship their Deliverer by dancing round the golden image of a calf?

The views of Philo, who gives the oldest comment of our laws, may be briefly stated. Moses thought the number seven, he observes, worthy of such reverence being "the pure and ever virgin number" (ἅγιος καὶ ἀεὶ παρθένος), that he ordained in every seventh year the remission of debts in order "to assist the poor, and train the rich to humanity"; he commanded that then the people should

**rest to the land, a Sabbath to the Lord; thou shalt not sow thy field, nor prune thy vineyard. 5. That which**

leave the land fallow and untilled, and "deliberately let slip out of their hands certain and valuable revenues", in order to teach them not to be "wholly devoted to gain, but even willingly to submit to some loss," and thus to prepare them to bear patiently any mischance or calamity; he desired, moreover, to intimate that it was sinful to weigh down and oppress man with burdens, since even the earth which has no feelings of pleasure or of pain, was to enjoy a period of relaxation; and that all benefits bestowed upon our fellowmen are sure to meet with reward and requital, since even the inanimate earth, after having been allowed to rest for one year, gratefully returns this favour by producing in the next years much larger crops than usual; just as athletes, by alternating recreation and exertion "as with a well-regulated harmony", greatly enhance their strength, and are at last able to perform wonders of endurance; or as nature has wisely ordained man to work and to sleep by turns, that he may not be worn out by toil. But the lawgiver's chief object was "humanity, which he thought fit to weave in with every part of his legislation, stamping on all who study the holy Scriptures a sociable and humane disposition". With this view he "raised the poor from their apparent lowly condition, and freed them from the reproach of being beggars", by "appointing times when, as if they had been deriving a revenue from their own properties, they find themselves in the possession of plenty, being suddenly enriched by the gift of God, who has invited them to share with the possessors themselves in the number of the sacred seven" (*Philo*, De Septen. cc. 8—12; comp. De Human. c. 11). In these remarks the charitable and moral motives of the Sabbatical year are admirably, but its theocratic tendencies imperfectly unfolded; nor can Philo be expected to appreciate the gradual development manifest in the various Books of the Pentateuch: in the law of Leviticus charity is no more than an incidental and subordinate object. Not very different is the view taken by one of the most recent Biblical scholars. "The field also", observes Ewald (Alterth. p. 378), "has its Divinely appointed right to enjoy a necessary and therefore Divine measure of rest and recreation; the field also must not always feel man's eagerness for work and gain ... The land gives every year its fruits like a debt paid to man and due to him for the pains he bestows upon it; but as, at times, debts are not exacted from human debtors, so man must allow the land to lie fallow in the proper time, without exacting from it a debt" (comp. also Job XXXI. 38, 39). Josephus merely observes, "Moses accorded to the land of the Hebrews rest from ploughing and planting every seventh year, just as he had prescribed to them to rest from working every seventh day; and he ordered, that what then grew of its own accord out of the earth, should in common belong to all who pleased to use it, making no distinction in that respect between their own countrymen and foreigners" (Ant. III. XII. 3). He mentions indeed the release from debt, not, however, as having taken place in the Sabbatical year, but in the Year of jubilee: this deviation from a plain Biblical command may be accounted for by the

**grows of its own accord out of thy harvest thou shalt not reap, neither gather the grapes of thy undressed vine: it shall be a year of rest to the land. 6. And the Sabbath of the land shall be food for you; for**

circumstance that, in his time, this command was not acted upon, and was soon superseded by the arrangement of the *Prosbul*.

As regards the history of the Sabbatical year, it is only necessary to add (see p. 535) that, in the time of Alexander the Great, it seems to have been an established and faithfully observed institution; that king is said to have remitted the tribute to the Jews and Samaritans in every seventh year, "because then they did not sow their fields" (*Jos.* Ant. XI. VIII. 6); and Caesar granted the same privilege to nearly the whole country, "because the people neither received the fruits of their trees nor did they sow their lands" (XIV. x. 6); yet later and less considerate proconsuls rigorously exacted the impost without intermission, so that Rabbi Janai, in the time of Severus, found it necessary to allow the cultivation of the land in the Sabbatical year also (*Talm.* Sanh. 26ᵃ). — In later times it was customary to use the Sabbatical cycle as a chronological era (comp. *Talm.* Pesach. 86ᵃ; Kiddush. 71ᵃ; etc.).—It is well known that Jewish agriculturists in Palestine and the neighbouring countries still keep the Sabbatical year much in the manner prescribed by the Pentateuch, in spite of the disadvantages which it involves. They reckon from seven to seven years without taking the Jubilee into account; and after many controversies and speculations they have agreed upon fixing a certain date, so that the last Sabbatical year they kept was in Ann. Mund. 5628, corresponding to the Christian year 1867—8, and the next will take place in Ann. Mund. 5635, or 1874—5 (see *infra* on vers. 8—13).

The idea of allowing the land to rest in honour of God, or as a sacrifice made to "His people, the poor" (Exod. XXII. 24), has an analogy in the Greek usage of keeping round the temples uncultivated fields and meadows dedicated to the deities (ἀνειμένα or ἄνετα; comp. *Aeschin.* Ctesiph. §§ 107—113, cc. 33—35, ὅρκον ὤμοσαν ἰσχυρὸν μήτ' αὐτοὶ τὴν ἱερὰν γῆν ἐργάσεσθαι μήτ' ἄλλῳ ἐπιτρέψειν κτλ.; *Spanheim* ad Callimach. Hymn. in Cer. 47, etc.).

Philological Remarks. — Among the material advantages that have been attributed to the Sabbatical year are these: it was intended to strengthen men and beasts by a longer period of rest; to restrain commerce and friendly intercourse with the neighbouring heathen tribes; to encourage occupations other than agricultural, such as trades and all kinds of handicraft; to prevent famine by accustoming the Hebrews to store up their provisions; to promote the chace, or to aid in the manure by allowing the cattle freely to graze on the fields. These and similar devices of cold calculation little harmonise with the enthusiastic promise of a supernatural blessing to be accorded to the Hebrews to counterbalance the losses of the seventh year (vers. 20—22, see notes *in loc.*). Yet they are not more objectionable than mystic or typical speculations like these: "The Sabbatical year points forward to a time when the whole creation shall be re-

**thee, and for thy servant, and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant, and for thy sojourner that dwells with thee, 7. And for thy cattle, and for the beasts that *are* in thy land, shall all its produce be food.**

leased from 'the bondage of corruption'" (Rom. VIII. 21; *Öhler* l. c. p. 211); which speculations have been extended, with increased eagerness, to the Year of jubilee, which, it is asserted, was designed "to give a foretaste of that blissful time which men will enjoy in the Divine presence after the coming of the anointed of the Lord" (*Keil*, Lev. p. 156; Archäol. I. 378); or to serve "as a type of the Messianic time of salvation when, after the perfect victory of the Divine kingdom, the discord of all worldly affairs shall be dissolved into the harmony of a Divine life, and when, with 'the rest of the people of God' (Hebr. IV. 9), the annals of history will close" (*Öhler*, l. c.; comp. also *Cook's* Holy Bible, p. 637). — "The earth shall keep a Sabbath to the Lord" (לַיהוָה, ver. 2), that is, by absolutely resting and being withdrawn from the labour of men, the land shall strikingly appear as belonging to God; moreover, keeping rest, because involving a sacrifice of gain and profit, is in itself regarded as an offering acceptable to God. Rashi explains לַיהוָה simply לשם יהוה, but Ebn Ezra mystically, "the rest shall be like that of the Sabbath-day, and this passage hints at the secrets of eternity". — שָׁבַת שַׁבָּת to keep a Sabbath; comp. XXIII. 32. — The suffix in תְּבוּאָתָהּ (ver. 3) refers to הָאָרֶץ (in ver. 2), which comprises both שָׂדֶה and כֶּרֶם. The latter term may include olive-gardens also (see on XIX. 10, p. 410), which are specially mentioned in the corresponding law of Exodus (XXIII. 11, כן תעשה לכרמך לזיתך); although זָמַר seems chiefly to apply to the pruning of the *vine* (Isai. V. 6; comp. זְמוֹרָה vine-branch, Num. XIII. 23).—In the seventh year the earth shall have "complete rest" or שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן, on which term see p. 492. — סְפִיחַ (ver. 5 from ספח in the general sense of pouring out or falling out) is properly *that which falls out*, that is, the produce springing up from the grains and seeds which fall out from the ears and fruits at harvest time, or the spontaneous growth; Sept. aptly αὐτόματα ἀναβαίνοντα τοῦ ἀγροῦ σου, Vulg. quae sponte gignet humus, Kimchi הצמח היוצא מבלי חרישה וזריעה, Luther was von selber nach deiner Erndte wächst, a. o.; similarly Onk. כַּתָּא דחצדך (aftergrowth), Jonath. ית כַּתֵּי שְׁבִיק חצדכון (the aftergrowth of that which has been left behind), etc. — As the נָזִיר was not permitted to cut his hair (Num. VI. 5), that word was figuratively employed for the *unpruned* vine, or for that which was left untouched in every seventh and every fiftieth year; the vine was the more fitly called "a Nazarite", as the leaves and branches of trees were often compared with the human hair (see p. 456; *Tibull.* I. VII. 34, Hic viridem dura caedere falce comam; *Catull.* IV. 11, comata silva; *Ovid.* Amor. III. x. 12, etc.); similar metaphors are not uncommon in Hebrew, as עָרְלָה the "uncircumcised" fruit (see p. 425); בתולת שקמה (*Talm.* Nidd. $8^b$) "the virginity of the sycamore", that is, a sycamore the branches of which have never been clipped. Yet this use of נזיר, which properly means "one separated", can only have originated at a later time, when the laws and habits of the Nazarite had

**8. And thou shalt number seven year-weeks to thee, seven times seven years; so that the time of the**

become fully familiar to the people. The ancient versions are here less happy than with respect to the preceding term; the Sept. renders עִנְּבֵי נְזִירֶךָ τὴν σταφυλὴν τοῦ ἁγιάσματος, thus introducing a foreign notion; the Vulg. still more inaccurately uvas primitiarum tuarum; Onkel. עִנְּבֵי שְׁבָקָךְ the grapes of thy shoots; Jon. עִנְּבֵי רְדִיפֵיכוֹן the grapes of your twigs, and in ver. 11 עִנְּבֵי שְׁמִיטְּתָא. Rashi explains (on vers. 5 and 11), "thou shalt not gather the grapes from which thou hast separated (הנזרת) and secluded other people, and which thou hast not declared common property; but from the vines which thou hast pronounced free, thou mayest gather"; which distinction is not intended in our context; and Kimchi, "the grapes from which thou hast kept aloof, and to which thou hast devoted no labour". — On the *dagesh forte euphonicum* in עִנְּבֵי see Gramm. § V. $6^b$. — והיתה שַׁבַּת הארץ לכ' (ver. 6) is literally, "and the Sabbath of the land shall be food for you", that is, by a double metonymy, that which the land *produces* in its *year* of rest shall serve you for sustenance, so that שבת הארץ nearly coincides in sense with ספיח קצירך, although the former term is meant once more to point out the sacred character of the seventh year. Jewish tradition includes the pagans also in the "hired servant and sojourner", and explains the תושב to be one who has pledged himself to abstain from idolatry and from eating unlawful food (נבלות; comp. *Siphra* and *Rashi* in loc.). — בְּהֵמָה domesticated cattle, חַיָּה the free beasts of the field and forest; see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 78. — On the divergence of vers. 6, 7 from Exod. XXIII. 11, see *supra* p. 535; comp. *Hupfeld*, l. c. III. p. 13; *Knob.* Levit. p. 561; *Öhler*, in Herzog's Real-Encyclop. XIII. 205; *Keil*, Levit. p. 148.

**8—13.** No arrangement could have more strongly impressed the importance, the sacredness, and the true nature of the Year of jubilee, than its proclamation on the Day of Atonement. As this was the latest and most solemn of Hebrew festivals, so was the Jubilee the latest and grandest of all theocratic institutions; the one restored the proper relations between God and the Hebrews as His *holy* people, the latter renewed the primitive bond between God and the Hebrews as a *free* nation, subject only to His sovereignty; as in the one case the disturbing effects of sin were removed, so in the other were the differences caused by the changes and misfortunes of life annulled; the one aimed at inward harmony, the other at the complete equilibrium between all the citizens of the commonwealth both in their personal relations and in their possessions; after the one, the moral and spiritual, after the other the material life of the nation was to make a new beginning. True liberty is only possible to the pure of heart, or after forgiveness of sins; and the "year of grace" (שְׁנַת רָצוֹן, Is. LXI. 21) commenced on the Day of Atonement. The analogies are striking, and they afford another proof of the thoughtful combinations to which the final ordinances of the Hebrews owe their existence.

But there is not a single trace that the Year of jubilee was ever kept; it is never mentioned in the historical Books of the Old Testament; it was never employed as a

**seven year-weeks shall be to thee forty-nine years. 9. Then shalt thou let the blast of the trumpet sound**

chronological epoch for which it would have been admirably adapted; and Talmudical and Rabbinical writers, living after the dispersion of the Jews, have nothing to offer but conflicting and hazardous conjectures. They contend that the periods of the Jubilee as well as of the Sabbatical year were counted from the time when, after the conquest of Canaan, the land had been distributed by Joshua, which they believe was accomplished in the fourteenth year after the Israelites' passage over the Jordan, the conquest lasting seven years, and the distribution as long, so that the first Sabbatical year was kept in the twenty-first, the first Jubilee in the sixty-fourth year after their entrance into western Canaan (comp. *Siphra* fol. 106$^b$, Behar c. 2; *Seder Olam* c. 11; *Talm.* Zevach. 118$^b$; Erach. 12$^b$, 13$^a$). Christian scholars assert, on no more solid grounds, that both cycles were reckoned from the time of the crossing of the Jordan, so that the first Sabbath-year was celebrated in the forty-seventh year after the exodus from Egypt (so Torniellus, Salianus, Des Vignoles, a.o.); or from the completion of the conquest, so that the first Sabbatical year took place in the fifty-fourth year after the exodus (so Scaliger, Petavius, Franck, a. o.). Moreover, according to Rabbinical authorities, the computation of the Sabbatical year and the Year of jubilee was several times interrupted by national calamities; for the Jubilee ceased to be kept after the abduction of the East-jordanic tribes into the Assyrian captivity, since the law applied only to the time when each tribe lived in its own appointed districts (comp. ver. 10, לכל יושביה; see *Siphra* l. c. and c. 3; *Talm.* Erach. 32$^b$; *Maimon.* l. c. X. 8); it was revived in the reign of king Josiah when, it is alleged, the exiled tribes were partially brought back by Jeremiah, thirty six years before the destruction of the first Temple (about 624; comp. *Seder Olam* c. 24; *Talm.* Megill. 14$^b$); after which catastrophe it was finally discontinued, since during the time of the second Temple the tribal organisation was completely altered (comp. *Talm.* Gitt. 36$^a$); yet before the exile, the Years of jubilee, even when not celebrated, were counted, as this was necessary for preserving the unbroken continuity of the Sabbatical periods; while during the exile both the celebration and the counting were suspended (*Talm.* Erach. 12$^b$, 13$^a$, 32$^b$, מני יובלות לקדש שמטין; *Seder Olam* c. 30). As regards the Sabbatical years, Talmudical teachers suppose that they were resumed in Ezra's time, but the Rabbins are so unreliable on the subject that they make the return of the exiles under Zerubbabel and the arrival of Ezra in Jerusalem almost contemporary events; they are not sure whether the counting of the Sabbatical periods was formally recommenced from the time when the foundation stone of the new Temple was laid, or six years later; and they derive their results from the most uncertain premises (comp. *Seder Olam* c. 30; *Talm.* Erach. 11$^b$, 12$^b$; *Maimon.* Shemitt. X. 3; other opinions or rather conjectures see *Zuckerm.* l. c. pp. 29, 30, 38). — Philo merely repeats the Biblical injunctions without adding a new feature, or alluding to any instance of actual celebration; and Josephus

**in the seventh month, on the tenth *day* of the month, on the Day of Atonement shall you let the trumpet**

strangely mixes up the Biblical ordinances of the Sabbatical year with those of the Jubilee, referring to the latter the exemption from debt; and he describes the mode of the restitution of lands in a manner which proves that he had reflected on the meaning, but that he had not witnessed the execution, of the law (comp. *Philo*, De Septenar. c. 13; *Jos.* Ant. XIII. xii. 3; see *infra* on vers. 14—17). But we have an interesting proof, which seems to be decisive on the subject. The passages above quoted from the first Book of the Maccabees (VI. 20, 49, 53; XVI. 14—16) and from the Antiquities of Josephus (XII. ix. 6; XIII. viii. 1; XIV. xvi. 2; XV. i. 2) show that the 149th, the 177th, and 275th year of the Seleucidic era (B. C. 163, 135 and 37) were Sabbatical years. Now between the second and the third date an interval elapsed of 98 years, or of just 14 Sabbatical periods; within this time once, if not twice, a Year of jubilee should have been kept, so that not the year 275, but 276 or 277 would be a Sabbatical year: but the fact, that the 275th year was a Sabbatical year proves that the Jubilee was *not* observed. The Year of jubilee was the result of a noble theory, but it appeared utterly impracticable even to generations that patiently submitted to the anomalies and inconveniences of the Sabbatical year. According to a tradition of Jewish Rabbis (the Geonim), the 1486th year of the Seleucidic era (A. C. 1174) was also a Sabbatical year, which agrees with the dates just referred to, for between the 275th and the 1486th year intervene 1211 years, or just 173 Sabbatical cycles; and according to another tradition the destruction of the second Temple (A. C. 70) took place in the first year of a Sabbatical cycle, which is likewise probable, since that event occurred in the 381st year of the Seleucidic era, or 15 full cycles and one year after the 275th year (comp. *Talm.* Avod. Zar. 9b; *Maimonid.* Shemitt. X. 4—6; *Zuckerm.* l. c. pp. 30—37). The combinations of a recent critic (Hitzig), who arrives at the result that "the author of the law of the Jubilee in Leviticus was king Jehoshaphat of Judah", and that he kept the first Jubilee in the third year of his reign (B. C. 912), because his starting point was the dedication of the Temple by Solomon exactly a hundred years before (B. C. 1012), are fairly bewildering by their boldness which, it must be owned, almost borders on recklessness.

That the Jubilee was instituted for every fiftieth, not every forty-ninth year, is not only plainly stated in our law (ver. 11), but follows from its very character; it was not to supersede and to replace, but to supplement the Sabbatical year: when the doubly holy cycle of seven times seven years had fully elapsed, and the land had kept a Sabbath to the Lord seven times, the great period of renewal and restoration was to follow; just as the Feast of Weeks was to be kept on the fiftieth day from the agricultural celebration of Passover, after the completion of seven full weeks (see *supra* p. 500). If the Jubilee were meant to coincide with the seventh Sabbatical year, the interdiction not to sow and not to reap in the Jubilee would be a superfluous repetition (ver. 11; comp. *Rashi* in

**sound throughout all your hallow the fiftieth year, and land. 10. And you shall proclaim liberty in the land**

loc.). The number fifty, or half of the great numerical period of hundred, occurs in various ancient narratives: there were fifty daughters of Thespius, and fifty daughters of Danaus; forty-nine both of the former and the latter succumbed to the temptations of vice and crime; while the fiftieth shone by virtue and heroism (comp. *Diod. Sic.* IV. 29; *Pausan.* IX. xxvii. 3; *Apollod.* II. i. 4; vii. 8). It is certainly unnecessary to adopt the speculations of Philo who calls the number fifty "the most holy and natural number, being compounded of the power of the right-angled triangle, which is the principle of the origin and condition of all things" (De Vit. Contempl. c. 8, ἁγιώτατος καὶ φυσικώτατος ἀριθμῶν κτλ).

It would probably be erroneous to attribute to the Year of jubilee predominantly a character of exultation; it was indeed a glorious time when the word "Liberty" resounded through the length and breadth of the land; and many hearts must have thrilled with gladness when the joyous message was heard, "You shall return every one to his possession, and you shall return every one to his family": but liberty was only to remind the released that they were God's servants, and those who went back to their property were to be made aware that the whole land belonged to God. Not a feeling of exuberant delight, but of a higher responsibility and dignity was to fill the mind of the Hebrew; for he was to remember that his deliverance from an earthly master brought him again under the more immediate dominion of his heavenly Lord, to whose worship and service he must devote his freedom. Therefore the law is introduced by these words, "*And you shall hallow* (וְקִדַּשְׁתֶּם) the fiftieth year" (ver. 10), just as the Sabbath-day was to be "hallowed" (Exod. XX. 8); and the legislator adds, "The Jubilee shall be *holy* to you (קֹדֶשׁ, ver. 12). The blowing of the trumpet which ushered in the Jubilee, was not intended to represent or to swell the joyful shouts of redeemed slaves and enriched paupers; it was a sacred and solemn "memorial", like the blasts of the first day of the religious year; but while the latter were meant to bring the Hebrews into merciful remembrance of God, those which announced the Jubilee were to remind the Hebrews themselves of their duties towards God; it was a signal of admonition calculated to rouse their energy, and to impress upon them that they were about to enter a period of no ordinary importance.

The Jubilee was, of course, with respect to agriculture, a complete Sabbatical year; and the universal rest throughout its duration was designed to give additional solemnity to the two worldly measures — the reversion of fields, and the liberation of servants —, and to stamp both with a religious character.

Philological Remarks. — The various opinions, and the decisions of the Rabbins, respecting the duration of the Jubilee period, are briefly as follows. (1.) The Jubilee was observed every fiftieth year: so justly Philo in various passages (De Septen. Op. II. 287, 289, 290) and Josephus (Ant. III. xii. 3, καλεῖται δὲ ὑπὸ Ἑβραίων ὁ πεντηκοστὸς ἐνιαυτὸς Ἰώβηλος), the Talmud and most of the later Jewish authorities (comp. *Maimon.* Hilch. Schemittah Vejovel

**to all its inhabitants: it shall be a jubilee to you; and you shall return every one to his possession, and you**

X. 1; a. o.; see *Salianus*, Ann. Eccl. II. 160; *Des Vignoles*, Chronologie de l'Histoire sainte, I. 699). — (2.) The Jubilee was kept every forty-ninth year; so first Bishop Isidorus Hispalensis (De Mundo c. 6), and after him many chronologers, as Scaliger and Usher, Patavius and Calvisius, Strauch, Des Vignoles, Gatterer, and Franck (comp. *Zuckermann*, Ueber Sabbathjahrcyclus und Jubelperiode, p. 7).— From this difference of views follows another, viz. (3.) The forty-ninth year is the seventh Sabbatical year, the fiftieth the Jubilee, — and the fifty-first the beginning of the new cycle or of the new Sabbatical period; so — no doubt in accordance with the meaning of the Bible — the Talmud and the Rabbins (comp. *Siphra* l. c. Behar cc. 3, 4; *Seder Olam* l. c.; *Talm.* Nedar. $61^a$; *Maimon.* l. c. X. 7), and a few later scholars (as *Reland*, Ant. Sacr. pp. 903–905); and (4.) The fiftieth year is both the Jubilee and the first year of the new cycle, and does not, therefore, interrupt the continuity of the Sabbatical periods; so Rabbi Jehudah living in the later part of the second century (*Talm.* Nedar. $61^a$; Erach. $12^b$, $13^a$, $32^b$, $33^a$); he says, יובל עולה למנין שבוע "the Jubilee is counted with the years of the next Sabbatical period", and שנת חמשים עולה לכאן ולכאן "the fiftieth year is counted both upwards and downwards", that is, both as the Jubilee and as the first year of the new cycle of Sabbatical years; he was long almost singular in this opinion, to which other Jewish doctors objected that thus the first Sabbatical period after the Jubilee would only include five harvests, and not six, as is intended by the Bible; but he has recently found some learned adherents, who believe that "the cycle of the Jubilee is astronomical, and the foundation of all chronology" (Franck), since "it was devised effectually and strikingly to harmonise the solar and the lunar year"; and this, it is supposed, can best be achieved by adopting a cycle of forty-nine years, in accordance with Rabbi Jehuda's theory (comp. *Rosenm.* Schol. on ver. 10; *Zuckermann*, l. c. pp. 14—16): that the Biblical author had no such chronological objects in view, may be regarded as unquestionable. The deductions above made from the first Book of the Maccabees and the Antiquities of Josephus (p. 550) would indeed go far to prove that, at least in the centuries just preceding the Christian era, a cycle of forty nine years was supposed to have been prescribed, if there were any historical evidence that a Year of jubilee was at all observed. — (5.) The forty-ninth year is both a Sabbatical year and a Jubilee, the fiftieth the first of the new cycles; so Scaliger, Petavius, Gatterer, Franck, a. o. — (6.) The forty-ninth year is the seventh Sabbatical year, the fiftieth the Jubilee, and at the same time the first of the following Sabbatical period, so that both cycles run side by side, and without reference to each other; so Salianus, a Catholic scholar, defending his conjectures in a spirit of opposition against Protestants who, as he supposed, invariably considered the forty-ninth, not the fiftieth year, as the Jubilee.— Some other opinions either quite fanciful or plainly in contradiction to the Biblical statements, need not be adduced (f. i. *F. W. Beer*, Erläuterung der alten Zeitrechnung; *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 385; a. o.) — "The blast of the horns, by which the Ju-

**shall return every man to his family. 11. A jubilee shall that fiftieth year be to you; you shall not sow,**

bilee was announced to the people, was nothing else than the interpreter of public joy", observes Gesenius (Thes. p. 562), and a similar view has been taken by many other scholars (*Wolde*, De Anno Hebraeorum Jubilaeo, p. 20, annus gaudio atque hilaritate insignis; *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 383, "lauteste Freudenschälle"; Knobel speaks of "muntere Hörnersignale", or "das funfzigste Jahr soll eine Zeit frohen Lärmens, fröhlichen Jubels für euch sein"); but it seems hardly justified by the nature of the year, as we have above pointed out; the translations of שנת היובל by annus jubilaei, "Year of jubilee", or "Jubeljahr", are, therefore, apt to suggest erroneous notions; and a rendering like "Halljahr" or "Year of trumpet sound", adopted by Luther and others, would be preferable. In Exod. XIX. 13 the words במשך היובל certainly do not involve joy and hilarity.—Literally interpreting the words of our command, the Rabbins declared that it devolved upon the great Sanhedrin publicly to count the seven years seven times; then, on the next New-year's day, to declare the year holy (ver. 10); and lastly, on the Day of Atonement, to blow with the trumpet nine blasts, which, however, were to be sounded by every individual Hebrew also; then only the privileges conferred by the Law were to be enjoyed (see notes on XXIII. 23—25; comp. *Talm.* Rosh Hash. 5ᵃ, 8ᵇ, 9, 20, 26; Kiddush. 38ᵇ; *Maimon.* Hilch. Schemittah c. 10). In their opinion, fields given away were subjected to the same law as fields sold by the proprietors (comp. Ezek. XLVI. 17); but not so the lands which had passed into another family through the marriage of an heiress; these remain in the possession of that family (comp. Num. XXXVI. 4; see *Mishn.* Bechor. VIII. 10; *Maimon.* Hilch. Scheviith, XI. 10). The years of the Sabbatical and the Jubilee periods were to be counted from the Day of Atonement, which in Palestine so nearly coincides with the end of the agricultural year (צֵאת הַשָּׁנָה, Exod. XXIII. 16; XXXIV. 22), that its choice as a starting point, while greatly increasing the solemnity of the ordinance, in no matter added to the practical difficulties of its execution. Jewish tradition counted the beginning of both cycles from the *first* day of the seventh month (Tishri), or from New-Year, though they admitted that in both cases, it was only announced on the tenth day of the month (comp. *Siphra* l. c., Behar cc. 1—3; *Talm.* Rosh Hash. 2, 8ᵇ). A modern critic, however, boldly proposes the alteration of בעשור (in ver. 9) into באחד (*Hupfeld*, l. c. p. 20). — שַׁבְּתֹת שָׁנִים (ver. 8) is literally "weeks of years" or year-weeks, that is, cycles of seven years, שַׁבַּת שָׁנִים being explained in our text by שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים; hence שבע שבתות שנים is forty nine years, and יָמִים is placed before these words as the general expression of time (comp. יְמֵי שְׁנֵי חַיֶּיךָ Gen. XLVII. 8, 9, "the time of the years of thy life"), as it is also placed pleonastically after the exact period, and then of course in the absolute state, as שְׁנָתַיִם יָמִים two years' time, חֹדֶשׁ יָמִים a month's time, שְׁלֹשָׁה שָׁבֻעִים יָמִים three weeks' time; etc.; Gen. XXIX. 14; XLI. 1; Deut. XXI. 13; 1 Ki. II. 1; Dan. X. 2, 3; etc. (see on XXIII. 15, p. 503). The expression year-week for seven years occurs also in Roman writers, as *Gell.* III. 10 fin, se jam duodecimam annorum hebdomadam ingressum esse, et ad eum

**nor reap that which grows of itself in it, nor gather *the grapes* in it of *your* undressed vine. 12. For it *is***

diem septuaginta hebdomadas librorum conscripsisse; *Censorin.* De Die Nat. c. 14; comp. also *Aristot.* Polit. VII. 15, οἱ γὰρ ταῖς ἑβδομάσι διαιροῦντες τὰς ἡλικίας. — שׁוֹפַר תְּרוּעָה (ver. 9) is literally "the trumpet of loud sound", that is, the loud sounding trumpet; similarly we find חצצרות תרועה (Num. XXXI. 6; 2 Chr. XIII. 12), and צלצלי תרועה the loud sounding cymbals (Ps. CL. 5); and שֵׁמַע being nearly synonymous with תרועה, we have also צלצלי שמע in the same sense (Ps. l. c.). Now the phrase העביר קול ב׳ denotes "to make a voice resound in some place" (comp. Exod. XXXVI. 6; Ezr. I. 1; X. 7; etc.); therefore, we must render the first words of the ninth verse thus: "Then shalt thou let the blast of the trumpet sound in the seventh month," שופר תרועה being, by way of metonymy, understood as the sound produced by the instrument; and similarly must be taken the concluding words of the same verse תעבירו שופר, "you shall let the sound of the trumpet be heard throughout all your land". — On שׁוֹפָר, which is different from חֲצֹצְרָה or the silver trumpet sounded by the priests on various solemn occasions (p. 489), and which is used parallel with קֶרֶן (Josh. VI. 5), because it had the form of a horn, or, as Jewish tradition contends, because it was made of the horn of some animal, especially of a ram, see *supra* on XXIII. 23—32, p. 507; and on יוֹבֵל, which is properly a synonym of שׁוֹפָר and of קֶרֶן "the loud sounding instrument," and therefore occurs in combinations like קֶרֶן הַיּוֹבֵל and שׁוֹפְרוֹת יוֹבְלִים (comp. Exod. XIX. 13, 16, 19; Josh. VI. 4—6, 8, 9, 13), but which was also employed to denote that period which, above all others, was announced by the sound of the *shofar*, see Comm. on Exod. p. 335. The meaning of liberty which Josephus and others attribute to the word יובל (perhaps tracing it to הוביל to bring back, viz. to the original proprietor), is merely a supposition hazarded from our context (see *Jos.* Ant. III. xii. 3, ἐλευθερίαν δὲ σημαίνει τὸ ὄνομα; Sept. ἄφεσις or ἀφέσεως σημασία; Targ. occasionally חֵירוּתָא; Nachman., Oehler l. c. p. 207; a. o.; but on the other hand, Rashi on ver. 11, יובל שנה על שם תקיעת שופר; comp. *Pfeiffer*, Dub. Vex. pp. 312, 313; *Carpzov*, Appar. pp. 447—460; *Bochart*, Hieroz. lib. II. cc. 32, 43, pp. 317, 426; *Rosenm.* Schol. 165—167; *Kranold*, l. c. pp. 11—20; *Bähr*, Symb. II. 572—575; *Knob.* Lev. p. 564). — Baumgarten (Comm. p. 233) observes: "The word יוֹבֵל and the thing point back to the great blast, by which the Israelites were made aware of the descent of the Divine hosts upon Mount Sinai (Exod. XIX. 13. 16)"; and this idea occurs also in other commentaries; but the analogy is confined to the circumstance, that in both cases the sound of the trumpet conveyed a solemn announcement and warning to the people; in every other respects the two occasions were entirely different. But one point has been admirably developed by the same writer: "The redemption of all the poor and oppressed in Israel is to be proclaimed on the Day of Atonement. For how does it happen that the Israelites, released from Egypt, and enjoying the ordinances of the Divine Law, again sink into the hard lot of poverty and servitude? Because they are not yet free from the corruption of nature, and are therefore still surrounded by the pollutions of human sin: and hence the redemption is connected

**a jubilee; it shall be holy to you; you shall eat its produce out of the field. 13. In this year of jubilee**

with expiation". — To express the ordinal number in connection with שנה, this word is usually placed at the beginning in the construct state, so here שְׁנַת החמשים שנה (vers. 10, 11) *the fiftieth year* (comp. Gen. VII. 11, בִּשְׁנַת שש מאות שנה *in the six hundredth year*; 2 Ki. XIII. 10; etc.). — The word דְּרוֹר seems, long before our law was framed, to have been the specific term used not only for the *liberation* of slaves, but also for the *restoration* of lands (comp. Jer. XXXIV. 8, 15, 17; Ezek. XLVI. 17; see also Isai. LXI. 1); and it was therefore aptly employed by our author to describe that year which effected both the one and the other (see *supra*, p. 538). — On סְפִיחֶיהָ and נְזִרֶיהָ (ver. 11) see *supra* p. 547. — "You shall eat its produce from the field" (מן השדה, ver. 12), that is, you shall not gather in the spontaneous growth of the fiftieth year, to store it up in your houses, but you shall take "from the field" always as much as is required for the moment, and not more.

**14—17.** As a necessary consequence of the law of the Jubilee, fields and vineyards were never actually sold and bought; but their crops were only ceded and farmed for a number of years (ver. 19); therefore in such transactions the price was naturally regulated by the time that had yet to elapse until the next Jubilee, and it was higher or lower according to the number of harvests which the purchaser hoped to enjoy before he was obliged to surrender the property to its original master. Now our law enjoins that such temporary sales should be conducted with the utmost fairness; the seller should not be extortionate by overstating the value of the annual crops; and the purchaser should not take advantage of the seller's distress to "oppress" him by offering too low a price. Thus one of the latest ordinances of our Book, ideal in conception, and perhaps impossible of realisation, is pervaded by humanity as by the breath of life: "You shall not oppress one another, but thou shalt fear thy God; for I am the Lord your God". The fear of God, the Avenger of all wrongs which escape the eye of human judges, or are not amenable to their tribunals, is always set forth as the most effectual protection of the weak, and the most solemn warning to the powerful and prosperous (comp. vers. 36, 43; XIX. 14, 32).

Philological Remarks. — The singular of the suffix in לעמיתך after the plural תמכרו ("if *you* sell to *thy* neighbour", ver. 14) must be understood in a distributive sense — if you sell, each to his neighbour (comp. Gramm. § 77. 9); and the absolute infinitive קָנֹה after the finite verb, takes the force of the latter, "or if you buy" (Gram. § 97. 8). — The verb ינה in Hiphil (vers. 14, 17) in the sense of oppressing or acting harshly and cruelly, occurs especially in Ezekiel, and as in our passage, in connection with landed property (comp. Ezek. XLV. 8; XLVI. 18) and the distress of the poor (Ezek. XVIII. 8, 12, 16; XXII. 7, 29): we have more than once pointed out how much the levitical writer was indebted to the prophet (see pp. 386, 387), who was the first that mentioned "the year of liberty" (p. 538). The Rabbins very minutely specify the offences which fall under the category of הונאה, and applying

**you shall return every one to his possession.— 14. And if thou sellest ought to thy neighbour, or buyest *ought* of thy neighbour's hand, you shall not oppress one another. 15. According to the number of years after the jubilee thou shalt buy of thy neighbour; according to the number of the years of the crops he shall sell to thee. 16. In proportion to the multitude of years thou shalt increase the price thereof, and in proportion to the fewness of years, thou shalt diminish the price thereof;**

this term the first time (in ver. 14) to defraudation of property, the second time (ver. 17) to galling words, they contend, in the latter respect for instance, that it is sinful to remind a man who has suffered the penalty of the law, of his former misdeeds, or to ask a person known to be no scholar some learned question in order to humiliate him (comp. *Talm.* Bab. Mets. $49^b$, $74^b$; *Maimon.* Hilch. Mechirah cc. 12, 14). — The sense of the $15^{th}$ verse is of course — in fixing the purchase money, the years must be counted that have elapsed since the *last* Jubilee (אחר היובל), in order to ascertain how many "harvest years" (שני תבואות) are still left to the *next* Jubilee, the Sabbatical years falling within the latter period being excluded in the computation. — The buyer, who has the distressed seller in his power, is enjoined to give to the latter his fair price, מִקְנָתוֹ (ver. 16); the suffix in this word refers, therefore, to the seller. — The words כי מספר תבואות הוא מכר לך must be taken quite literally, "for he sells to thee a number of crops"; they are not elliptical: not the fields were sold by the Hebrews according to our ordinance, but their produce only till the next Jubilee.

**18—22.** The law of the Sabbatical year had existed for centuries, but it had hardly ever been kept; it caused such inconvenience and entailed upon the proprietors so many sacrifices, that successive legislators had found it necessary to enforce its observance again and again, now by angry menaces (XXVI. 34, 35, *supra* p. 536), and now by hopeful promises. Thus our compiler, interrupting the special ordinances of the Year of jubilee, here inserted the assurance, that if the Hebrews faithfully carried out the Divine commands, they would prosper in the undisturbed possession of their land; and he continued: "And if you shall say, What shall we eat the seventh year? behold we shall not sow nor gather in our increase; then I will command My blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for three years" (vers. 20, 21). Thus he held out the hope of a constant miracle, and of a periodical intervention of God's providence, for the production of unusual harvests; and he might well expect to rouse the Hebrews by such a promise at a time when, by God's mercy, they had received back the fertile land of their ancestors, and when they began to submit to their religious laws more readily than they had ever done before. However, his enthusiastic expectations were not always realised. When in the time of Judas Maccabæus, the town Bethsura was besieged by the Syrians, we are told

for he sells to thee the number of crops. 17. You shall not therefore oppress one another, but thou shalt fear thy God; for I *am* the Lord your God.

18. And you shall do My statutes, and keep My judgments, and do them; then you shall dwell in the land in safety. 19. And the land shall yield its fruit, and you shall eat to satisfaction, and dwell therein in safety.

20. And if you shall say, What shall we eat the seventh year? behold we shall not sow, nor gather in

that "the people came out of the city because they had no victuals there to endure the siege, it being a year of rest to the land"; and equal distress prevailed during that year in the capital (1 Macc. VI. 49, 53). Again, when Herod laid siege to Jerusalem, "the people were pressed hard by famine and the want of all necessaries"; for, observes Josephus, "this happened to be a Sabbatical year" (Ant. XIV. xvi. 2; XV. i. 2). Thus history confirms what might be anticipated from the nature of the institution, that a perfect cessation of agricultural labours during one year in every seven, seriously disturbed all economic arrangements; and the difficulties would have been considerably increased, had the Jubilee, following after a Sabbatical year, ever been observed.

Philological Remarks. — These verses evidently interrupt the continuity of the precepts on the sale of landed property; for vers. 14—17 prescribe that a just equivalent shall be given for the crops expected till the next Jubilee; the same subject is resumed in ver. 23, and is discussed in its various aspects to ver. 34. Moreover, our passage does not even refer to the Jubilee, but to the Sabbatical year, and would more appropriately follow after the seventh verse; for it states distinctly, "If you shall say, What shall we eat in the *seventh* year" (ver. 20), not in the fiftieth; and the calculation made by the author was this: the abundant harvest took place in the autumn of the sixth year; the land rested to the autumn of the seventh year; and then, in a subsequent part of the same autumn, which, being later than the Day of Atonement, belonged already to the eighth year, the fields were sown, but of course matured their crops only at the end of the same, or the beginning of the next — the ninth — agricultural year (see *supra* p. 541). Thus understood, there is no obscurity in the 21st and 22nd verses, which can only by strained interpretations be referred to the Year of jubilee (comp. f. i. *Keil*, Archäol. I. 375, 376; Levit. p. 151; *Ideler* Chronol. I. 505; see on the other hand, *De Wette*, Beiträge, II. 284, 285; *Kitto* on ver. 21; *Knob.* Lev. pp. 565, 566, where, however, two computations are given neither of which is acceptable; *Graf*, Histor. Bücher, p. 79). We must, therefore, conclude that our verses, the language of which differs perceptibly from that of the rest of the chapter, have been inserted in this place by a reviser who, well aware of the great difficulties of the Sabbatical year, desired to encourage his countrymen to disregard them in pious reliance upon God's miraculous protection.—

our produce. 21. Then I will command My blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth produce for three years; 22. And when you shall sow in the eighth year, you shall eat *yet* of the old produce until the ninth year, until its produce comes in, you shall eat *of* the old *store*.

23. And the land shall not be sold for ever: for the

The twentieth verse is by some, as Nachmanides, construed thus: "If you shall say in the seventh year, What shall we eat (in the eighth)"? since the harvest of the sixth year precluded uneasiness as to the sustenance of the seventh. But the Hebrew words do not admit of such construction, and the author probably desired to intimate, that in the seventh year the stores might have seemed to require the utmost husbanding, since they would not be increased by new crops. Rashi clearly explains "the three years" (ver. 21) in the following manner: "Part of the sixth year from Nisan to New-year, up to the eighth year; for they should sow in the eighth year in the month of Marcheshvan, and would reap in the following Nisan"; and "the ninth year" (ver. 22): "Up to the Feast of Tabernacles of the ninth year; for that is the time when the produce of the eighth year is gathered into the store-houses" (comp. *Siphra*, Behar, c. 4, fol. 107[b]). At the period of the Jubilee, the crops of the sixth year were of course supposed to last for four years — the sixth year itself, the Sabbatical year, the Jubilee, and the next year down to the completion of the harvest. — עָשָׂת (ver. 21) instead of עָשְׂתָה, like הִגְלַת, הִרְצָת, a. o.; and similarly also in some verbs ל״א, as חָטָאת, הָבָאת, a. o.; see Gramm. §§ LXVI. 11[b]; LXVII. 10. — הַתְּבוּאָה יָשָׁן (ver. 22), a combination doubly anomalous, the adjective being without the article and in the masculine (comp. Gr. § LXXXIII. 15[a]); unless we translate, "and you shall eat of the produce that which is old".

**23—28.** Now returning to the sale of land in the Jubilee, our law propounds the first of the two great principles on which the enactments of the Jubilee are founded: "The land is Mine", says God; "for you are strangers and sojourners with Me" (ver. 23). God, the lord of the whole earth, who assigned to all nations their boundaries, and granted to the Hebrews the land of Canaan, which He helped them to wrest from warlike races, selected it for His own abode, to be the Holy Land, the place of His Sanctuary, the home of His servants and prophets. Thus the Hebrews were only tolerated "strangers and sojourners" in the land which was not really their own; they were not entitled to sell the fields or vineyards which they held as a trust, like tenants. If poverty compelled a Hebrew to dispose of his land, he was bound to redeem it as soon as his condition improved; if he had a prosperous relative, the latter was expected to redeem it at once; and if neither of these alternatives took place, he received it back in the Year of jubilee. So consistently was the theocratic theory worked out (comp. *supra* pp. 384, 536). The purchaser was obliged unconditionally to accede to the redemption; yet Jewish teachers made a few stipulations in his favour: the redemption of the

land *is* Mine; for you *are* strangers and sojourners with Me. 24. And in all the land of your possession you shall grant a redemption for the land.

25. If thy brother becomes poor, and sells *some* of his possession, then his nearest kinsman shall come, and redeem that which his brother has sold. 26. And if the man has no one to redeem it, and he becomes

land was not allowed earlier than two years after its sale, and a year of bad crops and a Sabbatical year were not counted; but in other respects they guarded the interests of the seller, to whom every facility was given for recovering his land, if he could do so by his own means. Moreover, they concluded from the words of our text, that no other cause justified the sale of ancestral property except hopeless poverty (ver. 25); but they hardly did justice to the spirit of our law in deciding, that if anyone sold his field for longer than fifty years, it did not return to him or his heirs in the Year of jubilee: a sale for sixty years was illegal according to the Bible, and was annulled in the next Jubilee (comp. *Mishn.* Erach. IX. 1,2); and Philo justly observes: "The law says, Do not give a price as if for an everlasting possession, but only for a definite number of years, which must be less than fifty" (*Philo*, De Septen. c. 13). — The mode of redemption follows naturally from the principles referred to: in selling the land, the annual value of the crops was multiplied by the number of harvest years to the next jubilee (vers. 14—17); the product was the purchase price; therefore in redeeming the land, the value of the crops which the purchaser had enjoyed from the time of acquisition was deducted from that price, and the difference had to be paid to him by the seller, to whom then his inalienable property reverted. Thus the interests of both parties were carefully weighed. Josephus, in stating our law, strangely confounds the redemption of lands with their restoration in the Jubilee; for he observes: "When the Jubilee is come, he that sold the land, and he that bought it meet together, and make an estimate, on the one hand, of the fruits gathered, and on the other hand, of the expenses laid out upon it. If the fruits gathered by the purchaser come to more than the expenses laid out by him, the seller takes the land back again; but if the expenses prove more than the fruits, the present possessor receives of the former owner the difference that is wanting, and leaves the land to him; and if the fruits received and the expenses laid out prove equal to one another, the present possessor relinquishes it to the former owner" (*Jos.* Ant. III. XII. 3). According to the Biblical law, no calculation whatever is made in the Jubilee, but the sold land returns free to the proprietor. And if land is redeemed between one Jubilee and another, only the second of the three cases put by Josephus is considered in our law, the first and third being incompatible with its provisions; for as the purchaser had paid the value of all the harvests till the next Jubilee, but loses a part of them when the owner redeems the property, he has, under all circumstances, a right to receive back a portion of the purchase money;

**prosperous, and acquires enough to redeem it; 27. Then let him count the years of its sale, and restore the overplus to the man to whom he sold it; that he may return**

the fruits gathered by him during his limited period of possession can never exceed or equal the price he paid for the field, except in cases of exceptional plenty, which the law of course does not take into account. We must, therefore, conclude, that Josephus, having no actual experience, nor even a safe tradition, to guide him, attempted on his own part an explanation, which fails to meet the meaning of the commands.

Some knowledge of our ordinance reached heathen authors; thus Diodor of Sicily writes: "Moses divided the land by lot, giving equal portions to the private citizens, but larger ones to the priests (sic); and he forbade the former to sell their lands, lest some greedily buy up many allotments, eject the less prosperous, and thus cause a decrease of the population" (*Diod. Sic.* XL. 3). Among other ancient nations we find some arrangements slightly analogous to the Biblical laws. Lycurgus, after having distributed the land essentially in equal parts, made it infamous for any one either to buy another's possession or to sell his own; yet by permitting the citizens to give their property away or to bequeath it, he paved the way for that which eventually happened, that "some had far too much, others too little, by which means the land came into few hands" (*Aristot.* Polit. II. 6; comp. *Plut.* Institt. Lac. c. 41). Solon enacted a law restraining persons from acquiring land beyond a given limit (*Arist.* l. c. II. 7). Plato believed that no one ought to possess more than four times as much as the lowest income or as "a single lot" (κλῆρος, *Plat.* Legg. V. 13). The Locrians were forbidden to sell their ancient patrimony or their original lots of land, unless notoriously compelled by distress; and in some other countries it was unlawful to sell such lands on any account (*Aristot.* l. c. II. 4; VI. 2). The Dalmatae made a partition of their land every eighth year (*Strab.* VII. v. 5). Among the old Germans, who did not pay much attention to agriculture, no one had a fixed portion of land as his own individual property; but the magistrates and chiefs allotted every year to tribes and families as much and in such situations as they thought proper, and obliged them to remove the following year: for this usage they assigned among other reasons these — lest they be anxious to acquire extensive estates, and the more powerful be tempted to dispossess the weaker; or that the common people, seeing that their own property was equal to that of the most powerful, might be kept in contentment (*Caes.* Bell. Gall. VI. 22; comp. *Tacit.* Germ. c. 26). Pheidon, the Corinthian, "one of the oldest of legislators", thought that the families and the number of citizens in a state ought to continue the same; though it might thus happen that all at the first have allotments disproportionate to their numbers (*Aristot.* Polit. II. 3). With a view of equalising the property of the citizens, Phaleas of Chalcedon ordained that the rich should give marriage portions, but never receive any, while the poor should always receive but never give them (*Arist.* Polit. II. 4). Yet even these and

**into his possession. 28. But if he does not acquire enough to restore *it* to him, then that which has been sold shall remain in the hand of him that bought it**

similar measures, imperfect and desultory compared with the complete and well-balanced law of the Pentateuch, were found impracticable, and for the most part remained a dead letter. — Aristotle thus comments on equality of property: "It is possible that an equality of goods is established, and yet that this may be either too great, when it leads to a luxurious living, or too little when it obliges the people to live hard. Hence it is evident, that the legislator must aim at a proper medium or a moderate sufficiency for all. And yet it is even of more consequence that the citizens should entertain a similarity of feelings than an equality of property; but this can only be if they are properly educated under the direction of the laws" (*Aristot.* Polit. II. 4). Would the great philosopher, had he known the legislation of the Pentateuch, have found in it the realisation of his ideal? He certainly describes with precision its main features.

Philological Remarks. — The first verses state the subject and the general principle of the ordinance; they are, therefore, more closely connected with the following verses (25—28) than with the preceding commands on the sale of landed property (vers. 14—17, vers. 18—22 being an interpolation). — צְמִתֻת (ver. 23), from צמת to be silent or to silence, to make an end (comp. Lament. III. 53), is *end* or *end of time*; לִצְמִתֻת or לַצְּמִתת is, therefore, *in all futurity, for ever* (Sept. εἰς βεβαίωσιν, Vulg. in perpetuum, Onk. לַחֲלוּטִין absolutely or for ever; comp. *Talm.* Erach. 31; *Siphra* in loc. fol. 108$^b$, לחולטנית; Luth. ewiglich; Rashi לפסיקה למכירה פסוקה צילמית, etc.; Ewald traces the word even to صمد and תָּמִיד; others entirely or altogether; Marg. Auth. Vers. to be quite cut off or for cutting off; Michaelis — Supplem. p. 2104 — ad silentium, i. e. ut venditori silendum in posterum sit): it is indeed difficult to see why so unusual a term should have been employed instead of the common לְעוֹלָם (ver. 46); yet that explanation seems preferable to the renderings "the land shall not be sold for extinction" (Keil), so that the seller loses it, or so that "he has to be silent", which is especially questionable in ver. 30, in which the seller is not mentioned at all; or "the land shall not be sold in a binding manner" (Knobel), that is, so that it would remain to the purchaser as his real property; but the use of צמת in the sense צמד is merely a conjecture. — גאלו הקרוב אליו (ver. 25) is literally "the redeemer that is nearest to him," that is, his next of kin, such as uncle or cousin (ver. 49), upon whom devolved the duty to watch over the personal rights and the family property of his kinsman (comp. Num. V. 8; XXXV. 21—27; Deut. XIX. 6, 12; Josh. XX. 3, 5, 9; Ruth III. 9, 12; IV. 1—8; 2 Sam. XIV. 11; Jer. XXXII. 7, 8; etc.; Comm. on Exod. p. 393); a similar phrase is שְׁאֵרוֹ הַקָּרוֹב אֵלָיו his nearest relation (XXI. 2; Num. XXVII. 11; p. 461). — On הִשִּׂיגָה יָדוֹ (vers. 26, 47, 49) *his hand has attained* or acquired, viz. wealth, for which also הגיעה ידו and מצאה ידו (ver. 28) are used, and which is nearly the opposite of מָטָה יָדוֹ; and on כְּדֵי גְאֻלָּתוֹ, literally "like the sufficiency of his redemption", that is, what is sufficient for his redemption, and דֵּי הָשִׁיב לוֹ (ver. 28) sufficient to restore the land to him, see Comm. on Lev. I. 515. — הָעֹדֵף (ver. 27) the

**until the year of the jubilee; and in the jubilee it shall be free, and he shall return to his possession.**

**29. And if a man sells a dwelling-house *in* a walled city, then he may redeem it within a whole year after it is sold; *within* a year he may redeem it. 30. But if it is not redeemed within the space of a full year, then**

*surplus* or excess, that is, the amount by which the purchase money of the field exceeded the value of the crops reaped by the purchaser (comp. Exod. XVI. 18; XXVI. 12; etc.). — הַקֹּנֶה אֹתוֹ (vers. 28, 30) *its purchaser*, the participle retaining the force of the verb (see Gramm. § 100. 2, 3).

**29—31.** The lawgiver's chief care was, to preserve the lands hereditarily in the families to which they had at first been assigned; to this object he made all his provisions subordinate; he therefore prescribed that, if any one sold a house in a walled city, he was indeed allowed to redeem it within one year; but after this time he lost all claim to its possession; it belonged for ever to the purchaser, nor did he or his heirs receive it back in the Year of jubilee. If, however, the house lay in a village or hamlet without walls, it was considered as a part of landed property, and was subject to exactly the same rules of redemption as the latter; and if not redeemed, it reverted in the Jubilee to the original owner. Houses, being the work of man, and not, like the land, the creation and gift of God, might be freely disposed of, yet only in so far as their sale did not interfere with the inviolable rights which God had reserved to Himself with respect to the land. But without the dwelling-houses and other buildings in villages or farms, the land cannot be properly cultivated and attended to; it must deteriorate in value and may have to be renounced altogether. Moreover, a foreigner might buy the farm buildings, which, if they belonged to him and his family for ever, would give him a permanent footing in the land which was to be the inheritance of the Hebrews. Strangers were at liberty to settle and to acquire property in towns, in which they formed an inferior element, whereas in scattered hamlets and in rural districts, they might gain a dangerous ascendancy. They were always to be no more than "sojourners" among the Hebrews. Thus our law, far from being capricious, fully harmonises with the character of the Jubilee. The conditions of the redemption of houses were the same as those with respect to fields, namely, the seller returned to the buyer part of the purchase money in proportion to the number of years that had still to elapse to the next Jubilee. The Rabbins, endeavouring to give to the vendor the greatest possible facilities, decreed that he had the option of redeeming his house during 365 days, or the full extent of the *solar* year; that towns, however large, which had no real walls, or the walls of which had not yet been built in the times of Joshua, were not considered as walled cities; and that sold houses in them could be redeemed at once, or were restored to their owners in the Jubilee. The Mishnah states: In former times it frequently happened that on the day when the year expired, the purchaser hid himself, in order to prevent the vendor from giving him back the money, and to secure the continued possession of the house.

the house that *is* in the walled city shall remain for ever to him that bought it throughout his generations; it shall not be free in the jubilee. 31. But the houses of the villages which have no wall round about them, shall be counted as the fields of the country; they may be redeemed, and they shall be free in the jubilee.

Therefore Hillel the elder ordained, that the seller might on that day deposit the money in a chamber of the Court of the Temple, and then go and break open the door of his sold house; while the buyer was at liberty to fetch the money from the Sanctuary (comp. *Mishn*. Erach. IX. 3—7.)

Philological Remarks.—The word יָמִים (ver. 29) is in juxtaposition with עוֹלָם (ver. 32): the right of redemption should be open to the seller only for "a limited time", not for ever (see *supra* on ver. 8); if it were meant to signify "year", שנה would probably have been repeated instead. — וְקָם הַבַּיִת ··· לַצְּמִתֻת (ver. 30) "the house shall remain (as permanent property) to the purchaser"; in this sense קום with לְ (lit. to stand by some one) is used both in earlier and later writings (comp. XXVII. 19; Gen. XXIII. 17, 20). — The words בעיר אשר לא חמה must, in our context, mean "in a town that has walls" (so the ancient Versions, the Samaritan codex, and many codices of Kennic.); so that לֹא stands for, or has the meaning of, לוֹ or rather לָהּ, the noun עִיר being usually feminine, though sometimes masculine suffixes refer to it (Num. XXXV. 3; Judg. X. 4; 2 Sam. XVII. 13; comp. the masculine termination of the plural עָרִים): about this strange Kethiv see *supra* pp. 161, 162, on XI. 21. Maurer (Commentar. Gramm. Crit. p. 53) suggests that לֹא may be meant for לָהּ, just as in Ezek. XXXVI. 5 מְגָרְשָׁא stands for מִגְרָשָׁהּ, which conjecture deserves attention; see also *Rosenm.* in loc. — בָּתֵּי הַחֲצֵרִים ··· יֵחָשֵׁב וכ' (ver. 31) "and the houses of the villages ... *each of them* shall be reckoned as the fields of the country"; the noun being taken in a distributive sense, as above in ver. 14, p. 555. — חשב על to be reckoned as belonging to something, as in 2 Sam. IV. 2. — The חֲצֵרִים are villages distinct from the great towns (ערים) and the smaller towns connected with them (בנותיה; comp. Josh. XIII. 23; XV. 32, 36, 41, 45, etc.; XVI. 9; XVIII. 24; etc.).

**32—34.** Anyone reading the Pentateuch for the first time consecutively, might well be perplexed when, coming to our passage, he meets with these injunctions: "And as to the cities of the Levites, the houses of the cities of their possession, the Levites may redeem them at any time" (ver. 32); and again: "But the field of the suburbs (שדה מגרש) of their cities may not be sold, for it is their perpetual possession" (ver. 34). What are the "cities of the Levites" or the "cities of their possession"? and what is "the field of the suburbs (מגרש) of their cities"? Nothing of this has ever been mentioned before; it was only about forty years after the date of these *Sinaitic* laws that, *in the plains of Moab*, "God spoke to Moses, Command the children of Israel that they give to the Levites of the inheritance of their possession cities to dwell in; and you shall give also to the Levites suburbs for the cities round about them; and the cities shall they have to dwell in; and the suburbs of them shall be for their cattle, and for their goods, and

32. And *as to* the cities of the Levites, the houses of the cities of their possession, the Levites may redeem *them* at any time. 33. And if one of the Levites re-

for all their beasts" (Num. XXXV. 1—3). If, therefore, the Hebrews had received the ordinances of our verses while encamping before Mount Sinai, they would have found them unintelligible; and if the allotment of forty eight levitical towns with pasture lands of just 2000 yards all around each, were be taken as a historical fact, our section would have to be referred to a much later time. But if at all historical, it was not carried out in the ante-Babylonian time, when, even according to the Deuteronomist, the Levites, constantly recommended to the charity of the people, lived dispersed throughout the land, settled wherever they hoped to find sustenance, and flocked especially to the capital, where they might expect to obtain employment at the common Sanctuary. The very assignment of a large number of towns with considerable fields clashes with the fundamental principle, that the Levites were to have no property, because God alone was their portion and inheritance (Num. XVIII. 20; etc.). Yet after the exile, when the Levites gained paramount influence, they could at least propose and theoretically describe such an arrangement without fearing that their spiritual aspirations and their material claims would be found incompatible. On the other hand, we have proofs, that priests at all times possessed landed property. Thus Solomon "commanded Abiathar the priest, Go to Anathoth to thy own fields" (עַל שָׂדֶיךָ), that is, to thy estate (1 Ki. II. 26); and Jeremiah, who was of priestly descent, bought of his uncle Hanameel, near his native town, a field that was for ever to remain in his family because "to him belonged the right of inheritance (הַיְרֻשָּׁה) and the right of redemption" (הַגְּאֻלָּה, Jer. XXXII. 6—15; see in general Comm. on Levit. I. 621, 622).

However, following our text, and viewing it in connection with the entire theocratic and levitical system, as worked out in later ages, we must appreciate the judiciousness and consistency of the enactments. The real property of the Levites was restricted to dwelling-houses and to fields for their cattle. In both respects their interests were to be fully protected. If compelled to sell their houses, they were permitted to redeem them at any time, and if neither they nor any of their relations were able to do so, they received the houses back free in the Year of jubilee; but the fields round their cities they were not to sell at all. Thus their houses, which were to them of no less importance than the land was to the other Israelites, were with evident fairness estimated exactly as land, and enjoyed the same privileges; while their fields were justly made inalienable, since they involved the preservation of their cattle, which were a chief means of their sustenance. The position in which the Levites were placed by these arrangements is not more favourable than naturally followed from the political and social organism devised with so much earnestness and perseverance, but with so little regard to the realities of life.

Philological Remarks. — As might be expected, attempts have been made to prove that the commands

**deems *it*, then the house that was sold in the city of his possession shall be free in the *year of* jubilee: for the houses of the cities of the Levites are their possession**

of this passage stand in their right place, and are consistent with the unity and Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch (comp. f. i. *Ranke*, Untersuch. II. 114—117): but they have of course been unavailing; no ingenuity can render it plausible that our verses contain "the general outlines" of a law for the first time communicated; the words, "And as to the cities of the Levites, the houses of the cities of their possession, the Levites may redeem them at any time", will make upon every unbiassed reader the impression, that we have before us a subject with which the Hebrews must have been familiar; while, on the other hand, the passage in Numbers quoted above, refers to the same matter as if it were a perfectly new one (compare the plain statement in Josh. XXI. 1—3. The scheme proposed in Ezekiel XLVIII, and its relation to the corresponding devices of the Pentateuch, will be explained on a future occasion). — The apposition, or rather qualification, "the houses of the cities of their possession" (בתי ערי אחזתם), following after the principal notions "the cities of the Levites" (ערי הלוים, ver. 32), points to the fact that the Levites were not meant to receive the whole towns, but only a sufficient number of houses in each of them. — The anastrophe in the construction of the sentence is not unusual, the subject being first emphatically stated irrespective of the predicate (see Gram. § 75. 5). — The 33rd verse, as it stands, offers considerable difficulties, but it yields a perfectly appropriate sense if, instead of ואשר יגאל, we read ואשר לא יגאל; the negative particle is indeed added by the Vulgate (si redemptae non fuerint); and this reading has been extensively adopted (f. i. by Houbigant, *Wolde* l. c. p. 41; *Ewald*, Alterth. p. 387; *Knob.* Lev. p. 569; *Oehler* l. c. p. 209); the case here stated would then be precisely analogous to *land* sold by other Israelites (vers. 25—28); namely, if the Levite disposes of his house, he shall be allowed to redeem it whenever he pleases; and if neither he nor any of his relatives redeems it, he receives it back in the Jubilee. In defence of the traditional text, it has been urged by Rabbinical and other interpreters, that the verb גאל *to redeem* should here be taken in the sense of קָנָה to buy, and that the meaning of the verse is this — if an Israelite buys a house from a Levite, the latter shall obtain again possession of it in the Jubilee (comp. *Rashi*, ואם יקנה בית and גאולה זו לשון מכירה; *Ebn Ezra* והטעם כמו יקנה; *Engl. Vers.* and if a man purchase of the Levites; *Baumgarten*, Lev. p. 235; *Keil*, Levit. p. 153; a. o.). But גאל is never *to buy*, but *to redeem*, and is constantly so used in this chapter (Kimchi s. v. ויש לפרש׳ לשון גאולה). Some have indeed contended, that if Israelites "bought" houses from Levites, they in reality "redeemed" them, since the houses originally belonged to the Israelites, and were only ceded to the Levites in harmony with the ordinance of the levitical towns; but few will approve of so artificial an explanation: according to the Law, neither the levitical nor any other towns ever really belonged to the Israelites, but were and

**among the children of Israel. 34. But the field of the suburbs of their cities may not be sold; for it *is* their perpetual possession.**

always remained the property of God, who, at the first division of the land, granted certain provinces to the Israelites, on condition that they should place a number of towns at the disposal of the Levites. More acceptable is another Rabbinical interpretation, namely, that the words ואשר יגאל מן הלוים mean that, even if a Levite had sold his house to another Levite, or if having sold it to a person of a different tribe, it had been redeemed by another Levite, his right of redemption was unrestricted, exactly as if he had sold the house to an Israelite; and if he did not redeem it, he could claim it again in the Jubilee (see *Siphra* in loc.; *Kimchi* sub גאל; *Rashi* in loc.; Wesseli, Rosenm., De Wette, a. o.). But thus understood, the verse seems strange and almost superfluous; for, what difference could it make whether the house of a Levite was sold to another Levite or to a person of a strange tribe, since the sole object of the law was to secure the property to the original owner? The addition of the particle לֹא would, therefore, be desirable, if it were better supported by the ancient versions. In this case, it would not be surprising to read, "If *one of the Levites* does not redeem it", because, as a rule, people in distress claim and expect the assistance of kinsmen; though, of course, the contingency of a friend of the Levite or his wife's relations from another tribe coming to his aid, is not excluded. — The words ויצא ממכר בית וכ׳ are literally, "then the sale of the house and the city of his possession shall be free in the Year of jubilee", that is, the house which he sold in the city of his possession; the words בַּיִת וְעִיר are, therefore, a hendiadys (Sept. διάπρασις αὐτῶν οἰκιῶν πόλεως, a. o.), and ועיר אחזתו is a genitive dependent on ממכר, like בית. Hence we must not translate, "the house and any other property in his city", for the Levite had no possession in the town exept his house; nor "the house and the city of his possession", for the Levites had not the power to sell the "levitical towns", which belonged to them but partially (see *supra*). Of course, the right of perpetual redemption and the free restoration in the Jubilee applied only to houses possessed by the Levites in their appointed towns, but not to houses elsewhere acquired; and this restriction is expressed in the words referred to (ממכר בית ועיר אחזתו). — The singular הִוא, being the copula, agrees with the predicate אֲחֻזָּתָם, not with the subject, which is in the plural בָּתֵּי וכ׳; see Gram. §78. 5. — מִגְרָשׁ (ver. 34) from גרש to drive, to lead forth, is the place to which cattle are driven, therefore *pasture* (analogous to מִדְבָּר from דבר to lead); thus we find מִגְרְשֵׁי שָׁרוֹן the pastures of Sharon (1 Chron. V. 16), and, as in our passage, dwellings and pastures are placed in contradistinction לְמוֹשָׁב וּלְמִגְרָשׁ (Ezek. XLVIII. 15); but the word is most commonly used of the fields round the levitical towns, appropriated to the cattle of the Levites, whence the towns themselves are called עָרֵי מִגְרָשִׁים (1 Chron. XIII. 2), that is, cities with fields or suburbs (comp. Num. XXXV. 2—7; Josh. XIV. 4; XXI. 2 *sqq.*; 1 Chr.

35. And if thy brother becomes poor and falls into decay with thee, thou shalt support him, the stranger and the sojourner, that he may live with thee. 36. Thou

VI. 40 *sqq.*; 2 Chr. XI. 14). The ancient translations of the words ושדה מגרש עריהם are not very accurate (Sept. οἱ ἀγροὶ οἱ ἀφωρισμένοι ταῖς πόλεσιν, Vulg. suburbana eorum; etc.). Jewish expositors hold, that the Levites were indeed at liberty to sell their fields, like their houses, and that our text treats of Levites "consecrating" their fields to the Sanctuary, in which case they were always allowed to redeem them, whereas persons from other tribes had, under similar circumstances, for ever to renounce their property, which might be sold again by the overseers of the Sanctuary (comp. XXVII. 20, 21): this view would render it necessary to translate לֹא יִמָּכֵר "it shall not be sold again", which is against the usage of the word. The reason why the Levites were on no account to dispose of their pasture lands, is quite intelligible.

**35—38.** Among the ordinances respecting the Year of jubilee are inserted, if not logically, yet not quite inappropriately, precepts on assistance to be afforded to persons in declining circumstances. For the spirit of charity, though rendered subservient to social and political principles, pervades all these injunctions, and is especially manifest in the provisions on the redemption of sold property and sold slaves. Moreover, the matter of timely loans had by a previous writer been brought into connection with the chief subject of our chapter. For we read in Deuteronomy: "If there be among you a poor man . . ., thou shalt not harden thy heart, . . . but thou shalt open thy hand wide to him, and shalt indeed lend him sufficient for his need in that which he wants; beware that there be not a thought in thy wicked heart, saying, The seventh year, the Year of release, is at hand, and thy eye be evil against thy poor brother, and thou givest him nought, and he cry to the Lord against thee, and it be sin to thee" (Deut. XV. 7—11). This passage may have been before our author's mind, who, to enforce his law, makes use of appeals similarly pathethic and awe-inspiring — "thou shalt fear thy God, . . . for I am the Lord your God who brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, to give you the land of Canaan, to be your God" (vers. 36, 38). Yet the last words are, besides, intended to impress upon the Hebrews, that they would be reckless, ungrateful, and hard-hearted, were they to forget the poor and struggling, since they had themselves once sighed in the yoke of bondage, from which God mercifully released them to give them prosperity in a fertile land, and to remain their Protector for ever. — But in one respect the levitical author shows a remarkable progress. For the Deuteronomist enjoins, "Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury; to a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury, but to thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury" (Deut. XXIII. 20, 21; comp. also Exod. XXII. 24). But in our passage we read, "And if thy brother becomes poor by thee, and falls into decay with thee, then thou shalt

**shalt take no usury of him or increase, and shalt fear thy God, that thy brother may live with thee. 37. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor give**

support him, the stranger and the sojourner (גֵּר וְתוֹשָׁב), that he may live with thee"; and then the writer continues, "Thou shalt take no usury of him or increase, . . . that thy brother may live with thee; thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor give him thy victuals for increase" (vers. 35—37). So, then, the great principle, "Thou shalt love the stranger as thyself", had become a reality, and the misery through which the Hebrews had passed, first in their long and desperate struggles for independence, and then in their sad subjection and captivity, had proved a school of moral training and enlarged their sympathies (see p. 435). — The laws of the Pentateuch on loans and interest have before been treated of (see Comm. on Exod. pp. 435—438). That even in our author's time the prohibition of usury was not superfluous, is evident from the fearful distress to which the poor were by that abuse reduced in the time of Nehemiah, who, when he was informed of the extent of the evil, called an assembly of the rich, and thus rebuked them: "You exact usury every man of his brother ... Restore then to them this very day their land ... and their houses, also the hundredth part of the money [being the monthly interest], and of the corn, the wine, and the oil, that you exact of them" (Neh. V. 7—11).

Philological Remarks. — The words גר ותושב (ver. 35) must undoubtedly be understood in the manner above indicated, and they would probably never have been differently understood, had it not been deemed necessary to remove, at whatever hazard, their divergence, in sense, from the corresponding passage in Deuteronomy. The usual translation is, with unessential modifications, "And if thy brother (an Israelite) becomes poor, ... then thou shalt support him, and he shall live with thee like a stranger and a sojourner" (f. i. Sept. ἀντιλήψῃ αὐτοῦ ὡς προσηλύτου καὶ παροίκου καὶ ζήσεται μετὰ σοῦ; Vulg. et susceperis eum quasi advenam et peregrinum, et vixerit tecum; Targ. Jon. ותקביה יהיה דייר ותותב; Luther du sollst ihn aufnehmen als einen Fremdling oder Gast, dass er lebe neben dir; and many others); and it is commonly thus explained: "after he has been obliged to sell his property, he shall be your sojourner, supporting himself and his family by his work as a hireling, until the Jubilee, when he receives back his possession" (so Knobel, a. o.). But our passage speaks not only of persons who have sold their lands, but perhaps more particularly of those who, by opportune loans, might be saved from the necessity of selling them. Moreover, the translation adverted to is philologically impossible, and the construction of the Hebrew words which it demands, would be surprising in a plain style of legal enactments (comp. in ver. 40 כְּשָׂכִיר כְּתוֹשָׁב יִהְיֶה עִמָּךְ). Indeed some of the best Jewish commentators have rendered the words גר ותושב in their true sense (f. i. Rashi in loc. אף אם הוא גר ותושב; Ebn Ezra או הוא מארצך או גר ותושב; a. o.); their example has been followed by some later translators (as Engl. Vers. yea though he be a stranger or a so

***him*** **thy victuals for increase. 38. I *am* the Lord your God who brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, to give you the land of Canaan, to be your God.**

journer; Mendelssohn, dass auch der Fremde und Geduldete bei dir leben möge; Rosenmüller, non solum fratrem tuum Israelitam pauperem juvabis, sed etiam peregrinum et advenam, qui ad paupertatem devenerit; Johlson, Herxheimer a. o. sei es ein Fremdling oder Beisasse; De Wette; etc.); and they explain the difference between Deuteronomy and our law by the supposition that the former passage (Deut. XXIII. 21) treats of the נָכְרִי or the heathen foreigners, but ours of the תושב or those resident strangers as have pledged themselves not to worship idols, nor to eat unlawful food (see *supra* on vers. 23—28): but this distinction is untenable, since the נכרי in Deuteronomy is evidently also a resident stranger (comp. Isai. LVI. 7; see also *Pfeiffer*, Dub. Vex. pp. 313—315; *Saalschütz*, Mos. R. p. 164). Pseudo-Phocylides likewise expresses the prohibition of usury quite generally: Μηδέποτε χρήστης πικρὸς γένῃ ἀνδρὶ πένητι (ver. 83). — אָחִיךָ *thy brother* is probably here the Israelite in contradistinction to גר ותושב, though it seems also to be employed to denote *fellow-man* in general (see on XIX. 18). — וּמָטָה יָדוֹ is literally "and if his hand wavers", יָד having the figurative sense of power or prosperity; therefore, "if his prosperity declines or decays": the phrase מָטָה רֶגֶל, literally "the foot slips" or fails (Ps. XCIV. 18), generally applies to moral failings (Deut. XXXII. 35; comp. Ps. XXXVII. 31; LXXIII. 2), and involves another metaphor. — תַּרְבִּית or מַרְבִּית, properly "addition" or "increase", seems, in our passage (ver. 37), to be different from נֶשֶׁךְ usury; the former signifying the charge made for the loan of corn or other food, the latter denoting interest taken upon money (see Comm. on Exod. p. 437). The Mishnah (Bab. Metz. V. 1) gives these definitions: נשך is practised if, for instance, a person lends to another a shekel, which is worth four denarii, and demands back five, or if he lends to another two seahs of wheat, and demands back three; but תרבית involves increase of property by means of fruit (המרבה בפירות); if, for instance, A receives from B a sum of money at a time when the measure of wheat costs 25 denarii, on condition that he shall throughout the year supply him with wheat at the same price; now if the wheat rises to 30 denarii the measure, he is not allowed to offer to the other wine, and in this exchange to compute the corn at the higher price. However, in other passages both terms are used as equivalents, and מרבית occurs in reference to any kind of usury (comp. Ezek. XVIII. 8, 13; XXII. 12; Prov. XXVIII. 8; see *Talm.* Bab. Mets. $60^b$—$63^b$, 71, 75; *Maimon.* Hilch. Malveh cc. 1, 4, 11; *Yor. Deah* § 160; *Selden*, De Jure Nat. et Gent. VI. 9, 10, pp. 713—724). — חֵי (ver. 36), which coincides with the construct state of the noun חיים life, is an irregular form, occurring nowhere else, of the third person past of Kal of חיי, equivalent to חיה, and stands for חַי which is repeatedly used (Gen. III. 22; V. 5; etc.; see Gramm. II. p. 214). The translation "the life of thy brother shall be with thee", חֵי being taken as the constr. st. of חיים, is not plausible (comp. *Maimon.* Mor. Nev. I. 68).

39. And if thy brother becomes poor by thee, and is sold to thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bondservant; 40. *But* as a hired servant *and* as a sojourner he shall be with thee, *and* shall serve thee to the year of the jubilee; 41. And *then* shall he go out free from thee, *both* he and his children with him, and

**39—55.** When everything had been done to help an impoverished Hebrew, and he was yet unable to support himself, then, and only then, when all his efforts to maintain his independence had failed, he might sell himself as a slave. He was not to take this step lightly, for liberty was the seal of the theocratic citizen; nor could he renounce his liberty for ever; if he lived to the return of the great and solemn period of the Jubilee, he became again a free man, and he went back with his children to his own family and the possession of his fathers; he could not be owned by a fellow-man; God was his lord, as He was his master's lord; all differences between Hebrew and Hebrew vanished, and to the meanest of them the principle applied, "They are My servants, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen are sold" (ver. 42; comp. ver. 55). Such was the theory which had been developed in the course of ages. How different was the law of earlier times, when experience rather than speculation guided the legislator! Then a six years' service was fixed as a rule; after the expiration of this term, it was left to the option of the slave, whether he would remain in servitude or not; and if he decided to do so, he was simply marked as his master's perpetual property. Yet even this law fell into disuse; for it is altogether ignored in our ordinance (see *supra* p. 538).

Now if a Hebrew sold himself to another Hebrew, he might indeed expect considerate treatment, since he was essentially the equal of his master, and might look forward not only to independence but to the re-instalment in his patrimony; he was merely as "a hired servant" and as "a sojourner", who need not submit to degrading or exhausting toil; he was no bondman, since by our law serfdom was virtually abrogated: in a work written at about the same period, a wealthy master exclaims, "If I despised the cause of my man-servant or of my maid-servant, when they contended with me: for what should I do when God rises up? and when He searches, what shall I answer Him? Did not He make him in the womb that made me? and did not One fashion us in the womb"? (Job XXXI. 13—15). But the sold Hebrew had not the right of redemption; the legislator deemed it just to protect the Hebrew master's interest also, which he thought would have been damaged by that right. He showed, however, no such consideration to a *heathen* master to whom an Israelite might sell himself. In this case, he not only permitted redemption, but strongly impressed it as a duty upon himself and his relatives — "after he has been sold, he may be redeemed again; one of his brothers shall redeem him; or his uncle or his uncle's son shall redeem him, or anyone that is near of kin to him of his family; ... or if he becomes prosperous, he shall redeem himself" (vers. 48, 49; comp.

shall return to his own family, and to the possession of his fathers shall he return. 42. For they *are* My servants, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen are sold. 43. Thou shalt not rule over him with rigour, but shalt fear thy God. 44. Both thy bondmen and thy bond-

Num. XXVII. 9—11). He was naturally anxious to afford to the Hebrew every facility for escaping from influences dangerous to his faith; that he entertained no hatred to the stranger, he showed by allowing him to acquire Hebrew slaves; and the very tenour of our law proves that strangers were living in prosperity among the Hebrews.

The conditions of the redemption of slaves and of fields were analogous: the Hebrew, when selling himself, received as much as a hireling would have earned from the day of the transaction to the Year of jubilee (ver. 50); therefore, when he was redeemed, he had to pay back to the master that sum less the amount which he would have earned as a hireling from the day of bondage to the day of release; and hence, "if there were yet many years behind, in proportion to them he was to return the price of his redemption out of his purchase money; and if there remained but few years to the Year of jubilee, then he was to count with him; in proportion to his years was he to return the price of his redemption" (vers. 51, 52).

But while the Hebrew was, under all circumstances, only the temporary servant of the heathen stranger, the stranger might be held as a perpetual and hereditary bondman by the Hebrew. This distinction will not be found surprising. The stranger was, in the latest codes of the Pentateuch, placed on an equal footing with the Hebrew in matters of charity, of jurisdiction, and even of religious privilege (see *supra* p. 436); but it cannot be expected, that he should have been so treated likewise in matters of theocratic organisation. No Israelite was for ever to be alienated from the possession of his ancestors, because the permanent existence of all Hebrew families was necessary for the maintenance of the holy community as constituted by God's directions; but the heathen strangers could not be objects of similar solicitude; they had, as a rule, no landed property in the Hebrew settlements, in which they lived scattered and isolated; to them, therefore, the Year of jubilee could have no social or political significance; and hence — so argued the legislator — in remaining perpetual bondmen and hereditary chattels, they lost no essential right or prerogative.

These are the only points in which the levitical ordinances regarding the stranger fall short of the strictest demands of humanity. Even the high-minded Philo, endeavouring to justify our law, observes, that "Moses intended, in the first place, that there should be a difference between one's countrymen and strangers; and secondly, he did not desire completely to exclude from the constitution that most indispensable property — slaves"; for even Philo declared a stranger to be "a person that has no right to a participation in anything" (*Philo*, De Septen. cc. 8, 16; comp. *supra* p. 417).

It was not unusual among the

**maids, whom thou mayest have, *shall be* of the heathen that are round about you; of them you may buy bondmen and bondmaids. 45. Moreover, of the children of the sojourners that dwell among you, of them you may buy, and of their families that *are* with you, that they begat in your land; and they may be your possession.**

Hebrews for people in poverty or debt, to sell themselves and their children even to heathens (Nehem. V. 8), or to be sold to their creditors. The old "Book of the Covenant" provides for the case that "a man sells his daughter to be maid-servant" (Exod. XXI. 7), which, according to the Hebrew law, he had the power to do (see *supra* p. 407). In the earlier part of the monarchical period, a prophet's widow complained to Elisha, that "the creditor had come and taken away her two sons to be his bondmen", and had thus left her wholly destitute (2 Ki. IV. 1). The same practice still prevailed in the time of the exile, and grew into an oppressive abuse; the people came with complaints to Nehemiah, saying that, having mortgaged their lands, their vineyards, and their houses, to buy corn and to pay the king's tribute, they were obliged "to bring into bondage their sons and their daughters to be servants", without any hope of ever being able to redeem them (Neh. V. 1—5). The rich were indeed severely rebuked by the zealous reformer for their heartlessness, and they promised redress; but the ruthless custom seems to have continued as before; and in one of his finest parables Christ introduces a king, to whom one of his subjects owed a large sum; and "as the man had not the money to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, together with his wife and children, and all that he had" (Matth. XVIII. 23—25). It is remarkable that not even in the time of Nehemiah allusion was made to the relief provided by the six years' term fixed in Exodus, or by the Year of jubilee described in our section: the explanations given in the preceding remarks will account for that silence.

We need hardly observe that the Hebrews were not singular in the rude usage under discussion (comp. *Dion Chrysostom*. Orat. XV, vol. I. pp. 265—267 ed. Dind.). The Roman law of the Twelve Tables adjudged to the creditor the person of the debtor, whom he might sell as a slave or kill; and if there were several creditors, they might, according to the letter of the law, cut the debtor's body in pieces and share them between themselves (see *Gell.* XX. 1; comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 435). Among the Gauls, "those who were pressed by debt or by excessive taxes, or by the tyranny of the more powerful, gave themselves in vassalage to the nobles, who possessed over them exactly the same rights as masters had over their slaves" (*Caes.* Bell. Gall. VI. 13). The old Germans, passionate dice-players, are related "to have often set their liberty and persons upon the last throw"; and if they lost, "they patiently suffered themselves to be bound and sold" (*Tacit.* Germ. c. 24). Not precisely parallel is the case of those who, like the Penestae in Thessaly, or the Mariandyni in Heraclea, of their own accord subordinated themselves to a power-

**46. And you may take them for yourselves as an inheritance for your children after you, to obtain *them for* a possession; they may be your bondmen for ever: but over your brethren the children of Israel, you shall not rule one over another with rigour.**

**47. And if a stranger, and *that* a sojourner, becomes**

ful community, and in return for the protection they enjoyed performed slavish services, though "many of them were richer than their masters" (*Athen.* VI. 84, 85).

Later Judaism admirably grasped and developed the spirit of our ordinances. Philo starts from the principle, "By nature the servants are born free, for no man is by nature a slave" (φύσει θεράποντες μὲν ἐλεύθεροι γεγόνασιν κτλ.) — the exact opposite of Aristotle's doctrine, "A slave is an animated tool, and a tool is an inanimate slave (ὁ δοῦλος ἔμψυχον ὄργανον κτλ.), whence there is nothing in common" between master and slave, and certainly no friendship can exist between them (*Arist.* Ethic. Nic. VIII. 11; comp. Polit. I. 3—6). Again, Philo enjoins the utmost kindness towards slaves; he points out, that Moses calls the poor the "brother" of the rich (ver. 39), in order "to implant in the mind of the owner an idea of relationship to his servant, that he may not neglect him as a stranger towards whom he has no good-will"; for those who are sold to others are, according to the Law, not really slaves (δοῦλοι) but only servants (θῆτες) and hirelings, being temporarily in distress, and giving some things while receiving others. Even the Sabbath he considers partially to have been appointed "as a kind of spark and kindling of freedom", to teach the slaves not to despair of better prospects, but to hope for a complete release to come in due time; and when this time has arrived, the masters should rejoice to have an opportunity "of doing a service to that most noble of all beings, man, in the most important of all blessings, freedom"; he should dismiss him cheerfully, and moreover supply him with abundant means for his future support and independence (comp. *Philo*, De Septen. cc. 7, 9). Plato, on the other hand, advises the master to keep his slaves well, not for their sake but for his own; he should indeed behave towards them with as little insolence as possible, but it would be very foolish to treat them as if they were free men, and thus make them arrogant (*Plat.* Legg. VI. 19; comp. *Athen.* VI. 87). Jesus Sirach recommends indeed, that the slave should be accustomed to habits of industry, which might be enforced even with severity and by correction; but he also recommends, "If thou have a slave, let him be as thyself; .... if thou have a servant, treat him as a brother" (Sir. XXXIII. 24 — 31). Pseudo-Phocylides, likewise an Alexandrian Jew, and probably a near contemporary of Philo, treats of slavery in the same spirit of fairness and mercy (vers. 223—227); he first enjoins upon masters not to give their slaves insufficient food, which exhortation seems to have been much needed in his time (comp. *Juven.* XIV. 126); he next forbids them to mark or brand their domestics, as they had no right to disgrace them for ever (comp. *supra*

**prosperous by thee, and thy brother becomes poor by him, and is sold to the strange sojourner by thee, or to the foreign offspring of the stranger's family: 48. After that he has been sold he may be redeemed again; one of his brethren shall redeem him: 49. Either his uncle or his uncle's son shall redeem him, or *any* one**

p. 429); and he impresses upon them not to disdain the advice of a well-disposed slave (λάμβανε καὶ βουλὴν παρὰ δούλου εὐφρονέοντος); while he warns strangers not to do harm to servants by speaking ill of them to their masters (comp. Prov. XXX. 10).

It cannot, therefore, be surprising, that the denouncement of slavery in whatever form originated in Judaism. Among the Essenes, "there was not a single slave, but they all were free, offering each other their good offices; they condemned masters not only as unjust, because destroying equality, but as impious (ὡς ἀσεβῶν), because violating the ordinances of nature, who has created all as equals, and who, as their common mother, intended all to be true brothers, not only in name but in reality" (ὡς ἀδελφοὺς γνησίους κτλ; *Philo*, Quod omnis prob. lib. c. 12, Opp. II. 457; comp. De Vit. contemplat. c. 9, Opp. II. 482, ἡγούμενοι συνόλως τὴν θεραπόντων ἢ δούλων κτῆσιν εἶναι παρὰ φύσιν).

But it is not our intention in this place to discuss a subject of which we have treated with some fulness before, and to which we shall have occasion to return again; we merely desired to illustrate the Hebrew laws of slavery by contrasting them with the views of some of the greatest and humanest thinkers of antiquity (see Comm. on Exod. pp. 380—391).

The Rabbins define "the service of a bondman" (עבדת עבד, ver. 39) as one of so degrading and humiliating a nature as to make the dependent condition strikingly apparent; they declare, therefore, for instance, that a man must not let his Hebrew slave attend him at his bath, nor make him tie up and undo his sandals; nor ought he to make any difference between himself and his slave in dwelling, food, and cleanliness of garments; they contend that the command not to sell a Hebrew "as bondmen are sold" (ממכרת עבד ver. 42), implies that he should not, as was the custom, be disposed of "on the auction stone" by proclamation, nor in the public places, but in private and with all possible consideration; and they teach that "ruling over a slave with rigour" (ver. 43) means that the master must not force him to learn a new trade, and that he should not let him work incessantly, but set him reasonable tasks, and when he has finished them, to allow him rest. — Yet they make all these concessions only in favour of those who have been sold into slavery by others whose just claims they were unable to satisfy, but not of those who sell themselves of their own accord: Hebrews who so forget their dignity, might in every respect be treated as bondmen (comp. *Siphra* in loc. Behar c. 6, and *Mechilt.* on Exod. XXI. 2; *Maim.* Hilch. Avadim c. 8; *Selden*, De Jure Nat. et. Gent. VI. 8, pp. 709—713; see *M. Mielziner*, Über die Verhältnisse der Sklaven bei den alten Hebräern nach biblischen und talmudischen Quellen dargestellt, Kopenhagen 1859; *Zadoc*

**that is near of kin to him of his family shall redeem him; or *if* he becomes prosperous, he shall redeem himself. 50. And he shall reckon with him that bought him from the year that he was sold to him to the year of the jubilee; and the price of his sale shall be according to the number of years; like the time of a hired**

*Kahn*, L'esclavage selon la Bible et le Talmud, 1867; comp. also *Hengstenb.* Authent. des Pent. II. 435—441, offering apologetic remarks against Vater, De Wette, and George; *Kranold* and *Wolde*, De anno Hebraeorum jubilaeo, 1837; *Hug*, Über das Mosaische Gesetz vom Jubeljahr, in Zeitschrift für das Erzbisthum Freiburg I. 1 *sqq.*; *Keil*, Archäol. I. 371—380; *Öhler* in Herz. Real-Encyclop. XIII. 204—213; etc.).

Philological Remarks.—Interpreters anxious to harmonise our law with that of Exodus (XXI. 1—6) of course assume, that if the Jubilee takes place before the expiration of six years' service, the slave then already goes out free (see f. i. *Rashi* on ver. 40); but in our text no allusion whatever is made to the term of six years; and both passages are so strikingly different in style, spirit, and tenour, that all attempts at proving their agreement necessarily fail (comp. f. i. *Michael.* Mos. R. § 127; *Hengstenb.* Authent. II. 438—441; *Saalschütz*, Mos. Recht, pp. 160—162, 698—708; Archäol. II. 240; *Öhler* in Herz. Real-Encycl. XIV. 269, 270). Some of the expedients that have been resorted to are: — the law of Exodus was in force for the first forty-four years of each Jubilee period, but our command for the last six years; which is the orthodox Jewish view above referred to; or the former applies to persons sold into slavery by the legal authorities for theft, the latter on account of poverty; or the former treats of pagans that have become Hebrews by naturalisation, or are born in a Hebrew family, or have emigrated from the old Mesopotamian home of the Hebrews, the latter of native Israelites. These and similar devices are wholly without Scriptural foundation. Hardly less tenable is the singular opinion that, at first, the release of slaves in the seventh year was instituted, as stated in Exodus; that, when this law was no longer complied with, the author of Leviticus confined himself to commanding the release in the Jubilee; but that subsequently the Deuteronomist restored the old law (so Ewald a.o.; comp. also *Riehm*, Gesetzgebung etc. p. 72, "the Deuteronomist derived his provisions from the oldest statute in Exodus, and took no notice of the later and contradictory law in Leviticus"). Such unhistorical assumptions are inevitable, if the legislation of Leviticus is placed anterior to that of Deuteronomy; whereas, if their succession is reversed, the laws of slavery manifest an organic progression free from planless fluctuations. — The Hebrew slave was to be with his master "as a hired servant sojourning with him" (כשכיר כתושב ver. 40; see ver. 6), that is, as one over whom he has no absolute and permanent power, and who may leave him at his pleasure; he must therefore not use his authority cruelly, nor wear out his fellow-citizen with oppressive labour (לא תרדה בו בפרך, ver. 43; comp. Exod. I. 13, 14; Onk. and Jon. בקשיו). The Rabbins assert, that the children of a Hebrew slave

**servant shall he be with him. 51. If *there be* yet many years *behind*, in proportion to them he shall return *the price of* his redemption out of his purchase money. 52. And if there remain *but* few years to the year of the jubilee, then he shall count with him; in proportion to his years shall he return *the price of* his redemption.**

went out free with him in the Jubilee (ver. 41) only if they had been born of a free Hebrew wife before his entering into servitude, whereas they remained the master's property if born of a slave whom he had given him as a wife (comp. *Selden* l. c. VI. 7; *Mielziner* l. c. p. 34): this is merely an interpretation of our law after the analogy of Exod. XXI. 4; for a tradition on the subject did not exist. — Perpetual bondmen (called מקנת כסף, as the χρυσώνηται of the Cretans, *Athen.* VI. 84, in contradistinction to ילידי בית slaves born in the house, Gen. XVII. 12, 13, 23, 27) might be bought from the surrounding heathen nations (not from the tribes of Canaan, which were meant to be exterminated, Deut. XX. 16—18; comp. however, Judg. I. 19, 21, 27—35; II. 21—23; III. 1—5; etc.), or from the children of resident strangers (התושבים הגרים וכ׳ ver. 45, or גרים תושבים ver. 47), or from their relations "who may be born in the land" of the Hebrews (אשר הולידו בארצכם, ver. 45). The latter words describe the ordinary and most frequent case; but they are not intended to make birth in Canaan an indispensable condition for acquiring resident strangers as bondmen, since the Hebrews were permitted to take as hereditary slaves even foreigners totally unconnected with their community (ver. 44). — הִתְנַחֵל (ver. 46) is "to appropriate to oneself as one's portion, property, or inheritance" (comp. Num. XXXII. 18; XXXIII. 54; XXXIV. 13; Isai. XIV. 2; Ezek. XLVII. 13), different from הִנְחִיל which is simply "to give or leave as an inheritance" (comp. 1 Chr. XXVIII. 8, והנחלתם לבניכם; Deut. I. 38; III. 28; XII. 10; XXI. 16; etc.); the latter sense is here incorrectly expressed by Sept. (καὶ καταμεριεῖτε αὐτοὺς τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν) Vulg. (et hereditario jure transmittetis), a. o.; but the former one correctly by Rashi (החזיקו בהם לנחלה לצורך בניכם), a. o. — On הִשִּׂיג יָד (ver. 47) see ver. 26, p. 561. — "And if a stranger, and that a sojourner, גר וְתושב, becomes prosperous by thee": thus the two Hebrew words must evidently be translated (Rashi aptly גר והוא תושב), the particle וְ in ותושב introducing the noun תושב as a qualification of the preceding term גר (as in וְעִיר in ver. 33, see p. 566); and hence immediately afterwards גר וְתושב alternates with גר תושב; both words are not precisely synonymous (*Ewald*, Alterth. p. 245), גר being the generic appellation, תושב a specific class. — עֵקֶר (from עקר to tear out, to uproot) is properly uprooting, then an uprooted and transplanted shoot, and therefore, figuratively, *a foreigner*, who has left his native country and settled in a strange land, in contradistinction to the אזרח or native. The Septuagint and Vulgate do not render the word at all (ἢ ἐκ γενετῆς προσηλύτῳ, aut cuipiam de stirpe ejus); many give some general word, as *stock* (Luther Stamm, Engl. Vers. a. o.), or *offspring* (De Wette, Keil, Sprössling, a. o.), or *root* (Ebn Ezra כמו שרש); but Targ. Onk. has לְאַרְמָאי to the Roman, that is, the heathen; and

53. As a yearly hired servant shall he be with him: *and the other* shall not rule with rigour over him in thy sight. 54. And if he be not redeemed by these *relations*, then he shall go out free in the year of jubilee, *both* he and his children with him. 55. For to Me the children of Israel *are* servants; they *are* My servants, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: I *am* the Lord your God.

similarly many Jewish interpreters, as Targ. Onk. "if he sells himself to the root (לשריש) of idolatry (that is, to the idol himself), to serve him and his worshippers" (*Talm.* Bab. Mets. 71ª, וזה שנמכר לעבודת אלילים עצמה), and he is called עקר, because he tears himself away נעקר from all his occupations, in order to give himself up to idolatrous service; Yalkut (לאלילים), Rashi, Kimchi, a. o. — The conjunction "after" is expressed by אַחַר and אַחֲרֵי with or without אֲשֶׁר; thus אַחַר הִקֵּץ (XIV. 43), and אַחֲרֵי נִמְכַּר (ver. 48) *after he has been sold*; comp. I Sam. V. 9 (אחרי הסבו). — שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ (ver. 49) "one that is near of kin to him"; see on XVIII. 6, p. 389. — The Hebrew slave shall be with his heathen master כִּימֵי שָׂכִיר (ver. 50) "like the days of an hireling," that is, his services shall be reckoned like those of an ordinary day labourer, and their value shall be accordingly estimated in fixing the price of his redemption; or he shall be with his master כִּשְׂכִיר שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה (ver. 53) "as a hireling from year to year," that is, as a yearly hireling, who after a short term may leave his employer, if he finds him too exacting. — אם עוד רַבּוֹת בַּשָּׁנִים (ver. 51) *if there be yet many years behind*, literally, "many of the years", viz. till the Jubilee, בַּשָּׁנִים having the force of a partitive genitive; or רַבּוֹת, the feminine in the plural, may be taken as representing the neuter (a great deal or portion, much, comp. Isai. XLII. 20; see Gramm. § 84. c.), like מְעַט in the following verse ואם מעט נשאר בשנים עד שנת היבל (ver. 52) *and if there remain but little of the years* (few years) *to the year of jubilee.* — The slave goes out free in the Year of jubilee אם לא יגאל בְּאֵלֶּה (ver. 54) "if he is not redeemed by these" viz. the relations mentioned before (in vers. 48, 49); the less common case that the slave redeems himself does not seem to be considered; unless בְּאֵלֶּה be taken in a general sense "by these means" or "in any of the ways mentioned" (so Engl. Vers. Marg., Knobel, a. o.); others translate, with little probability, "in these years" (Ebn Ezra, Engl. Vers., a. o.), that is, within the years still left till the Jubilee, to which orthodox interpreters naturally add, "and if he has not been released before by the expiration of his six years' term".

# IX.

# PROMISES AND MENACES.

## CHAPTER XXVI.

SUMMARY. — Prohibition of idol worship, and repetition of previous injunctions with regard to the Sabbaths and the Sanctuary (vers. 1, 2). — Then follows an elaborate address promising to the Hebrews the most perfect happiness if they obey the Divine laws (vers. 3—13), and threatening them with terrible and increasing punishments if they are rebellious (vers. 14—40); yet the author holds out to them the hope of ultimate restoration to national prosperity, if they repent and humble themselves before God (vers. 41—45). — A statement, that the Sinaitic laws are completed (ver. 46).

1. You shall make for yourselves no idols, nor shall you rear up for yourselves *any* graven or standing image,

**1, 2.** "To Me the children of Israel are servants; they are My servants whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt": with these words, proclaiming the absolute sovereignty of God over the Hebrews, concluded the laws of the Sabbatical year and of the Jubilee. Therefore our Book might well continue: "You shall make for yourselves no idols, nor shall you rear up for yourselves any graven or standing image . . . to bow down before it, for I am the Lord your God" (ver. 1); and this command, in its turn, seems to point forward to the caution, that if the Hebrews still adopt heathen worship, God will "destroy their high places, and cut down their images, and cast their carcases upon the carcases of their idols" (ver. 30). Again, as the institutions of the Sabbatical year and the Jubilee intensify the idea of the weekly Sabbath, and supplement the circle of annual festivals, they might well be followed by the short but all-embracing command, "You shall keep My Sabbaths" (ver. 2); while this injunction, on its part, seems to prepare the reader's mind for the subsequent warning, that if the Hebrews do not observe the Sabbaths, they will be driven from their land, which shall then, in its desolation, keep the years of rest that had been neglected (vers. 34, 35, 43). And

**nor shall you set up *any* memorial of stone in your land, to bow down upon it; for I *am* the Lord your God.**

lastly, as the service at the common Temple was the chief test of the people's piety, the behest to keep it undefiled and to "reverence God's Sanctuary", seems appropriately to precede the announcement of the future destinies of the nation; and it derives greater force from being apparently adverted to both among the promises and the menaces, God declaring, on the one hand, "I will set up My dwelling among you . . . and I will walk among you" (vers. 11, 12); and on the other hand, "I will bring your Sanctuaries into desolation, and I will not smell your sweet odours" (ver. 31). — Thus then the two first verses of our chapter seem fitly to occupy their place between the larger sections which precede and follow them. They contain two commands of the Decalogue — on idol-worship and the Sabbaths —, and a third which stands in the closest connection with one of them, since the Sabbaths were chiefly celebrated at the Sanctuary (see *supra* p. 431; comp. XX. 3; XXI. 12, 23).

Philological Remarks. — We have attempted these explanations with a view of pointing out the logical thread which may possibly have guided the compiler of the Book in inserting the two verses in this place; but we confess, that even if we should have correctly interpreted his conceptions, we are by no means convinced, that the commands were originally written for this context. Upon every unbiassed reader they must make the impression of occupying an isolated position, belonging organically neither to the ordinances of the Sabbath-periods, nor to the announcement of the blessings and curses. They occur almost literally in previous portions (see XIX. 3, 4, 30; and notes in locc.); and there is no cogent reason why they should here have been inserted again. This repetition, inexplicable if we assume the continuous composition of our Book by one author, may well be accounted for if we consider the gradual completion of the Book from many and heterogeneous sources. "The incorporation of the two laws on idolatry and the Sabbaths", observes De Wette (Beiträge, II. 299), "seems to be quite purposeless, and can only be accidental: the compiler found these lines; and by embodying them in his collection, he desired to prevent them from being lost". Critics will probably abide by some such conclusion. The abnormal place of these verses has indeed been generally felt, and it has been supposed, that they properly belong to the preceding chapter (*Bertheau*, Gruppen, p. 217); or that they form a fit conclusion to the Sinaitic legislation which, by re-enjoining the purity of Divine worship and the holiness of the Sabbaths and the Sanctuary, "returns to its first beginning" (Exod. XX. 1—11; *Baumgarten*, Levit. p. 237); or that they were originally prefaced by some introductory formula, which the later reviser omitted when he connected them with the laws of the Jubilee (*Knobel*, Lev. p. 574); since both chapters were meant to be inseparably united (*Ranke*, Untersuch. I. 109). Yet some writers really consider them as "a proper introduction" to the blessings and the curses (*Keil*, Lev. p. 157; *Wogue*, Lev. p. 350), or as a part of a connected "speech" appropriately beginning with a few fundamental laws, which were of

2. You shall keep My Sabbaths, and reverence My Sanctuary: I *am* the Lord.

special importance for the Israelites living in exile among heathen nations (*Graf*, Geschichtl. Bücher, p. 80): but the first verse expressly alludes to Canaan (בארצכם), and the second to the Temple (מקדשי). — On אֱלִילִים "non-entities" or idols, which word occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch except in the nineteenth chapter (ver. 4) that has many analogies with ours, see *infra* on vers. 3—13; on מַצֵּבָה a statue or pillar with distinct attributes of some deity, and on אֶבֶן מַשְׂכִּית (ver. 1) memorial stones with idolatrous figures or emblems, upon which (עליה) the worshippers prostrated themselves, see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 397, and p. 371 notes 18, 19, 21, 22. In Ezek. VIII. 12 "chambers with figures" (חדרי משכית) are mentioned, that is, chambers the walls of which were covered with emblematic representations of idol-worship (comp. *ibid.* ver. 10; Prov. XXV. 11). Kimchi believes the word משכית signifies "beholding" (הבטה), since people "look at" images; the Septuagint also renders λίθος σκοπός, but this term means "tutelary stone" placed as a protection against evil; Vulg. lapidem insignem (Rosenm. lapidem speculatorem, i. e. vigilem, custodem, ut esset προφυλακτικόν quiddam); but it cannot be simply "an idol or image of stone (so the Targum., Syriac, a. o.); Spencer understands obelisks, Michaelis and Mendelssohn columns with hieroglyphic inscriptions (comp. *Spencer,* Legg. Ritt. l. II. c. 22, pp. 443—449; *Rosenm.* Schol. in loc.). Jewish tradition strangely supposes that such stones were chiefly consecrated to Mercury. It is well known, that among the earliest symbols of the sun and the moon — of Baal and Ashtarte — were cubical and conical stones or obelisks with rude figures of the deities upon them, and many such piles with vestiges of a human face have been found in various parts of Arabia and Syria. "Monarchs have entered into a sort of rivalry with one another", observes Pliny (XXXVI. 8 or 14), "in forming elongated blocks of this stone (the syenites, a sort of red granite), known as obelisks and consecrated to the divinity of the Sun; the blocks had this form given to them in resemblance of the rays of that luminary, which are so called in the Egyptian language; Mesphres, who reigned in the city of the Sun (Heliopolis), was the first who erected one of these obelisks." In Pharae in Achaia, near a celebrated statue of Hermes, there were "about thirty square stones, each of which was worshipped by the people under the name of a different deity; and indeed in early times rough stones were throughout Greece revered as images of gods" (*Pausan.* VII. xxii. 4). "The Arabians", says Maximus Tyrius (Dissert. XXVIII.), "worship a deity which I cannot name; but the image I saw was a square stone; the people of Paphos pay special homage to Venus, and her statue resembles most a white pyramid"; comp. *Apollon. Rhod.* Arg. II. 1175, 1176 (μέλας λίθος ἱερός, ᾧ ποτε πᾶσαι Ἀμαζόνες εὐχετόωντο); *Euseb.* Praep. Ev. III. 7; *Herodian.* V. iii. 5 (describing the statue of Heliogabalus, λίθος δέ τις ἔστι μέγιστος κτλ.); *Amm. Marc.* XVII. 4; *Selden*, De Diis Syris, pp. 223, 291, 292; *Meiners*, Geschichte der Religionen, I. 391; *Gesen.* Monum. Phoen. tab. 21—24; and *infra* on ver. 30,

3. If you walk in My statutes and keep My commandments, and do them; 4. Then I will give you rain

ad המנים. A similar purpose was served by the sacred stones so frequently mentioned under the name of *Baetylia* (see Comm. on Lev. l. c. note 20). That all the forms of idol-worship here interdicted — by images of wood and stone, of gold and silver, by pillars and memorial-blocks — flourished among the Hebrews until the latest time of the monarchy, and were but gradually banished after their return from the exile, has been proved before; in our very section allusion is made to "heights" (במות) and "sun-images" (חַמָּנִים) and idols (ver. 30); and the prohibitions could, therefore, not be repeated too often nor too emphatically (comp. l. c. pp. 377—379).

**3—13.** The levitical compiler had now collected all the ordinances and narratives which seemed to him important for individuals and the community, and apt to promote a pious life and the organisation of the theocracy; and he was anxious to conclude the "Sinaitic" laws with a general exhortation setting forth, under Divine authority, the rewards of a strict adherence to the Law, and the fearful disasters that must follow its transgression. He found, in the sacred writings of earlier periods, ample precedents to support him in his plan. He was aware, that the old "Book of the Covenant" finishes with emphatic promises that, if the Hebrews obeyed the voice of the "messenger" sent by God, He would be "an enemy to their enemies, and an adversary to their adversaries"; that He would drive the heathen tribes from the land destined for their occupation; that He would "bless their bread and their water, and remove sickness from their midst"; that He would make them fruitful, and grant them long and happy lives (Exod. XXIII. 20—33, see *infra* on vers. 14—17). Again, our compiler was aware that, in Deuteronomy, the full and eloquent recapitulation addressed to the people by Moses himself, is wound up with a grand proclamation of blessings and curses which has hardly its equal in impressive and soul-stirring pathos (Deut. XXVIII—XXX.) And he had seen, more recently, how the prophet Ezekiel entwined his ideal legislation now with insinuating promises and now with appalling menaces (comp. also XVIII. 24—30;, XX. 22—26; XXII. 31—33; Deut. XI. 13—20). He was fully equal to the self-imposed task, and his composition yields to no similar effort in power and skill. He owed indeed his *ideas*, in a very great measure, to the two first named of his predecessors, the author of the legislation of Exodus and the Deuteronomist; and he formed his *style* so strikingly upon that of Ezekiel that we can at least account for, though we do not share, the opinion, that the prophet himself wrote this portion (see *supra*, p. 386, and *infra* Phil. Rem.). But his arrangement of matter is so lucid and so appropriate, and his language shows yet so much force and freedom, that the composition has all the freshness of originality, and never fails to produce a thrilling effect.

Both as a parallel and a contrast we quote the conclusion of a Hindoo code: "When the Rishis had heard these laws from the mouth of Yâjnavalkya, they thus addressed the high-souled and most illustrious prince of the Yogins: — Those who zealously

**in due season, and the land shall yield its increase, and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit. 5. And**

preserve this book of laws, shall gain glory in this world and shall enter into heaven; he who strives after knowledge, shall obtain knowledge; he who desires wealth shall acquire wealth, and he who wishes to live shall live long. Even if a man repeats only three slokas from this book, his ancestors shall gain imperishable bliss: of this doubt not. By keeping this book, the Brahman will be a righteous man, the Kshatriya shall be victorious, and the Vaisya rich in corn and every other possession. He who explains this book to the twice-born when the moon changes, shall receive the reward of the great horse-sacrifice. Thou, o lord, wilt grant it" (*Yâjnav.* III. 329—334).

An attentive analysis shows, that this entire section (vers. 3—46) was written during the exile, and not later; it contains no distinct allusion to the actual restoration of the Jews to their own land, but merely hopeful anticipations of this event; and the last verses (the 44th and 45th) are as plain as can be expected in a composition shrouding facts in the veil of prophecy: "And yet even so while the Hebrews are in the land of their enemies, I do not cast them away, nor do I abhor them (לא מאסתים ולא געלתים), to destroy them utterly, and to break My covenant with them; .... but I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors" etc. There is nothing in these words that leads us beyond the misfortunes of the captivity. But as the Book of Leviticus includes ordinances originating considerably more than a century after the return from the exile, for instance, those on the Day of Memorial, the Day of Atonement, and the Jubilee, it is evident that our portion was found, not composed, by the final compiler or reviser of the Book; and this fact helps us to account for its resemblance both to Deuteronomy and the writings of Ezekiel, since its date was not far distant from either. — It would be difficult to argue with those who insist upon attributing the whole of this section to the Mosaic time; for the indispensable basis of argument is the disposition to analyse historical documents historically. "The opponents of the Mosaic authorship of these pledges and threats", observes a recent interpreter, "forget that, even irrespective of a higher inspiration, the chief idea which underlies them, must have been vividly before the eye of Moses. He could easily foresee that the worldly-minded and profane people would not fulfil the severe demands of the Law, but would frequently rebel against God; that therefore times of happiness would alternate with times of distress, but that finally God's mercy would pardon His sorely tried and humbled people, and gloriously complete the work of salvation" (*Keil*, Levit. p. 157). These views are reproduced in one of the latest Commentaries (*Cook's* Holy Bible, Lev. p. 643), the writer of which moreover adds: "It is indeed an inspired Prophecy in the true sense of the word, an utterance of the Spirit regarding the present and the future. ... But Moses knew the human heart, and he was acquainted with the temper and disposition of his own people... He knew that such a law as that of the Sabbatical year would run counter to their selfishness and

**your threshing shall reach to the vintage, and the vintage shall reach to the sowing time; and you shall eat**

avarice" (comp. also *Baumgarten*, Lev. pp. 238, 240; *Hengstenb.* Auth. des Pent. II. 330—335; a. o.). Reasoning like this may indeed have been in the mind of the compiler of our Book, and may have induced him to venture the incorporation of this chapter; but it cannot satisfy those who, looking more closely at the wording and the tenor of these verses, find reflected in them not possible, but actual, events and conditions. For while the promised blessings are so enthusiastic that they could never have been realised, and might well be described as Messianic, the threatened calamities and the sins which occasioned them are delineated with such plain distinctness, that they might almost serve as a foundation for constructing the history of the Israelites from the eighth to the sixth century. We have brought before our eyes not only the people's stubborn idolatry, but the very forms of their strange worship, including such details as the little statues of the sun (חמנים, ver. 30); we see not only the hostile invasion, the defeat, and the flight (vers. 16, 17), but the awful scenes of sieges when parents "ate the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters" (ver. 29); not only pestilence and failing crops and famine (vers. 19, 20, 26), but the population mercilessly massacred, fields desolated, cities levelled with the ground, the Temple in ashes, and the land occupied by the foreign conqueror (vers. 30—32); nay we follow the miserable Hebrew captives into the land of their dispersion; and while they are there pining away, their land lies an uncultivated waste, and at last keeps the Sabbatical years, which, we learn, neither they nor their fathers had kept while they dwelt in it (vers. 33—43). The picture, so clear and so familiar, is a likeness drawn from life. And the features rapidly glanced at lead us to the Babylonian exile: there had been invasions, devastations, and partial dispersions before (Joel IV. 1, 2; Hos. XI. 10, 11; Isai. XI. 11); the Pentateuch itself repeatedly announces similar disasters as imminent (Deut. IV. 26—30; XXVIII. 36, 49, 64; XXIX. 27; XXX. 18; XXXII. 21—27); but our chapter evidently describes the actual subjugation of the whole land, and the actual captivity of the whole people; it cannot, therefore, refer to the conquest of the northern provinces by Pul (770), nor to the abduction of the east-Jordanic tribes by Tiglath-pilesar (740), nor even to the destruction of the kingdom of Ephraim by Shalmanesar (720), all which opinions have been advocated (by *Bleek*, Repert. I. 55; *Ewald*, Gesch. I. 155, 156; *Lengerke*, Ken. p. XCIII; *Nöldeke*, Untersuch. p. 66; a. o.); none of these events brought the fortunes of the entire Hebrew nation so low as they are portrayed in our chapter with such terrible truth. Even apologetic writers could not fail to see that "no solid argument for the lateness of the composition can be obtained, unless we bring it down below Josiah, to the period of the Captivity" (*Cook's* Holy Bible, Lev. p. 643).

In depicting the glorious rewards of pious obedience, our author gathers his traits from the works of all prophets who had gained popular authority, from the earliest down to his own contemporaries, from Amos

**your bread to satisfaction, and shall dwell in your land in safety. 6. And I will give peace in the land, and**

and Hoseah to Ezekiel and the second Isaiah; he writes only with the one object of rousing and stimulating his apathetic compatriots, many of whom, it may be, had abandoned all hope of deliverance; he does not stop to enquire what blessings are probable or possible; but boldly soaring into the sphere of the ideal, he trusts that the fervour of his readers will be kindled by his own. He promises rain in its due time, and such unparalleled fertility that the crops of one year shall be abundantly sufficient for many seasons; tranquil and peaceful enjoyment of this prosperity; constant increase of the population; security from the ravages of wild beasts and from hostile invasion; in case of foreign war, easy and complete victory; the Divine presence hallowing the land; and the Divine power protecting the people. And to convince them that their God is well able to bestow upon them wealth and happiness, he reminds them that it was He who once released their forefathers from Egyptian bondage. These promises admirably advance from material to spiritual benefits, from well-being to holiness, which is peace and truth and righteousness.

In order to prove how much our author is indebted to anterior writers, we shall give below the chief analogies to every individual phrase (see Phil. Rem.); here we shall only insert a few verses from the Book of Ezekiel, which will show at a glance that they served as the foundation for our passage: "And I will make with them a covenant of peace (ברית שלום), and I will destroy evil beasts out of the land (והשבתי חיה רעה מן הארץ), and they shall dwell safely in the wilderness (ישבו במדבר לבטח), and sleep in the woods. And I will make them and the places round My hill a blessing, and I will cause the rain to come down in its season (והורדתי הגשם בעתו); there shall be showers of blessings. And the tree of the field shall yield its fruit (ונתן עץ השדה את פריו), and the earth shall yield its increase (והארץ תתן יבולה), and they thall be safe in their land (והיו על אדמתם לבטח), and they shall know that I am the Lord when I have broken the bands of their yoke (בשברי את מטות עלם), and delivered them out of the hand of those who made them bondmen. And they shall no longer be a prey to the nations, nor shall the beasts of the land devour them; but they shall dwell safely (וישבו לבטח), and none shall make them afraid (ואין מחריד) ... Thus shall they know that I the Lord am with them, and that they, the house of Israel, are My people, says the Lord God" (Ezek. XXXIV. 25—30).

Twice annually, as is well known, rain is needed in Palestine to ensure successful crops — "the earlier rain" (מוֹרֶה or יוֹרֶה), beginning in the second half of October, at the time of the autumnal sowing of wheat and barley, falling most copiously in December, and continuing, at intervals, to the end of January; and the short "latter rain" (מַלְקוֹשׁ), falling in March at the time of the sowing of the summer-fruit, and before the beginning of the harvest (see Comm. on Gen. pp. 508, 509): hence the promise is given that "the rains" (גְּשָׁמִים) will be sent "in their due seasons" (ver. 4), which elsewhere are more distinctly specified (Joel II. 23; Hos. VI. 3; Deut. XI. 14; Jer. V. 24; Job XXIX. 23;

**you shall lie down, and none shall make *you* afraid; and I will destroy evil beasts out of the land, nor shall**

see Phil. Rem.). And the author emphatically describes the produce as so plentiful that the threshing, which begins in April simultaneously with the harvest, will occupy the husbandman until the commencement of the vintage, which takes place four or five months later; and again the vintage will be so abundant that it will not be finished at the seed-time, or in the second part of October (see *supra*, p. 509). The same idea is, however, even more clearly and more poetically expressed by a previous writer in a passage which was manifestly before our author's mind: "The ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that sows seed" (Am. IX. 13; see Phil. Rem.)

Philological Remarks. — Without entering upon a full comparison between our section and the corresponding portion of Deuteronomy (XXVIII), we will in this place only observe, that the Deuteronomist, though seeing the national dangers threaten and approach, was still uncertain which of the two powerful empires that were then contending for the supremacy, would absorb Judea, whether Babylon or Egypt; therefore he announced indeed the invasion and the triumph of the Babylonians, whom he described as "a nation which neither they nor their fathers had known", as "a nation that comes from afar, from the end of the earth, as swiftly as the eagle flies" (XXVIII. 36, 49, 50); but he declared also, "The Lord will bring thee into Egypt again with ships, by the way of which I spoke to thee, Thou shalt no more see it again; and there you shall be sold to your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you" (ver. 68); his apprehensions, though not realised to their full extent, can well be understood, as, in his time, the Hebrews under king Josiah were signally defeated, at Megiddo, by Pharaoh Necho (611). On the other hand, the author of our chapter, writing at a period when the fate of Judah had long been decided, and when his countrymen lived as captives in the districts of the Euphrates, hardly describes their new masters, nor does he find it necessary to mention either the Egyptians or the Babylonians, since he alludes to well-known facts. The style in the address of Deuteronomy is indeed "more diffuse, rhetorical, and moralising" (*Gesen.* Gesch. der hebr. Sprache, p. 32), but these are characteristics of an individual writer, and they afford no argument as to the age of the Book compared with that of Leviticus. On the whole, it may be contended, that the language of Deuteronomy resembles that of Jeremiah, while the language of this and some previous sections of Leviticus has numerous analogies with that of Ezekiel. Yet in spite of these affinities, which will be pointed out in the notes on each verse, our chapter is remarkable for many new idioms and peculiar phrases which occur nowhere else in the Old Testament, and which vindicate for the author a distinct individuality (as דַּיִשׁ ver. 5 threshing; יָשָׁן נוֹשָׁן ver. 10 old store that has become old, see *infra*; קוֹמְמִיּוּת ver. 13 upright; הֵדִיב ver. 16 to grieve; comp. 1 Sam. II. 33 לַאֲדִיב, Gr. § XLVII. 2; הָלַךְ קֶרִי עִם or more frequently בְּקֶרִי vers. 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 40, 41, to walk contrary to some

**the sword pass through your land. 7. And you shall chase your enemies, and they shall fall before you by**

one; נְקַם בְּרִית ver. 25 the revenge of the covenant; פֶּגֶר ver. 30 carcase or the fragments of an idol; מֹרֶךְ ver. 36 faintness; מְנֻסַת חֶרֶב ibid. flight before the sword; תְּקוּמָה ver. 37 power of withstanding: nowhere else in *the Pentateuch* are found בֶּהָלָה ver. 16 terror; נְחֻשָׁה ver. 19, for נְחֹשֶׁת, brass; חַמָּנִים ver. 30 images of the sun; רָצָה vers. 34, 41, 43, in the meaning to pay off; נִכְנַע ver. 41 to be humbled). Apologists believe that the peculiarity of language and the large number of unusual terms may be accounted for by "the peculiar tendency of this Divine revelation which could not fail to move Moses deeply" (*Keil*, Levit. p. 157); but why are the corresponding portions in Deuteronomy, which contain almost the same ideas, expressed in a style so different from that of our chapter, and so similar to that prevailing throughout Deuteronomy? The analogies between our section and the nineteenth chapter, which embodies the best and noblest fruits of Hebrew thought, are neither so numerous nor so striking as to justify us in tracing both portions to the same source (so *Knobel*, Lev. p. 573); those analogies are limited to a very few phrases which occur elsewhere also (as תשמרו ועשיתם in ver. 3 and in XIX. 37; and פָּנָה אֶל in ver. 9 and in XIX. 4, 31, where, however, the meaning of the term is different). Our section is prophetic, the nineteenth chapter legislative; the one pre-supposes the Temple and the land in desolation, the other treats of the sacrificial service and of the produce of fields and orchards (XIX. 5-10, 23—25); and recent critics even maintain positively and not improbably, that "we have in the whole of the Old Testament from the author of this portion no other composition of any length, since the difference is too striking" (*Ewald*, Geschichte, I. 155; *Nöldeke*, Untersuchungen, p. 66); whereas, on the other hand, it has been suggested, with surprising vagueness, that the language of our chapter, "in its main features resembles that Prophetic style which appears to have been common to all ages of Hebrew literature" (*Cook's* Holy Bible, p. 642): would any reader of the Hebrew original assert, that the style of Hosea has any essential feature in common with the style of Malachi? The nearest approach to the spirit of our address is found in the conclusion of the eighteenth and twentieth chapters (XVIII. 24—30; XX. 22—26; comp. XVIII. 5).

The principal parallels to our portion are — To ver. 3: The phrase הָלַךְ בְּחֻקֹּתַי to walk in My statutes, occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch, but is very frequent in Ezekiel (V. 6, 7; XI. 20; XVIII. 9, 17, 19; XX. 13, 19, 21; XXXVI. 27; see also Lev. XVIII. 3—5; XX. 23). — The combination שמר ועשה to keep and to do, is peculiar to the latter part of Leviticus (XVIII. 4, 5; XIX. 37; XX. 8, 22; XXV. 18). — To ver. 4: The plural גְּשָׁמִים rain or the rainfall of the different seasons, is, besides, only found in Ezekiel (XXXIV. 26) and in a few later writers (Ezra X. 9, 13; Ps. CV. 32). — With the words ונתתי גשמיכם בעתם I will give you rain in due season, may be compared Joel II. 23 ("He gives you the former rain in sufficiency, and He will make descend for you the former

**the sword. 8. And five of you shall chase a hundred, and a hundred of you shall chase ten thousand; and your**

rain and the latter rain"); Deut. XI. 14 ("I will give you the rain of your land in its due season, the first rain and the latter rain"); Jer. V. 24 ("Let us now fear the Lord our God who gives rain, both the former and the latter, in its season"); and Ezek. XXXIV. 26 ("I shall cause the rain to come down in its season; there shall be rain-showers of blessing"); see also Deut. XXXIII. 28; Zech. X. 1; Prov. XVI. 15. — With תתנה הארץ יבולה and the land shall yield its increase, compare Ezek. XXXIV. 27 (והארץ תתן יבולה); XXXVI. 29, 30; Ps. LXVII. 7 (ארץ נתנה יבולה); LXXXV. 13; see also Joel II. 19, 22, 24; Hos. IX. 2; Deut. XI. 14; Zech. VIII. 12. — To ver. 5: The first part of this verse is an obvious reminiscence or reproduction of Am. IX. 13, וְנִגַּשׁ חוֹרֵשׁ בַּקֹּצֵר וְדֹרֵךְ עֲנָבִים בְּמֹשֵׁךְ הַזָּרַע; our author has changed the concrete into less poetical abstract nouns, and has rendered the parallelism of the members more regular indeed, but less pithy and forcible. — זֶרַע is seed-time, as also in Gen. VIII. 22; or the sowing itself, as in Gen. XLVII. 24. — With ואכלתם לחמכם לשבע, and you shall eat your bread to satisfaction, compare Joel. II. 26 (ואכלתם אכול ושבוע); Exod. XVI. 3 (באכלנו לחם לשבע); Deut. XI. 15 (ואכלת ושבעת); see also Exod. XXIII. 25; Lev. XXV. 19. — With וישבתם לבטח בארצכם you shall dwell in your land in safety, compare Ezek. XXXIV. 25, 27, 28 (וישבו לבטח, etc.); see also Ps. IV. 9; Isai. XIV. 30; Deut. XXXIII. 12; Lev. XXV. 18, 19. — To ver. 6: With ונתתי שלום בארץ I will give peace in the land, compare Ezek. XXXIV. 25 (וכרתי להם ברית שלום); etc. — With ושכבתם ואין מחריד and you shall lie down, and none shall make you afraid, compare Isai. XVII. 2 (ורבצו ואין מחריד); Mic. IV. 4 (וישבו · · · ואין מחריד); Jer. XXX. 10; Ezek. XXXIV. 28 (וישבו לבטח ואין מחריד); XXXIX. 26; see also Deut. XXVIII. 26; Jer. VII. 33; Job XI. 19; Zeph. III. 13. — With והשבתי חיה רעה מן הארץ and I will destroy evil beasts out of the land, compare Ezek. XXXIV 25 (והשבתי חיה רעה מן הארץ), 28; see also Exod. XXIII. 29 (ורבה עליך חית השדה); Isai. XXXV. 9, and *infra* on vers. 21, 22. חיה רעה is wild beast as in Gen. XXXVII. 20. — With וחרב לא תעבר בארצכם and the sword shall not pass through your land, compare Ezek. XIV. 17 (חרב תעבר בארץ). — To ver. 7: With ורדפתם את איביכם וכ׳ and you shall chase your enemies, and they shall fall before you by the sword, compare Ps. XVIII. 38—40 (ארדוף אויבי וכ׳); Deut. XXVIII. 7. — נפל לפני to fall before or through some one, as in 1 Sam. XIV. 13, and לחרב by the sword (with ל auctoris), as in Gen. XIV. 9; Exod. XII. 16; etc. — To ver. 8: With the peculiar idea ורדפו מכם חמשה וכ׳ and five of you shall chase a hundred, and a hundred of you shall chase ten thousand, compare the remarkable parallels Isai. XXX. 17 (אלף אחד מפני גערת אחד מפני גערת חמשה תנוסו, where the parallelism is bolder and more elliptical, as might be expected in the original); Deut. XXXII. 30 (איכה ירדף אחד אלף ושנים יניסו רבבה); and Josh. XXIII. 10 (איש אחד מכם ירדף אלף). — To ver. 9: With ופניתי אליכם and I will turn to you (that is, be gracious to you, as 2 Ki. XIII. 23, וירחמם ויפן אליהם; not merely "pay attention to you", as XIX. 4, 31.; XX. 6) com-

enemies shall fall before you by the sword. 9. And I will turn to you and make you fruitful, and multiply you, and establish My covenant with you. 10. And you shall eat old *store* that has become old, and remove the old on account of the new. 11. And I will set My dwelling among you, and My soul shall not abhor you. 12. And

pare Ezek. XXXVI. 9 (כי הנני אליכם ופניתי אליכם); see also Exod. II. 25; Ps. LXIX. 17. — With והפריתי אתכם והרביתי אתכם and I will make you fruitful and multiply you, compare Gen. I. 28; IX. 2; XVII. 2, 6, 20; XLVII. 27; Exod. I. 7; Jer. III. 16; Ezek. XXXVI. 9, 10 (והרביתי עליכם אדם ובהמה ורבו ופרו); see also Exod. XXIII. 26; Mic. V. 6, 7; Neh. IX. 23; etc. — With והקימתי את בריתי אתכם and I will establish My covenant with you, and with the 11th and 12th verses in general, compare Ezek. XXXVII. 26—28, which include, almost in identical terms, nearly every idea expressed in our passage, "I will make a covenant of peace (ברית שלום) with them ... and I will multiply them, and will set My Sanctuary in the midst of them (ונתתי את מקדשי בתוכם) for evermore; and My dwelling shall be with them (והיה משכני עליהם), and I will be their God, and they shall be My people".— The phrase הקים ברית, so frequent in Genesis (VI. 18; IX. 9, 11; XVII. 7, 19, 21), is likewise used by Ezekiel (XVI. 60, 62; see also Deut. VIII. 18, where it means to maintain or uphold a covenant, and so probably in our passage; 1 Sam. XXII. 8; Exod. XXXIV. 10, 27); and its opposite הפר ברית to break the covenant, in ver. 15, is met with before in Gen. XVII. 14; Isai. XXXIII. 8. — To ver. 11: With ונתתי משכני בתוככם and I will set up My dwelling among you, compare, besides, Exod. XXV. 8 (ושכנתי בתוכם); XXIX. 45; Joel IV. 21; Josh. XXII. 19; etc. — With ולא תגעל נפשי אתכם and My soul shall not abhor you (also ver. 30), compare Jer. XIV. 19 (בציון געלה נפשך); Ezek. XVI. 5 (בגעל נפשך), 45; see also Isai. XLI. 9; Deut. XXXII. 19; Lev. XX. 23; *infra* vers. 15, 43; Ps. LXXVIII. 59. — To ver. 12: והתהלכתי בתוככם and I will walk among you, compare especially the concluding words of the Book of Ezekiel, "The name of the city from that day shall be, The Lord is there" (יהוה שמה); see also Jer. III. 17; Zech. II. 9; Zeph. III. 15, 17; Hagg. II. 5 (ורוחי עמדת בתוככם).— The construction of התהלך with בתוך is found only in our passage and in Ezek. XIX. 6; XXVIII. 14.—With והייתי לכם לאלהים וכ׳ and I will be your God etc., compare, besides, Ezek. XI. 20 and XXXVI. 28 (where the words occur almost literally), etc. — To ver. 13: With ואשבר מטת עלכם and I broke the bands of your yoke, compare Ezek. XXXIV. 27 (בשברי את מטות עלם), where alone, in addition to our passage, the combination מטות על is found; see also Isai. IX. 3; X. 27; XIV. 25; Deut. XXVIII. 48; Jer. II. 20; XXVII. 2; Ezek. XXX. 18. — מהית להם עבדים so that you should not be their bondmen, literally, "away from being their bondmen", which is no unusual meaning of the preposition מן; see Gramm. § 105. 4. — The "bands of the yoke" מטת על (ver. 13) are the rods which are inserted in the yoke, and which, by being kept tight on the neck of the beast, make the yoke serviceable; and these bands are used to denote the yoke itself.—

I will walk among you and will be your God, and you shall be My people. 13. I *am* the Lord your God who brought you out of the land of Egypt, that you should not be their bondmen; and I broke the bands of your yoke, and made you go upright.

14. But if you will not hearken to Me, and will

There remain, then, as peculiar expressions in these verses, דַּיִשׁ threshing (ver. 5), יָשָׁן נוֹשָׁן old store that has become old (ver. 10), and קוֹמְמִיּוּת upright (ver. 13, properly a noun "uprightness", here used adverbially, comp. Gramm. § 70. 3, 4): the first and the third of these terms call for no comment, for their derivation is clear, and they are in their appropriate place; but the second occurs in a verse which interrupts the continuity of an address in every other respect so remarkably consistent, and the suggestion offers itself that the verse, which should logically follow after the fifth, may be a later addition, framed perhaps on a corresponding passage which occurs in the law of the Jubilee (XXV. 22, ואכלתם ישן and ואכלו ישן): for the connection which some have pointed out — "however numerous the Hebrews may become, they will have abundant food" — is hardly satisfactory. The tenth verse being removed, the tenor of our passage would exactly coincide with that of Ezek. XXXVII. 26, 27, "I will multiply them, and will set My Sanctuary in the midst of them" etc. — The Niphal נוֹשַׁן means elsewhere *to be of old standing*, or *to be long established* in some place (Deut. IV. 25), and the participle is used of an old and *inveterate* disease (Lev. XIII. 11).

**14—17.** In promising the rewards and blessings of piety, the author almost describes the golden and the Messianic age — almost, for wars, though successful, are yet deemed probable (vers. 7, 8); but in announcing the many punishments and curses of disobedience, he descends into the sad realities of actual events, and faithfully portrays what he has witnessed himself or what he has read in the trustworthy annals of his nation. To illustrate his words, let us compare them with a few similar speeches, which appear as the landmarks of Hebrew history, and well reflect its successive stages.

We have first that speech at the end of "the Book of the Covenant", to which we have already referred (Exod. XXIII. 20—33, p. 581). Writing in the time of the monarchy, when the nation was still hopefully carrying on its struggles, and was enjoying a large share of prosperity, the author threatened no misfortunes, but confined himself to admonitions and promises: the Lord would send His messenger before the Hebrews, and help them to conquer not only the land of the Canaanites, but all the territories from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean, and from the Arabian desert to the Euphrates. He would grant them plenty and shield them from disease and every other trial. He would terrify their enemies, and even cause the noxious animals to come to their aid. The only conditions He imposed upon them were that they should serve Him alone and obey His messenger without murmuring; that they should exterminate the heathen from their country, and break down all

**not do all these commandments; 15. And if you will despise My statutes, and if your soul abhors My judg-**

idols. The writer had in his mind the glorious time at the end of David's and the beginning of Solomon's reign, when the Hebrew dominions extended almost to the boundaries described (comp. 1 Ki. V. 1, 4; see Comm. on Exod. p. 468). The covenant between God and the Israelites had been concluded with the free assent of both: the One had said, "If you will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then you shall be a peculiar treasure to Me above all nations, for all the earth is Mine"; and the others had answered, "All that the Lord has spoken we will do" (Exod. XIX. 5, 8); there was, therefore, as yet no occasion for threatening chastisements: this was evidently the writer's view, and looking at the condition of his country in his own age, he was well justified in entertaining it.

Very different was the aspect of affairs at the period when the Book of Judges was compiled; then the Assyrians had already repeatedly invaded and ravaged the country, and the northern tribes had been led away into captivity (comp. Judg. XVIII. 30); the nation had commenced to taste the bitterness of foreign servitude; yet there were sufficient resources left to warrant the hope of ultimate recovery. Therefore, the author of that Book, in entering upon his task, and surveying in his mind the chequered fortunes of his people from the time of Joshua to his own, mingled complaint and exhortation, rebuke and encouragement; he strangely wavered between the dark and the brighter sides of the picture, and his words breathed sorrow, rather than despondency. "The children of Israel", he said, "did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served the gods of the people that were round them, and provoked the Lord to anger, .... and He delivered them into the hands of spoilers that spoiled them, and He sold them into the hands of their enemies round about, ... and they were greatly distressed: nevertheless the Lord raised up Judges who delivered them out of the hand of those that spoiled them; and yet they would not hearken to their Judges, but went astray after other gods; . . . and the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and He said, Because this people has transgressed My covenant, . . . I also will not henceforth drive out any of the nations which Joshua left when he died, that through them I may prove Israel, whether they will keep the way of the Lord to walk therein as their fathers did keep it, or not" (Judg. II. 11—22). In some earlier time, then, so the author believed, the Hebrews had been pious and righteous, and he did not despair that his own generation might yet be induced to follow their example; he saw indeed present trials and dangers, but might they not be the means of recalling his contemporaries to duty and allegiance?

And then came the first great blow which struck down the kingdom of Ephraim; the Assyrian occupied the fairest portions of the Holy Land, and ten of the tribes of Israel wandered into exile; illusions were no longer possible; and yet not even then were the Hebrew patriots deserted by their innate buoyancy; they almost hoped against hope; they had learnt

**ments, so that you will not do all My commandments, *but* that you break My covenant: 16. I also will do**

to trace misfortune to iniquity, and they had been taught, that God is merciful; therefore they pointed to the dark idolatries of Ephraim as the source of their ruin; but might not the people of Judah be spared a similar fate, if they walked in uprightness and truth, and might not God in His mercy even bring back the scattered tribes of Israel? In this light the Deuteronomist, living about a century after Ephraim's fall, read the past and the future history of his nation. For this reason he so frequently impressed upon his countrymen, that through piety "their days would be prolonged in the land which God had given them" — a pledge which before his time once only had been given in the Decalogue (comp. IV. 26, 40; V. 30; VI. 2, 3; XXV. 15). He urged upon them again and again, that "on account of the wickedness of the heathen nations God had driven them out of Canaan"; and on the other hand, that "if they forgot the Lord, and walked after other gods, they would surely perish; as the nations which the Lord had destroyed before them, so would they perish" (comp. Deut. VIII. 19, 20; IX. 5; XXX. 17, 18). And what was his estimate of the people? Did their conduct inspire him with hope? His eloquence, so simple and yet so grand, never rose to greater fervour than when he denounced their stubborn perversity. "Thou art a stiff-necked people", he exclaimed; "remember and forget not how thou didst provoke the Lord to wrath in the wilderness; from the day that thou didst depart out of the land of Egypt until you came to this place, you have been rebellious against the Lord, from the day that I knew you" (comp. Deut. IX. 6, 7, 24; XXXI. 27; etc.). Considering all this, and well knowing the impetuosity and the insatiable ambition of the Babylonians, who had not long before emerged from their obscurity to terrify all Asia, "a non-people" (לֹא־עָם) whom he saw in his mind press forward "as the eagle darts", he felt that the doom of Judah also was approaching, and that their only refuge was in repentance and in the clemency of God. He himself condensed his whole experience, his fears, and anticipations in a few words: "When you shall have remained long in the land, and be corrupt . . . to provoke the Lord to anger, I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, you shall soon utterly perish from off your land . . . And the Lord shall scatter you among the nations, . . . and there you shall serve gods, the work of men's hands . . . But if from thence thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, thou shalt find him if thou seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul . . . For the Lord thy God is a merciful God; He will not forsake thee nor destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which He swore to them" (Deut. IV. 25—31).

At last the Babylonians did come, and the kingdom of Judah was also destroyed. The author of our chapter of Leviticus, who probably resided among the captives near the Euphrates, could not materially differ from the view taken by the Deuteronomist of the condition and prospects of his people; for the Deuteronomist had clearly marked out the only course which the events

this to you; and I will appoint over you terror, con-

could possibly be expected to take in accordance with the Hebrew doctrine of retribution. The difference, that our author had witnessed the dispersion not of ten, but of all the twelve tribes, is not essential; yet he might point out, with greater emphasis than had ever been done before, that the Hebrews had disgracefully broken their part of the covenant which they had once concluded with God; for they had rejected all warnings, and had fallen into a deeper and more fearful abyss of idolatry and wickedness; and he might, therefore, announce that God, released from His promises of protection, would send dire calamities horrible beyond all precedent. In this one respect he went beyond his predecessor; having lived to see the crowning catastrophe of his people, he described the awful degradation of sin and misery, and showed how God long-sufferingly tried to rouse the erring nation by lesser trials, how by their obduracy the disasters were multiplied, till they culminated in the annihilation of the commonwealth. This was the plan on which the author constructed his composition: menace follows menace in fatal succession, till they reach the terrible climax. But then, because he is a Hebrew prophet, with all the fine enthusiasm of his order, he yet believes in the people's repentance and in the forgiveness of God; he sees in the far distance the dawn of a new morning that forbids him to despair; and in the name of his God he proclaims, "Even while they are in the land of their enemies, I do not cast them away, . . . but I will remember the covenant of their ancestors whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt". As they had been redeemed from Egypt before, so they would be redeemed from Babylon ere long.

Who does not see that this entire survey almost coincides with the pragmatic sketch which in the Books of Kings concludes the sad history of Israel, and of which these are the leading sentences: "So it was that the children of Israel had sinned against the Lord their God . . . and served idols. And the Lord testified against Israel and against Judah by all the prophets, saying, Turn from your evil ways, and keep My commandments . . . Yet they would not hear, but hardened their necks . . . And they rejected His statutes and His covenant. Therefore the Lord was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of His sight; there was none left but the tribe of Judah only. And Judah also kept not the commandments of the Lord their God, . . . and the Lord rejected all the seed of Israel, and afflicted them, and delivered them into the hand of spoilers, until He had cast them out of His sight" (2 Ki. XVII. 7—23; comp. also 1 Ki. IX. 2—9).

The words with which each new series begins, "If you will not hearken to Me", are almost like a refrain, and remind us of a similar burden in one of the addresses of Amos, which indeed, as a composition, greatly resembles our section: it begins, "I have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places; yet have you not returned to Me, says the Lord"; then follow new punishments and the same refrain, "Yet have you not returned to Me"; and so again and again (Am. IV. 10—13).

The first scourges by which God will try to wean the Hebrews from

sumption and fever that shall consume the eyes and wear

their iniquity, are diseases so fearful as to become a "terror" (בֶּהָלָה) to them, such as consumption (שַׁחֶפֶת) and the burning ague (קַדַּחַת), wearing out their strength and their lives in agony; whereas the Book of the Covenant, written in happier times, promises on the contrary, "I will take away sickness from the midst of thee" (Exod. XXIII. 25). The ancient Hebrews were indeed a remarkably healthy race (comp. *Tacit.* Hist. V. 6, corpora hominum salubria et ferentia laborum), yet consumption (phthisis pulmonum) is not unusual in Palestine, especially in more elevated regions, and consumptive persons (ξηροί) were wont to seek relief in the pool of Bethesda (John V. 3). Fevers have at all times been one of the greatest plagues of the land, and have constantly claimed many victims; they are often so dangerous and obstinate, that in several instances the New Testament represents their cure as miraculous (Matth. VIII. 14, 15; Mark I. 30, 31; Luke IV. 38, 39; John IV. 52; *Joseph.* Ant. XIII. xv. 5). Intermittent, especially tertian fevers are frequent, particularly during March and October, in valleys and in marshy parts, as in the plains of Acca and Sharon, and in the almost tropical plain of the Jordan, on the borders of the hot and low-lying northern Lake of Merom, and round the Lake of Tiberias, which has in recent times also become notorious for its malignant fevers: the rubbish of the ruins of towns and villages, in many parts piled up for centuries, is in the winter season saturated with rain, which evaporates in the summer, and thus engenders malaria.

As the next calamity the author threatens, that the Hebrews will sow their fields, whereas their enemies will enjoy the crops; they will "toil in vain", just as their forefathers had toiled, when, in the period of the Judges, the Midianites and the Amalekites ravaged their land "after the seeds had been sown, and destroyed the produce of the soil, and left no sustenance for Israel"; or when, in more recent times, the hosts of the Assyrians and the Babylonians devastated the blooming fields or spoiled the harvests (Judg. VI. 3, 4); whereas a contemporary of our author, in describing God's returning favour to Israel, declared, "The Lord has sworn by His right hand, and by His strong arm, Surely I will no more give thy corn to be food for thy enemies; and the sons of the stranger shall not drink thy wine, for which thou hast laboured" (Isai. LXII. 8; comp. LXVI. 21—23; Am. IX. 14).

And then will follow disastrous battles; the Hebrews, routed and pursued, will be compelled to submit to the imperious dictates of cruel invaders; harassed by a feeling of insecurity, they will flee though no one pursues them, and as another writer pithily expresses it, "The sword shall destroy without, and the terror in your houses" (Deut. XXXII. 25). How different is this from the happy times depicted before, when the Hebrews shall have no wars in their own land, and if they march out to meet a foreign foe, then "five of them shall chase a hundred, and a hundred of them shall chase ten thousand" (ver. 8; *supra* p. 587).

Philological Remarks. — We continue to give the parallels from previous writings, in order to show how constantly these were our author's guide in the second great section of this chapter also; any additional ex-

out *your* lives; and you shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it.

17. And I shall set My face against you, and you shall be slain before your enemies; and they that hate

planation that may be necessary will be inserted after the parallels of each verse. — To ver. 14: With ואם לא תשמעו לי וכ' but if you will not hearken to Me, compare Deut. XXVIII. 15; etc.; see also Malach. II. 2. — To ver. 15: With ואם בחקתי תמאסו and if you shall despise My statutes, compare 2 Ki. XVII. 15; Ezek. V. 6, and XX. 13, 16, 24 (וחקתי מאסו וכ').— About תגעל נפשכם see *supra* on ver. 11, and about הפר ברית on ver. 9. — The form הַפֵּרְכֶם, the infin. Hiphil with suffix, is modified from הָפֵרְכֶם, see Gramm. § XVII. iii. 3^a. — To ver. 16: With והפקדתי עליכם ··· אֶת־הַשַּׁחֶפֶת וְאֶת־הַקַּדַּחַת I will appoint over you consumption and fever, compare Deut. XXVIII. 22 (יככה יהוה בַּשַּׁחֶפֶת וּבַקַּדַּחַת וּבַדַּלֶּקֶת וּבַחַרְחֻר), 27, 59—61; Jer. XIV. 6. — With מכלות עינים ומדיבת נפש consuming the eyes, and wearing out your lives, compare 1 Sam. II. 33 (לכלות את עיניך ולאדיב את נפשך); Deut. XXVIII. 65 (כליון עינים ודאבון נפש); see also Job XI.20; XVII.5; XXXI.16.—With וזרעתם לריק וכ' and you shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it, compare Mic. VI. 15; Deut. XXVIII. 30, 33, 51; Jer. V. 17; Job XXXI. 8, which passages express the exact sense of ours, though the words but partially coincide; see also Hagg. I. 6. — שַׁחֶפֶת (from שָׁחַף to be lean, like the Arab. سخف) is meagreness or emaciation, hence consumption (like the Arab. سخاف, to which Jonah ben Gannach refers; Saad. has حمى السل consumptive fever; Kimchi "a malady, which emaciates the body, whence perhaps the bird שַׁחַף XI. 16 has its name, as it often suffers from similar disorders"; Parchon חולי שפים את האדם דק; etc.); comp. רָזוֹן, which is also leanness and pthisis (Mic. VI. 10; Isai. X. 16). The Sept. renders ἀπορία and the Vulg. egestas, poverty and leanness being considered as correlatives (in our passage the text of the Sept. seems corrupted, as the words בהלה and שחפת are apparently rendered τήν τε ἀπορίαν τήν τε ψώραν, the latter being a cutaneous disease, as scurvy or scab; but the text in Deuteron. XXVIII. 22 is unequivocal). Other translations are less acceptable, as tumors (Luther Schwulst), dropsy, etc. — קַדַּחַת (from קָדַח to light a fire or to burn) is properly heat or flame; hence the *burning fever*; Vulg. ardor; Saad. cold fever; Sept. in Deut. πυρετός, but in our passage less aptly ἴκτερος jaundice, which has been taken to apply here to the "bilious' typhoid fever" very frequent in Egypt and Syria (*Furrer* in Schenkel's Bibel-Lexicon, II. 588); Kimchi אש של עצמות; hence אֶקְדָּח (Isai. LIV. 12) a precious stone of a burning colour (כמראה אש); comp. Aram. אֶשָּׁתָּא, Lat. febris from fervere, etc.: the Hebrew name of other diseases also is derived from the notion of heat or burning, as the general term רֶשֶׁף (Deut. XXXII. 24; Hab. III. 5) the glow of fever, and then חַרְחֻר (from חרר to burn, Sept. ἐρεθισμός), and דַּלֶּקֶת (from דָּלַק to kindle a fire, Sept. ῥῖγος the fever-frost; Deut. XXVIII. 22). On these diseases may be compared *Pruner*, Krankheiten des Orients, pp. 87, 283, 337, 356 *sqq.*; *Tobler*, Nazareth in Palästina, p. 267, and Medicin. Topo-

**you shall rule over you; and you shall flee when none pursues you.**

**18. And if you will not yet hearken to Me after *all* this, then I will punish you seven times more for**

graphie in Jerusalem, pp. 32, 42; *Hartmann*, Skizze der Nilländer, pp. 359 *sqq.* Michaelis (in his 68th Arabian question) suggests as the meaning of קַדַּחַת hollow teeth! — מְכַלּוֹת עֵינַיִם are diseases "which destroy the eyes", that is, make their light and brightness vanish (Onk. מחשכן עינין; Sept. σφακελίζοντας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν), and מְדִיבֹת נֶפֶשׁ diseases "which cause the soul to pine away", that is, wear out life, and prove fatal (Sept. τὴν ψυχὴν ὑμῶν ἐκτήκουσαν, Vulg. consumat animas vestras; the rendering "that cause sorrow of the heart" seems too weak); for דִּיב (kindred with זוב) is synonymous with דאב, to melt away, to be destroyed (Ps. LXXXVIII. 10; Jer. XXXI. 25). — To ver. 17: With ונתתי פני בכם and I shall set My face against you, compare Ezek. XIV. 8 (ונתתי פני באיש ההיא); XV. 7; Jer. XXI. 10; see also Levit. XVII. 10; XX. 3, 6. — With ונגפתם לפני איביכם and you shall be slain before your enemies, compare Deut. XXVIII. 25 (נִגָּף לפני איביך); see also Judg. II. 14; Jer. XIX. 7; Num. XIV. 42. — With ורדו בכם שנאיכם and your enemies shall rule over you, compare Ps. CVI. 41 (וימשלו בהם שנאיהם). — With ונסתם ואין רודף אתכם and you shall flee when none pursues you, Prov. XXVIII. 1 (נסו ואין רודף רשע); see also Ps. LIII. 6 ("there were they in great fear, where no fear was").

**18—20.** If the Hebrews continue in their evil ways, God will chastise them "seven times" more; and to rouse them to reform, He will send afflictions infinitely more fearful. And what will these afflictions be? Drought and dearth with their ghastly train of famine and starvation. To the ear of the Hebrews this announcement was appalling; for they knew the misery which dearth had so often brought upon the land; they remembered — for the tradition had been vivid and faithful — how in the time of Elijah the Tishbite neither rain nor dew fell for years, and the horses and mules died for want of grass, and nearly all the cattle perished (1 Ki. XVII. 1; XVIII. 5); how, about a century later, a most awful locust plague was aggravated by a protracted drought, of which they were constantly reminded by the wonderful description of Joel: "The seed is rotten under their clods and the corn is withered: why do the beasts groan, why are the herds of cattle perplexed? because they have no pasture; . . . for fire devours the meadows of the plain, and a flame burns all the trees of the field, . . . and the springs of water are dried up" (Joel I. 17—20); and they knew that, in more recent times, in the reign of king Jojakim, a similar calamity happened, which most painfully enhanced the alarming distress that was threatening from without: this dearth is dwelt upon by Jeremiah with a poetical force, which almost rivals that of Joel or Amos, and his description may possibly have been in our author's mind; for it is also interwoven with reproof and exhortation: "Judah mourns, and its gates languish, . . . and the cry of Jerusalem rises up. Their nobles send their inferiors to the water; they

**your sins. 19. And I will break the pride of your power, and I will make your heaven as iron, and your earth as brass; 20. So that your strength shall be spent in vain, and your land shall not yield its increase, nor shall the trees of the land yield their fruits.**

come to the pits, and find no water, they return with their empty vessels; they are ashamed and confounded, and veil their heads . . . Yea, the hind in the field calves, and forsakes her young one, because there is no grass; and wild asses stand on the hills, they gasp for air like jackals, their eyes are dimmed; for there is no grass. O Lord, though our iniquities testify against us, do Thou it for Thy name's sake; for our backslidings are many, we have sinned against Thee" (Jerem. XIV. 1—7; comp. Am. IV. 7). Palestine is indeed a fertile land, but the people's pride and strength (גְּאוֹן עֹז), arising from abundant crops, shall be humbled and broken, when the heavens, "a molten mirror", will be like iron, yielding neither rain nor dew, and the earth, hardened and parched up, will be like brass, unable to bring forth a green blade. Both metaphors — the iron sky and the brazen earth — could not have been more appropriately chosen to describe an Eastern drought.

Imprecations like those set forth in our section were not unusual among the ancients; one brief parallel may here be inserted. When the people of Cirrha and others had polluted the temple of Delphi and profaned its holy treasures, the Amphictyons, after having devastated their territories, and sold the inhabitants as slaves, protested and swore, that no one should ever cultivate the devoted land, and they publicly pronounced this curse: "If any persons transgress this edict, whether private individuals, or a tribe, or a people, their land shall bear no fruit, and the women shall bring forth no children who resemble their fathers, but shall give birth to monsters; nor shall the beasts produce young of a normal shape; misfortune shall befall them in their wars, their tribunals, and their public assemblies; they themselves, with their houses and their whole race, shall be destroyed; and they shall never again present to the gods an acceptable offering" (*Aeschin.* Cont. Ctesiph. c. 34, §§ 110, 111 ed. Becker).

Philological Remarks. — "And if you will not hearken to Me" עַד־אֵלֶּה, literally "to the end of these things", that is, if you will repent neither while the threatened plagues are happening, nor when they have been sent; so that עַד־אֵלֶּה has the sense of "after all this" (Targ. Jon. בָּתַר אִלֵּין), for עַד often includes the *terminus ad quem* (comp. Exod. XV. 16; 1 Sam. I. 22; see Comm. on Gen. p. 749: in ver. 27 בְּזֹאת occurs in the same connection, "if you will not hearken in spite of this", a not uncommon meaning of the preposition בְּ, Isai. IX. 11; Job I. 22; etc.); but in ver. 23, בְּאֵלֶּה, construed with a passive verb (תִוָּסְרוּ), is simply "*by* or *through* all this". Other translations of עַד־אֵלֶּה are "during this" (Knob. a.o.), or "up to this" (Sept. ἕως τούτου, De Wette), or "for this" (Engl. Vers., Luth. über das); etc. — "I will punish you for your sins שֶׁבַע seven times more", that is, many times or infinitely more; in which sense the number seven is frequently used

**21. And if you walk contrary to Me, and will not hearken to Me, I will bring seven times more plagues upon you according to your sins. 22. And I will send among you the beasts of the field, which shall bereave**

(comp. Gen. IV. 15, 24; Deut. XXVIII. 25; Isai. IV. 1; Prov. XXIV. 16; Ps. LXXIX. 12; CXIX. 164; Job V. 19, "He shall deliver thee in six troubles, and in seven there shall no evil touch thee"; 1 Sam. II. 5, where שבעה is parallel with רבת בנים; Luke XVII. 4), seven denoting a complete group or set, and therefore underlying the various Sabbath periods; yet other numbers also are similarly employed, as ten (ver. 26; Gen. XXXI. 7; Zech. VIII. 23; Job XIX. 3; etc.), three, and four (comp. Am. I. 3, 6, 9, 11, 13; etc.). It is, therefore, quite inappropriate to take in our passage "seven" literally, which necessarily leads to artificial devices (see, f. i. *Bertheau*, Gruppen, pp. 241, 242, who counts in vers. 14—17 just seven punishments, and believes, that the same number of menaces is meant in each of the four following divisions — viz. vers. 18—20, vers. 21 and 22, vers. 23—26, and vers. 27—33 — but that they are not specified, as it sufficed to mention in each case the number seven, viz. in vers. 18, 21, 24, and 28: and from these premises he deduces at a curious, though ingenious result). — "I will break" גאון עזכם (ver. 19), literally "the pride of your power", that is, your power which fills you with so much pride, and emboldens you to defy the Divine warnings; "the power" is chiefly the wealth derived from abundant harvests; though Jewish interpreters assert, that it means the Temple (Siphra, Targ. Jerus.; comp. Ezek. XXIV. 21, מקדשי גאון עזכם), or the heroes and champions of Israel, like Joab (so Rabbi Akiva and others), or the proud men, or the counsellors and nobles (comp. *Talm.* Gitt. 37[a]): the same phrase occurs more than once in Ezekiel (besides XXIV. 21, in XXX. 6, 18; XXXIII. 28; see also VII. 24), and in no other part of the Old Testament. But the peculiar comparisons which follow, "and I will make your heaven as iron, and your earth as brass", are borrowed from Deuteronomy (XXVIII. 23, 24), where they are found modified and enlarged: "And thy heaven, that is over thy head, shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron; the Lord shall make the rain of thy land sand and dust; from heaven shall it come down upon thee, until thou art destroyed"; compare also XI. 17, "He will shut up the heaven that there be no rain"; see Mal. I. 10. — שָׁמַיִם heaven with personal suffixes (שְׁמֶיךָ and שְׁמֵיכֶם thy and your heaven) is peculiar to Deuteronomy and to this passage. — The parallelism of נְחֻשָׁה with בַּרְזֶל renders it probable, that that word is here not the feminine of the adjective נָחוּשׁ brazen, but the noun brass, instead of נְחֹשֶׁת (as in the corresponding passage of Deuteronomy), and it is so used in poetical works (Job XXVIII. 2; XL. 18; Isai. XLV. 2). — With ותם לריק כחכם and your strength shall be spent in vain (ver. 20), compare Isai. XLIX. 4 (לריק יגעתי . . . כחי כליתי). — With the threat "your land shall not yield its increase", compare Deut. XI. 17; XXVIII. 18, 38—40, 42; see also Mal. I. 10, 11.

**21, 22.** Should the blind recklessness of the people proceed to open

**you of your children, and destroy your cattle, and make you few in number, and your *high*-ways shall be desolate.**

and defiant rebellion against God's decrees, He will, as a second gradation, let loose against them the wild beasts, which He will arm with unwonted ferociousness for their appointed work of destruction; by these means He will cause frightful ravages among men and cattle; and the population, previously lessened by war and fatal diseases, will become so few in number, and these few will be so much terrified by the sanguinary intruders, that the public roads will be empty and desolate, and all intercourse will cease. In holding out this threat, our author needed not apprehend lest it appear to his readers fanciful or exaggerated; for he had ample precedents, which he knew were treasured in the recollection of all: when little boys had mocked the prophet Elisha, "he turned round, and looked at them, and cursed them in the name of the Lord; and there came forth two she-bears out of the wood, and tore forty-two children of them to pieces" (2 Ki. II. 24.); and another tradition related, that when the Assyrians, who had settled in the northern provinces of Canaan, "did not fear the Lord, the Lord sent lions among them that killed many of them" (2 Ki. XVII. 25). The Hebrews, accustomed to draw the animals into the closest relations with men, and deeming them capable of sin and degeneracy, could not be surprised at the idea that God should make savage beasts the instruments of His vengeance, and "a rod of correction", like famine, foreign invasion, and subjection. Thus we find in the last Song of Moses, "They shall be consumed by hunger, and devoured with heat, and poisonous pestilence, and I shall send upon them the teeth of wild beasts, with the venom of the serpents that creep in the dust" (Deut. XXXII. 24); and thus Ezekiel constantly menaces his fellow-citizens in the name of God, "I shall send upon you famine and evil beasts, and they shall bereave thee; and pestilence and blood shall pass through thy land, and I shall bring the sword upon thee" (Ezek. V. 17; see Phil. Rem.). There is, from the Biblical point of view, force and truth in the remark, "The enmity of animals towards man, their heaven-appointed lord, reveals the strife and discord which he has brought into creation by his sin" (*Baumgarten*, Lev. p. 239). Nor was the desertion of high-roads on account of the dangers of travelling a trait unfamiliar to later readers; they knew from the song of Deborah which lived on every tongue, that "in the days of Shamgar, the son of Anath, in the days of Jael, the highways were silent, and travellers walked through tortuous by-roads" (Judg. V. 6); they could not fail to recollect the words in the "Lamentations", which probably even then had been attributed to the prophet Jeremiah, "The ways of Zion mourn, because none come to the solemn feasts; all her gates are desolate" (Lam. I. 4); and Ezekiel plainly conveys the idea reproduced in our text: "I cause evil beasts to pass through the land, and they shall bereave it, so that it be desolate, that no man may pass through because of the beasts" (Ezek. XIV. 15; see also Isai. XXXIII. 8).

Philological Remarks. — "And if

23. And if you will not be reformed by Me by these *things*, but will walk contrary to Me; 24. Then will I also walk contrary to you, and I also will chas-

you walk with Me" קֶרִי, literally "in an encounter", that is, in hostile meeting and revolt, or inimically; for קֶרִי in הָלַךְ קֶרִי, which occurs only in this chapter, is the absolute accusative with adverbial force, as in the analogous phrase הָלַךְ רָכִיל (XIX. 16; see p. 414); it alternates, therefore, with בְּקֶרִי (in pausa בְּקֶרִי, vers. 24, 27, 40, 41). Kimchi explains: "If you say, that the inflictions which I bring upon you come by chance (דרך מקרה הם), and not as a retribution for your sins" — which sense cannot grammatically be derived from the words הלך קרי.—שֶׁבַע is in apposition with or qualification of מַכָּה, "I will bring plagues upon you, and that seven times more than before, in accordance with your sins".—With והשלחתי בכם את חית השדה וכ׳ (ver. 22) "I will also send wild beasts among you" etc., compare Ezek. V. 17 (ושלחתי עליכם ··· חיה רעה ··· וְשִׁכְּלֻךָ); XIV. 20 (וחיה רעה ··· שלחתי); see also XXXIII. 27, and *supra* on ver. 6.—With והכריתו את בהמתכם וכ׳ and they shall destroy your cattle, compare Ezek. XIV. 13, 17, 20; XXV. 13; XXIX. 8. — With ונשמו דרכיכם and your highways shall be desolate, compare Isai. XXXIII. 8 (נשמו מסלות); see also Zeph. III. 6.

**23—26.** The third gradation does not consist of new calamities, but of former visitations fearfully intensified—of discomfiture so disastrous and so complete, that resistance is abandoned as hopeless; those who escape from the sword, seek the protection of the walled and fortified towns as their last refuge; but they are pursued and besieged by the relentless enemy; they begin to be pressed by want; still they hold out; they anxiously husband their scanty provisions; they are content with meagre rations which, doled out by weight, do not satisfy their hunger, and barely ward off starvation; yet, faint as they are, they do not yield; but then large numbers are struck down by pestilence, and the remnant fall into the hands of their foes. And why do these terrible trials befall them? Because by their unblushing breach of the Divine covenant, they have provoked not merely retribution but vengeance; they have to suffer because their iniquities overthrow the common ordinances binding upon all men, and because they violate pledges which they had specially and solemnly given to their Divine Lawgiver and Ruler; the sword, therefore, which destroys them, is "an avenger of the covenant". Thus our author skilfully approaches closer to those more recent calamities which his own contemporaries were bemoaning in their exile. He may also have had in his mind the numerous antecedent wars of Judah and Israel, and the sieges of Samaria and Jerusalem during the attacks of the Syrians and Assyrians, when "an ass's head was sold for eighty shekels, and the fourth part of a cab of dove's dung for five shekels of silver" (2 Ki. VI. 25); but he seems more especially to allude to the horrors of the Babylonian invasions, and to the words with which the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel describe them, and of which his own appear like an epitome: "I will smite", wrote Jeremiah, "the inhabitants of this city, both man and beast; they shall die of a great pestilence; and afterwards, says the

**tise you seven times for your sins. 25. And I will bring the sword upon you, that shall avenge My covenant; and when you are gathered together within your cities, I will send pestilence among you, and you shall be delivered into the hand of the enemy; 26. While I break the staff of your bread, so that ten women shall bake your bread in one oven, and they shall deliver *you* your bread again by weight, and you shall eat *it*, and not be satisfied.**

Lord, I will deliver Zedekiah, king of Judah, and his servants, and the people, and such as are left in this city, from the pestilence, from the sword, and from the famine, into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, . . . and he shall smite them with the edge of the sword" (Jer. XXI. 5, 6). More graphically Ezekiel announces, "The sword is without, and the pestilence and famine within; he that is in the field shall die with the sword, and he that is in the city, famine and pestilence shall devour him" (Ezek. VII. 15; comp. V. 12); and he also notices the famine in terms with which those of our author are almost identical, "Son of man, behold, I will break the staff of bread in Jerusalem, and they shall eat bread by weight, and in sorrow; and they shall drink water by measure, and in distress" (Ezek. IV. 16; comp. V. 16, 17; Jer. IV. 5—10; XIV. 18; XXI. 3—10; XXIV. 8—10; LII. 6; Lam. I. 20; IV. 9; Isai. XXII. 2; 2 Ki. VI. 25 *sqq.*; VII. 4; XVIII. 9, 10, 13 *sqq.*).

Philological Remarks. — With ואם ··· לא תִוָּסְרוּ (ver. 23) and if you will not be reformed, compare Ps. II. 10 (הִוָּסְרוּ); Jer. VI. 8; see also Prov. XXIX. 18. — לִי "by Me" (see Gramm. § 86. 9. *i.*). — To ver. 25: With והבאתי עליכם חרב and I will bring the sword upon you, compare Ezek. V. 17 (וחרב אביא עליך); VI. 3; XIV. 17; XXIX. 8; XXXIII. 2; see also V. 1, 2, 12. — With ונאספתם אל עריכם and when you are gathered together within your cities, compare Jer. IV. 5 (האספו ונבואה אל ערי המבצר); XXI 4 (ואספתי אותם אל תוך העיר הזאת); see also XXXV. 11. — With ושלחתי דבר בתוככם I will send pestilence among you, compare Am. IV. 10 (שלחתי בכם דבר); Jer. XXIV. 10 (ושלחתי בם את הדבר); XXIX. 17; see also Deut. XXVIII. 21; Jer. XIV. 12. — נֹקֶמֶת נְקַם בְּרִית is simply "avenging the covenant", or the breach of the covenant; for נָקַם נְקָם is to avenge (Gram. § 102. 7). — To ver. 26: With בשברי לכם מטה לחם while I break the staff of your bread, compare Ezek. IV. 16 (הנני שבר מטה לחם); V. 16 (ושברתי לכם מטה לחם); XIV. 13. The phrase שבר מטה לחם meaning to inflict a famine, occurs only in Ezekiel and in our passage, and besides in Ps. CV. 16; comp. משען לחם and משען מים (Isai. III. 1) the support of bread and the support of water. The notion that bread, or food in general, is a "support" or a source of "strength" to the body, is natural; see also Gen. XVIII. 5; Judg. XIX. 5, 8; Ps. CIV. 15; comp. besides מַטֵּה עֹז in Ezek. XIX. 11—14; Ps. CX. 2; in later Hebrew, סעודה "support" is the ordinary word for meal or repast; and the younger Pliny calls food "the props" of the body (corpori vaco cujus fulturis animus sustinetur, *Plin.* Ep. I. 9): the Syriac version renders in Ps. CV.

27. And if you will not for *all* this hearken to Me, but walk contrary to Me; 28. Then I will walk contrary to you also in fury; and I will also chastise you seven times for your sins. 29. And you shall eat the flesh of your sons, and the flesh of your daughters shall you eat. 30. And I will

16 "the stalks of the corn". — With the phrase, "ten women shall bake your bread in one oven", compare Isai. IV. 1 ("seven women shall take hold of one man"); Zech. VIII. 23; etc. — Ordinarily each family has its own oven (תנור), or whatever the contrivance may be for baking bread, leavened or unleavened (see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 482); in the unhappy times foreshadowed, one oven will suffice for ten families; so limited will be their stores of flour. There were, however, also public baking houses, and Jeremiah (XXXVII. 21) mentions a "bakers' street" (חוץ האופים; comp. Hos. VII. 4). — With והשיבו לחמכם במשקל and they shall deliver you your bread again by weight, comp. Ezek. IV. 16 (ואכלו לחם במשקל). — With ואכלתם ולא תשבעו and you shall eat and not be satisfied, comp. Hos. IV. 10 (ואכלו ולא ישבעו); Mic. VI. 14 (אתה תאכל וכ'); see also Isai. IX. 19; Hagg. I. 6.

**27—33.** Are all these scourges insufficient to make the Hebrews pause and repent? The infatuated people continue their works of impiety, and they still "walk contrary" to God. But now even His long-suffering is exhausted. He no longer deals out simply "measure for measure", but He "walks contrary" to the people "in fury"; He goads them to deeds of frenzy and appalling horror; He declares to the desperate crowd maddened by hunger, "You shall eat the flesh of your sons, and the flesh of your daughters shall you eat". Can any other calamities follow after this most heart-sickening trial? Yet they come, and they portend the bitter end. The idolatrous heights and altars and statues, with which the land is filled, are cut down, and the corpses of the Hebrews mingle with the fragments of those misshapen images in one ghastly heap. What is there that now prevents the heathen invaders from laying the towns in ashes, from overthrowing the Sanctuary, and converting the whole land into a waste and a wilderness, which they themselves, the new masters, shall behold with amazement? It may be that the people, in their consternation and agony, offer up sacrifices and burn incense; but their hearts are as stubborn as before; how should their offerings be accepted? God "abhors them"; He has "no delight in their sweet odours". So they flee from the soil of their ancestors, or they are carried away wretched captives; they may long to return, and to cultivate their fields as of old; but God frustrates their efforts; He sends the sword against them, and they are driven back; and so "their land remains desolate, and their cities remain waste."

Is this a picture drawn from imagination? It is not prophecy but history; every one of its awful details may by traced in the annals of the Hebrews, which our author so skilfully uses for his great and noble purpose. He alludes to the harrowing scenes that disgraced the siege of Samaria by the Syrians, when a Hebrew mother complained to Joram, the king of Israel, "This woman said to me, Give thy son, that we may eat

**destroy your high places, and cut down your sun-images, and cast your carcases upon the carcases of your idols, and My soul shall abhor you. 31. And I will make your cities waste, and bring your Sanctuaries to desolation, and I will not smell your sweet odours. 32. And I will bring the land into desolation, and your ene-**

him to day, and we will eat my son to-morrow; so we boiled my son, and did eat him; and I said to her on the next day, Give thy son that we may eat him; and she has hidden her son" (2 Ki. VII. 28, 29). He remembers the distress that prevailed during the siege of Jerusalem by the Chaldean hosts, when "the hands of merciful women boiled their own children, who were their food" (Lam. IV. 10; comp. II. 20), and when the people "ate the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters, and ate every one the flesh of his friend in the siege and in their straitness" (Jer. XIX. 9). He suppresses indeed the cruel and loathsome details with which the misery and the atrocity of those times are depicted in Deuteronomy (XXVIII. 53—57); yet what can exceed the emphasis of his simple menace, "And you shall eat the flesh of your sons, and the flesh of your daughters shall you eat"! He followed here also his great model Ezekiel, who likewise coupled the siege of the capital with the dispersion of the people: "The fathers shall eat the sons in the midst of thee, and the sons shall eat their fathers; and I will execute judgment in thee, and the whole remnant of thee will I scatter into all the winds" (Ezek. V. 10; comp. also Isai. IX. 19; Zech. XI. 9; see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 324 note 5). But he reproduced the words of Ezekiel still more closely in menacing the annihilation of idols in Judea; for the prophet had written: "I will destroy your high places utterly (במותיכם), and your altars shall be desolate, and your sun-images (חמניכם) shall be broken, and I will cast down your slain men before your idols (גלוליכם), and will lay the dead carcases (פגרי) of the children of Israel before their idols, and I will scatter your bones round about your altars" (Ezek. VI. 3—7). Of these and of the following sentences our passage is a pithy abridgement. — We need not repeat, how common were in the Holy Land "the heights", and how numerous the statues of Baal and Ashtarte — the images of the sun and the moon — which the Hebrews worshipped on those heights and in sacred groves down to the latest times of the monarchy, and how difficult it was to wean them from these abuses even after their return from the captivity: it is certainly not surprising that, after their contact with the Persians, they should have clung with increased obstinacy to the worship of the Sun (see Comm. on Lev. I. 357—362, 372, 373). — It is recorded, that Josiah, in his reforming zeal, "broke in pieces the statues, and destroyed the images of Ashtarte (אשרות), and filled their places with the bones of men"; and that in Samaria "he sacrificed (ויזבח) all the priests of the high places that were there upon the altars, and burnt men's bones upon them" (2 Ki. XXIII. 14, 20; 2 Chr. XXXIV. 5): similar facts and traditions may have been in our author's thoughts when he announced the piling up of the dead bodies of ido-

mies who dwell therein shall be amazed at it. 33. And I will scatter you among the nations, and will draw out the sword after you, and your land shall be desolate, and your cities shall be waste. — 34. Then shall the land pay off its Sabbaths as long as it lies desolate, and you *are* in your enemies' land; then shall the land

laters together with the shivered limbs of their idols; but the vengeance which he describes is not the vengeance of a pious Hebrew king, but of a heathen conqueror.

No one who reads these verses without preconceptions, can deny that, in the writer's time, the "high places" had long been used by the Hebrews, and the idols so distinctly specified had actually been worshipped by them in Canaan; and that, therefore, these statements refer to a post-Mosaic age (see *supra* p. 583). Let the tenor of our section, as the author wished it to be understood, for a moment be considered. The Hebrews had just been released from the oppressive bondage of Egypt; they were still far distant from the land of promise, which they reached only forty years later, and which they had to conquer from warlike tribes in protracted wars: yet then already, in the desert of Sinai, they were told, that their future home would be devastated, and that they themselves would be expelled from it, on account of their inveterate wickedness. The conception is indeed grand, and bespeaks a genius capable of surveying and linking together the history of millenniums; yet he is unable to conceal, that the annals of that history lie complete before him, and that they have furnished him the materials for his far-reaching combinations (comp. also 1 Ki. IX. 2—9). He writes as his predecessor wrote: "A third part of thee shall die with the pestilence, and with famine shall they be consumed in the midst of thee; and a third part shall fall by the sword round about thee; and I will scatter a third part into all the winds, and I will draw out a sword after them" (Ezek. V. 12; comp. XII. 14, 15).

Philological Remarks. — The קְרִי "encounter" of the Hebrews will be met by the חֲמַת קְרִי of God (ver. 28), which is, literally, "the wrath of encounter", that is, by a wrathful hostility on the part of God, inflicting frightful calamities; compare Jer. XXI. 5 ובאף ובחמה ובקצף גדול, and the whole passage vers. 4—10, which is closely parallel to ours; see also Ezek. V. 13, 15 (בחמה ובתכחות חמה); VI. 12; Lam. II. 11; Isai. LXIII. 3; LXVI. 15; etc. — We have shown before how utterly groundless is the view brought forward by some (as *Ghillany*, Menschenopfer, pp. 643—647), that the eating of human flesh in exceptional cases of agonising want proves, that "cannibalism" was a common and prevailing habit among the Hebrews, especially in connection with sacrifices (comp. Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 410, 411). — The parallels to the words ואכלתם בשר בניכם have been given above in the general notes. — To ver. 30: With והשמדתי את במותיכם וכ׳ and I will destroy your high places, and will cut down your sun-images, compare Ezek. VI. 3, 4, 6 (ואבדתי במותיכם ··· ונשברו חמניכם). — With ונתתי את פגריכם וכ׳ and I will cast your carcases upon the carcases of your idols, compare Ezek. VI. 4, 5, 13 (ונתתי את פגרי בני ישראל לפני גלוליהם).—On "heights"

**rest, and pay off its Sabbaths; 35. As long as it lies desolate, it shall rest *the years* which it did not rest in your Sabbaths, when you dwelt upon it. 36. And *as to* those that are left *alive* of you, I will send a faintness into their hearts in the lands of their enemies; and the sound of a shaken leaf shall chase them, and they shall flee *as if* fleeing from a**

(בָּמֹת), see Comm. on Lev. I. 372, 373; comp. also *Graf* in Merx' Archiv, 1867, pp. 95, 108. — חַמָּן from חַמָּה sun, properly an adjective "appertaining to the sun" or "solar", whence בעל חמן, which has repeatedly been found on Phoenician and Palmyrene inscriptions, the Sun-Baal, and חמנים statues or memorial stones of this deity (analogous to בְּעָלִים and אֲשֵׁרִים statues of Baal and Ashera), which were placed on the altars of the god (comp. 2 Chr. XXXIV. 4). The ancient translations are vague or inexact, rendering simply either images or shrines (Sept. ξύλινα χειροποίητα, or in other passages εἴδωλα, βδελύγματα, τεμένη, or ὑψηλά, Vulg. simulacra, delubra, Syr. חלתא, etc.), and so many later interpreters; but the Arabic version (Erpen.) renders correctly شمسات suns, which Kimchi explains to mean "images made for idolatrous worship of the sun"; while Rashi, Ebn Ezra, and Abarbanel, though justly referring the word to חמה sun, questionably modify the sense (Rashi, "a kind of idol, which was placed on the roofs, and because the statues were exposed to the sun—חמה—they were called חמנים"; Ebn Ezra and Abarbanel, "houses or temples, in which people worshipped the sun"). Onkelos renders חַמָּן by the unusual word חנסנים, which has hardly yet found a satisfactory explanation (the conjecture proposed in Frankel's Monatsschrift 1859, p. 319, that it is identical with the Greek χώνευσις, χωνευτός or χώνευμα, an image formed of molten metal, seems hazardous). See *supra* on vers. 1, 2, p. 580; Comm. on Lev. I. pag. 361 notes 14 and 15; *Spencer*, Legg. Ritt. Lib. II. c. 25, pp. 469—482; *Jablonski*, Panth. Aeg. III, Proleg. § 34, pp. 80—83; *Michael.* Supplem. pp. 817—821; *Gesen.* Thes. pp. 489—491; *Movers*, Phoeniz. I. 188, 294, 345, etc.; *Franks*, On recent excavations and discoveries on the site of ancient Carthage, 1860, pp. 18 *sqq.*—פֶּגֶר corpse is only in this passage applied to shattered idols; but the term is intelligible, since idols were supposed to have consciousness and sensation (Vulg. cadetis inter ruinas idolorum vestrorum; comp. Comm. l. c. p. 371): it is unnecessary to assume, that animals are meant worshipped by the Hebrews in imitation of the Egyptians. — To ver. 31: ונתתי את עריכם חרבה and I will make your cities waste, compare Ezek. VI. 6 (הערים תחרבנה), 14; XII. 19, 20; XIV. 16; XXXVI. 4; Jer. IV. 7; IX. 10; XXV. 11, 18; see also Jer. IV. 7.— With והשמותי את מקדשיכם and I will bring your Sanctuaries into desolation, compare Ezek. IX. 6; Ps. LXXIV. 7. — The plural מקדשיכם your Sanctuaries may be explained by the two altars, in the Court and the Holy; but Siphra, applying the notions and institutions of a later time, supposes that the מקדשים include the Synagogues and colleges (לרבות בתי כנסיות ובתי מדרשות); others believe, that idolatrous temples are meant, though the phrase אריח בריח ניחוח seems to refer to the offerings on the legitimate altar; while Rashi explains curiously, that the word denotes the

**sword, and they shall fall when none pursues. 37. And they shall fall one upon another, as *it were* before a sword, when none pursues; and you shall have no power to stand before your enemies. 38. And you shall perish among the nations, and the land of your enemies shall eat you up. 39. And those that are left of you, shall**

pilgrims, and he paraphrases והשמותי את מקדשיכם thus: "I will make the Temple empty, for no more shall multitudes of Israelites, as before, sanctify themselves (מתקדשות) and prepare to journey thither" (comp. Ezek. VII. 24, מְקַדְּשֵׁיהֶם for מִקְדְּשֵׁיהֶם; see *Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. III. 234; IV. 170, 171). The Samaritan codex has מקדשכם without י; but the plural occurs in several other passages also (Lev. XXI. 23; Ps. LXVIII. 36; LXXIII. 17; Ezek. XXI. 7; XXVIII. 18). — On the phrase ריח ניחוח see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 7, 8; comp. Ezek. XX. 41; it is here completed by the verb ריח, which means to delight in something (comp. Am. V. 21; Isai. XI. 3). — To ver. 32: With ושממו עליה and they shall be amazed at it, compare Jer. XVIII. 16; XIX. 8 (כל עובר עליה ישום); 1 Ki. IX. 8. — "Your enemies that dwell therein" — these words imply, that the foreign conquerors will take possession of the land of the Hebrews and settle there (comp. Ezek. XXXVI. 5; Joel IV. 2). — To ver. 33: With ואתכם אזרה בגוים and I will scatter you among the nations, compare Ezek. V. 2, 10, 12; VI. 8; XII. 14, 15; XX. 23; XXII. 15; all which passages resemble ours in sense and language; see also Jer. IX. 15; Ps. XLIV. 12; Zech. II. 4; VII. 14. — With והריקתי אחריכם חרב and I will draw out the sword after you, compare Ezek. V. 2, 12; XII. 14 (וחרב אריק אחריהם); see also XXI. 8—10.

**34—39.** Now the author no longer delineates the past but the woful present, not the wind that had been sown, but the whirlwind that his generation were reaping; and his description has all the power and truth of the eye-witness. Yet it is not a piercing cry of agony and despair; he contemplates indeed with a heavy heart the terrible disasters under which his countrymen are writhing, but to his clear mind those disasters convey great lessons; they are the finger of God, and disclose to him the laws of Divine government. Rising above the troubled reality, he penetrates into the "seeds of time" and into the secrets of the moral world. What, he asks himself, is the condition of this unhappy people in their dispersion? Their thoughts wander to their own loved land; they know it is lying in desolation; and with bitter self-reproaches they confess, that it suffers that dire fate because they had not allowed it to rest during the Divinely appointed Sabbatical years—no, not all the time they had held it in possession: having eaten the fruits that belonged to God and His poor, they have now to repay them in grief and distress. Thus weighed down by sorrow and remorse, they lose all courage and confidence; they are terrified by imaginary dangers; surrounded by enemies who do not speak their own tongue, their anguish, their "faintness of heart" conjures up everywhere attack and fierce onslaught and pursuit; they are "chased by the sound of a shaken leaf"; they hear the foe following in their track, they flee, they fall — and no one is pursuing them; in their confusion they rush

**pine away on account of their iniquity in the lands of your enemies, and also on account of the iniquities of**

blindly upon each other and fight for their lives, still haunted by the phantoms of danger: how should they make a stand before the enemy? Thus driven onward without rest and peace, many fall victims to their fears and anxieties — the strange land "eats them up." The survivors, tortured by remorse, languish away in wretchedness. And why do they suffer all these pangs and miseries? "They pine away on account of their iniquity, and also on account of the iniquities of their fathers with them do they pine away". This is the pith and kernel of the author's sketch: it is the sins of their fathers *together with their own*, which have brought down upon them such appalling distress. In the old and primary Commandments, the Hebrews had been taught, that God visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation *of those that hate Him*. Yet for many centuries afterwards, the proverb was current in Israel, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." Then Ezekiel, opposing this doctrine, declared: — "The soul that sins, it shall die; the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, nor shall the father bear the iniquity of the son" (Ezek. XVIII. 20; comp. Deut. XXIV. 16). And now our author, combining and applying the thoughts of the old and the recent master, insisted, that his countrymen were indeed suffering for the iniquity of their fathers, but only because they themselves "hated God", or had "walked contrary to Him"; their "teeth were on edge", because they themselves had "eaten sour grapes"; and they died and suffered because they had acted wickedly like their fathers. As once "the sin of the Amorites had been full", so the sin of the Hebrews was full then; their ancestors had begun to add guilt to guilt, and they had themselves completed the measure. Thus we have here again the same pragmatic survey and the same inductive construction of history which we have before admired (see p. 384); but we have *history* indeed; the non-observance of the Sabbatical years for many centuries was known to the author as a sad experience (see *supra* p. 535); and on such facts he built up a system, which, as might be expected, is indeed founded on history and philosophic thought, but culminates in theology and ethics.

In Deuteronomy, the picture of agonising restlessness and gratuitous terror is more detailed, yet hardly more thrilling, than in our passage: among the nations the Hebrews find no ease and no repose, for God gives them "a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind"; their lives are in constant danger, they fear day and night, and are never confident of safety. As a parallel, we may add a few lines of a Hindoo code, from which we have quoted before, and which thus describes the punishment of the sinner: "In his sleep he is violently plunged into water, and... falls in with carnivorous beasts; he is in the company of persons of the lowest castes, and of asses and camels; wherever he walks, he fancies himself pursued by enemies; he is distracted in mind, does useless things, and desponds without cause: if he be a prince, he does not obtain the government, ... if a scholar he gets no appointment, if a merchant no profit, if a husband-

**their fathers with them shall they pine away. 40. Then they will confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their**

man no harvest" (*Yâjnav.* I. 271—275).

Philological Remarks. — The meaning of רָצָה and of the Hiphil הרצה in connection with הארץ (vers. 34, 43) is apparent from ver. 43, in which the words והארץ ··· תִּרֶץ את שבתתיה are evidently placed in juxtaposition with והם ירצו עונם; but the latter words mean unquestionably "and they — the Hebrews — shall pay for their iniquity", that is, pay the penalty of their iniquity (comp. also ver. 41; Luther die Strafe ihrer Missethat); therefore, the first phrase אז תרצה הארץ את שבתתיה signifies no doubt, "and the earth shall pay the penalty of its (neglected) Sabbatical years", as a debt which it has incurred; which figure of speech is fully in harmony with Biblical notions (comp. Ebn Ezra תשלים; Abarbanel in loc. תפרע את חובה, and הרצה היא מלת השלמה). The verb רָצָה with the accusat. indeed means frequently to enjoy or to delight in something (comp. Prov. III. 12; Job XIV. 6; etc.); but the translation "the land shall enjoy its Sabbaths", that is, shall delight in them (so Engl. Vers., Keil, a. o.), besides disregarding the parallelism referred to, involves an idea hardly in harmony with the context; for the land must be supposed to mourn, in sympathetic grief, for the misfortunes of the Hebrews and its own desolation, rather than to enjoy or to delight in its compulsory rest (comp. ver. 32, and the passages there quoted; see also 2 Chr. XXXVI. 21). Others render, even less plausibly, "the land will appease (תפייס) God on account of the Sabbatical years" (Rashi); or "the land will conciliate the Sabbatical years" incensed at the neglect they have suffered (Herxheim.); etc. — הָשַּׁמָּה is literally "its being devastated", though the suffix ה is without the mappik (comp. Exod. II. 3, הַצְּפִינוֹ ; see Gram. § LXII. 8); or it may be a feminine termination of the infinitive, which occurs so often in Kal, occasionally in Piel, and once in Hiphil (הֲנָחָה; see Gram. § XXXIX. 1).— About הִרְצָת instead of הִרְצְתָה see *supra* on XXV. 21 עָשָׂת; p. 558. — As שָׁבַת is construed with the accusative (comp. XXIII. 32, תשבתו שבתכם), it is easy to account for the phrase תשבת את אשר לא שבתה (ver. 35), that is, the earth will rest or keep the Sabbaths which it did not keep before; את אשר needs, therefore, not to be translated "because" (Engl. Vers. a. o.), as it is always a real, though elliptical, accusative (so also in Gen. XXX. 29; Deut. IX. 7; XXIX. 15). — Jewish writers attempt various computations to show, how the number of neglected Sabbatical years coincides with the years of the captivity (see *Rashi* in loc. after Seder Olam; *Abarban.* in loc.; etc.; comp. *supra* on XXV. 1, p. 536; see also Ezek. IV. 4—6; XIV. 34). — On the construction והנשארים בכם וכ׳ (ver. 36), the principal notion being placed first in an absolute form, see Gram. § 75. 5. — מֹרֶךְ, as appears from the parallel passage in Deuteronomy (XXVIII. 65), is faintness or fear, cowardice and anguish (Sept. δειλία, Vulg. pavor, etc.), whether the word be derived from רכך to be timid, after the analogy of מֶכֶס from כסס, or from the root מרך (which, however, occurs nowhere else in the O. T.) kindred with מרח and מרק to rub away, to wear out (comp. Ezek. XXI. 12, וְנָמֵס כל לב וכ׳).

**fathers in trespassing against Me, and also that they have walked contrary to Me; 41. *And that* I also have**

— וְנָסוּ מְנֻסַת חֶרֶב literally, and they shall flee the flight of the sword, that is, as if they were escaping from the sword (comp. ver. 37, כמפני חרב, and ver. 25, נקמת נקם ברית). — With ואין רודף compare Prov. XXVIII. 1, נסו ואין רודף רשע. — תְּקוּמָה (ver. 37) standing, or power to stand (καὶ οὐ δυνήσεσθε ἀντιστῆναι; comp. Josh. VII. 12, 13; Judg. II. 14). — ואכלה אתכם וכ׳ (ver. 38), comp. Ezek. XXXVI. 13; Num. XIII. 32. — With ימקו בעונם (ver. 39) compare Ezek. IV. 17 (ונמקו בעונם); XXIV. 23 (ונמקתם בעונתיכם); XXXIII. 10. — They shall pine away בעונות אבותם אִתָּם on account of the sins of their fathers with them, that is, on account of their fathers, who sinned with or like them. (Onkel. "and also on account of the evil sins of their fathers which they hold fast in their hands, shall they pine away"; similarly Siphra, Rashi כשאוחזים מעשה אבותיהם בידיהם, etc.). Others explain, "on account of the sins of their fathers, which are with them, and which they must bear and expiate"; and others again, joining אִתָּם with ימקו, translate, "they shall pine away with them"; so the Masorites understood the words, as they placed a conjunctive accent beneath אתם. — In the 39th and the following verse עון is iniquity, not punishment of iniquity.

**40—45.** But the author, who longed for the revival of the house of Israel, could not conclude with menace and despair; and as his object was to reform and to encourage his sorely tried countrymen by rebuke, rather than to crush them by anguish, he held out to them the prospect of help and release, and of a speedy restoration to Divine favour. He saw with satisfaction, that they had at last begun to connect their misfortunes with their own reckless iniquity and that of former generations, to confess their sins, nay to humble their hearts hitherto hardened and "uncircumcised"; and accustomed as he was to trace the course of events to the people's conduct, and firmly relying on God's justice and mercy, he confidently predicted, that those germs of contrition and repentance would burst forth in deliverance, and result in God's gracious remembrance of the covenant concluded with the primeval patriarchs, and ratified by the wonderful redemption from Egypt. He was justified in regarding that feeling of humility and penitence as strong and genuine; for it did not remain without fruits; it gave rise to the development of the sin-offerings, which approach nearest to a true heart service, and to the institution of the Day of Atonement, which preserved in the nation at once a consciousness of human guilt and a yearning for Divine purity (see *supra* p. 276). But though sure of God's renewed favour, he described the form in which it would be manifested with caution; he merely assured his anxious contemporaries, that "even in the land of their enemies, God would not cast them away nor abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break His covenant with them." He did not even speak with the decision and distinctness of his predecessors; for he must have read in the Book of Jeremiah the Divine announcement, "After seventy years are accomplished at Babylon, I will remember you, and perform My good promise toward you, in causing you to return to this place" (Jer. XXIX. 10; comp. XII.

**walked contrary to them, and have brought them into the land of their enemies: if then their uncircumcised**

15, 16; XXIV. 6); and he was no doubt familiar with the prophecy of Ezekiel, "In My holy mountain, says the Lord God, there shall all the house of Israel, all of them in the land serve Me; there will I accept them, and there will I require your offerings . . . I will accept you with your sweet odour, when I bring you out from the people, and gather you out of the countries wherein you have been scattered" (Ezek. XX. 40, 41). He merely, in his own more brief and emphatic manner, expressed again the hope of the *moral* regeneration of Israel; and as a sure guarantee of deliverance, he pointed to God as the Eternal and Unchangeable (אני יהוה), who was certain to redeem His old pledges. Like all the nobler minds, he clung, with rocklike firmness, to the conviction, that God had entered with the Hebrews into relations absolutely and for ever indestructible; this conviction proved an anchor in times of trouble, and a beacon in ages of depravity. How far he followed the two great prophets nearly contemporary with him, may be judged from the following parallels. "I will give thee", declared Jeremiah in the name of God, "a heart to know Me that I am the Lord; and they shall return to Me with their whole heart" (Jer. XXIV. 7; comp. XXIX. 12, 13; XXXII. 39—41; XXXIII. 7, 8); and more explicitly still wrote Ezekiel, "And they that escape of you shall remember Me among the nations whither they shall be carried captives, when I have subdued their faithless heart, which has departed from Me, . . . and they shall loathe themselves for the evils which they have committed in all their abominations" (Ezek. VI. 9; comp. XI. 18—20; XVI. 60; XXXVI. 25—33; XXXVII. 23—28; see also Deut. IV. 29—31; XXX. 1—10). Our author is indeed full of trust; but so dense is the gloom of exile, and so sad the reality around him, that hope seems like a distant and indistinct vision.

His pictures of blessing and curse, though grand and largely conceived, move within the old ideas of retribution: piety secures earthly boons, wickedness is attended with calamity, and the deeds of one generation are sure to influence the fate of later ages — as the Hebrews suffered for their ancestors' sins, so also were they benefited by their ancestors' merit and righteousness. Yet there are several points which, in fairness to our author, ought not to be overlooked. Addressing his speech to the nation, rather than to individuals, he is justified in making national prosperity dependent on public virtue; and in doing so, he by no means confines himself to material boons, such as wealth and power, long life and posterity; but his promises comprise God's presence in the midst of the people and His spiritual grace; while his menaces include despondency and oppression of heart, gnawing remorse and torturing self-reproach. A nation that aimed at being a "holy" people, because God, their Ruler and Guide, is holy, cannot be said to have regarded virtue simply as a means of worldly success, and not to have prized and practised it for its own sake. The healthy mind will ever hold fast to the belief, that dutiful and conscientious work does not only yield inward satisfaction, but will also procure the necessaries of life; the

**hearts will be humbled, and they will then pay *the penalty of* their iniquity, 42. I will remember My covenant with Jacob, and also My covenant with Isaac, and also My covenant with Abraham will I remember; and I will remember the land. 43. For the land shall be deserted by them, and shall pay off its Sabbaths, while it lies desolate without them; and they shall pay *the penalty of* their iniquity, because, even because they despised My judgments, and because their souls abhorred My statutes. 44. And yet**

contrary conception would engender the utmost prostration and confusion. Long before the Babylonian age, in which our author wrote, the questions of Divine government, and the apparent arbitrariness in the distribution of human happiness, had engaged many reflecting minds; but their speculations had led to no new conclusions; the sum of their convictions remained, as it had been of old, "Say to the righteous that it shall be well with them, for they shall eat the fruit of their doings; woe to the wicked! it shall be ill with him; for the reward of his hands shall be given to him" (Isai. III. 10, 11). Yet even after the Book of Job had, in the Persian period, discussed the subject with a depth, a power, and a boldness till then unexampled, the traditional views remained practically prevalent. For in seasons of sorrow, men found no great comfort in the *negative* results set forth in that Book — neither in the melancholy and humiliating truth that wisdom is nowhere found among men, nor in the abstract maxim that the decrees of God are unfathomable and inscrutable: for resignation is not happiness, and the virtual abandonment of a momentous and vital problem does not secure peace and contentment. It was only when the doctrine of immortality or of future compensation was developed and gained ground, that all doubts were solved and all anxieties calmed. However, even then the people adhered to the time-honoured teaching, which is so congenial to the human mind, because it manifests God's justice and providence in the most direct manner; and the doctrine of retribution pervades the New Testament as it pervades the Old (comp. Matth. XIX. 29; Luke V. 20; John V. 14).

Philological Remarks. — On מעל (ver. 40), wich involves the notion of faithlessness, and refers here to the heedless breach of the Divine covenant on the part of the Hebrews, see Comm. on Levit. I. 267 note 20; and on the metaphorical use of עָרֵל (ver. 41), notes on XIX. 23 and Exod. VI. 12. — The words אף אני אלך וכ׳ (ver. 41) must logically be construed with והתודו (ver. 40), and are co-ordinated with ואף אשר הלכו; therefore אף אני stands for ואף אשר אני, and the future אֵלֵךְ, expressing a continued or often repeated action, has the meaning of the past (Gramm. § 94. 8): in their exile, the Hebrews will acknowledge, that their distress was inflicted upon them by God in His anger and "hostility"; and that they had fully merited it by their wickedness. — או seems here to have the sense of *if* (as in IV. 28; Exod. XXI. 36; 2 Sam. XVIII. 13) — "if

even so, while they are in the land of their enemies, I do not cast them away, nor do I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break My covenant with them; for I *am* the Lord their God. 45. But I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt before the eyes of the nations, that I might be their God: I *am* the Lord.

46. These *are* the statutes and the judgments and

then (after the confession of their sins) the Hebrews humble their hearts, then I will remember My covenant"; the Sept. omits א׳, the Vulgate renders אִז א׳ donec, Luther da wird sich ja ihr Herz demüthigen, Rosenm. usque dum, Maurer nisi forte, Knob. ob etwa, Keil oder vielmehr. — ירצו את עונם is "they will pay the penalty of their iniquity" (see *supra* on ver. 34); some take רָצָה here also in the sense of enjoying, and translate either "they will be well pleased with their sins" (Sept. εὐδοκήσουσι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν; Keil sie werden ihre Missethaten geniessen), or "they will take pleasure in the punishment they receive for their sins" (Luther sie werden sich die Strafe ihrer Missethat gefallen lassen); that is, as has been explained, "they will rejoice to have been so deeply humbled, and to have thus been brought to see the abyss of sin into which they had fallen" (Keil) — or "having repented, they shall have the blessing of chastisement" (*Cook's* Holy Bible) — an idea which its advocates themselves describe as "bold" or "paradoxical", and which certainly appears too abstract (comp. Tobit XIII. 1—15). The Vulgate renders inaccurately tunc orabunt pro impietatibus suis. — On the irregular phrase בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקוֹב, a construct state following after a noun with a suffix, see Gramm. § LXXXVII. 11 (but in 2 Ki. XIII. 23, בריתו אֶת־אברהם; comp. Lev. XXVII. 12, הָעֶרְכְּךָ הַכֹּהֵן; though some take the י in בריתי as י paragog. "the covenant of Jacob"; comp. *Gesen.* Gramm. § 322. 2); and on בְּהָשַּׁמָּה for בְּהָשַּׁמָּה (with dagesh in ש), see Gramm. §§ XI. 4. b; LXII. 8. — The emphatic conjunction יען וביען (ver. 43) occurs, besides, only in Ezek. XIII. 10, and יען ביען in Ezek. XXXVI. 3.

**46.** Here ended the collection of laws, which tradition or some learned historian assigned to the period, when the Hebrews were encamped in the regions of Mount Sinai; and here the Book of Leviticus was originally finished — "These are the statutes and the judgments and the laws, which the Lord made between Himself and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses". It was at the end of the Book that the compiler fitly placed the promise of rewards and the menace of punishments; and not to him is due the incongruity, that a new series of important laws, also purporting to have been revealed in the district of Horeb, was appended, and that the reviser then added another formula of conclusion (XXVII. 34), which not only rendered that of our chapter superfluous, but made it appear inappropriate. — The term

**the laws, which the Lord made between Himself and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses.**

"in Mount Sinai" (בהר סיני) means not only the mountain itself, but also the localities near it, since many laws were communicated to Moses from the Tabernacle (see *supra* p. 539). — The commands were intended to confirm the covenant concluded between God and the Hebrews, or they formed a part of that covenant; and hence the expression "the laws which the Lord made between Himself and the children of Israel" (בינו ובין בני ישראל), aptly points to the chief object of the theocratic legislation.

# X.

# LAWS ON VOTIVE OFFERINGS AND TITHES.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

SUMMARY. — This appendix begins with the laws concerning votive offerings; viz. 1. If *persons* are dedicated or dedicate themselves to God by a vow (נֶדֶר; vers. 1—8); 2. If *animals* are offered to God as vows (vers. 9—13), for which purpose, however, firstborn beasts are not available (vers. 26, 27); 3. If *houses* (vers. 14, 15), and 4. If *fields* are so sanctified (הקדיש; vers. 16—26); and 5. If men, animals, or hereditary fields are "devoted" (החרים) to God (vers. 28, 29). — Then follow precepts respecting the tithes both of vegetable produce and of the increase of flocks and herds (vers. 30—33). — Another conclusion winds up the collection of Sinaitic laws (ver. 34).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Speak

**1.** *General Survey.* — Vows so naturally result from the same feelings and notions as sacrifices, that both are co-eval and nearly co-extensive. A vow was offered by the patriarch Jacob in these explicit words: "If God will be with me . . . and I return again to my father's house in peace, . . . then this stone, which I have set for a monument, shall be a house of God; and of all that Thou wilt give me, I shall surely give the tenth part to Thee" (Gen. XXVIII. 20 — 22); and vows were usual among nearly all the more civilised nations of the ancient world. Being pronounced either when dangers threaten, or when they have been successfully overcome, they correspond in meaning to holocausts, and still more to thank-offerings, one class of which is indeed called "vow-offerings" (VII. 16; XXII. 18, 21; see notes in locc., and Comm. on Lev. I. p. 2; Num. XV. 3 *sqq.*; Deut. XII. 17, 18; 1 Sam. I. 21). Yet Hebrew legislators and moralists do not seem to have encouraged this form of religious service. Experience had probably taught them, how difficult it was for persons harassed by the ex-

**to the children of Israel, and say to them, When a man**

citement of trouble and misfortune, to weigh their words with calmness, and not to utter vows which afterwards they might deeply regret, or perhaps regard with amazement; and the one instance of Jephthah, which seems to have been kept fresh in the memory of the people by annual celebrations, was sufficient to serve as a terrible warning. They insisted, therefore, that pledges should be given with the utmost caution. A proverb declared, "It is a snare for a man to be heedless in sacred things, and to consider only after the vow" (Prov. XX. 25); and the Preacher gives the most emphatic admonitions: "Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter anything before God; for God is in heaven and thou art upon earth; therefore let thy words be few" (Eccles. V. 1). But they were too conscientious and too earnest to permit trifling with holy promises once made, since they considered them no less solemn and binding than oaths; and they enjoined again and again: "When thou shalt vow a vow to the Lord thy God, thou shalt not be slow in paying it, for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee, and it would be sin in thee" (Deut. XXIII. 22, 24; comp. Num. XXX. 3); or "When thou vowest a vow to God, defer not to pay it, for He has no pleasure in the wicked; . . . better is it that thou shouldest not vow, than that thou shouldest vow and not pay" (Eccl. V. 3, 4). They seem to have had no reason to complain of want of zeal on the part of the people; for though instances of base evasion may have occurred (Mal. I. 14), vows were, as a rule, faithfully kept even under the most harrowing circumstances. When Jephthah saw his daughter, who had come out to meet him, he exclaimed, "I have opened my mouth to the Lord and I cannot go back" (לא אוכל לשוב); and the maiden replied, "My father, thou hast opened thy mouth to the Lord, do to me according to that which has proceeded out of thy mouth"; upon which Jephthah "did with her according to his vow which he had vowed" (Judg. XI. 35, 36, 39; see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 383—390; comp. also 2 Sam. XV. 7, 8; Ps. XXII. 26; LXVI. 13; LXXVI. 12; CXVI. 14, 18). Nevertheless the Deuteronomist, anxious to shield the people from guilt, expressly declared, "If you shall forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in you" (XXIII. 23). The levitical writers, on the other hand, were of opinion, that vows, in spite of inherent dangers and disadvantages, might prove an inestimable help in promoting both the spiritual and the material interests which they had at heart. For they had so fully developed the sacrificial system, and had so minutely prescribed offerings and rituals for every conceivable emergency, that they were glad to afford to the people means for the free exercise of piety and for satisfying spontaneous emotions and impulses. And they were naturally desirous of increasing in every possible manner the revenues of the Temple and of their own order. By enacting a series of laws on votive gifts, they might well hope to attain this twofold end most effectually: they introduced an element of liberty into the rigorous compulsion of the Law, and they opened a source of income which, considering the bias of their time, could not fail to prove most productive.

Means had been devised of mitigat-

**shall pronounce a vow, the persons *shall be* for the Lord**

ing the baneful effects of heedless vows by expiatory sacrifices, which had then been worked out in their full depth. Therefore, a levitical code ordained, that rash pledges and protestations might be atoned for by a female lamb or goat killed as a sin-offering, or in cases of poverty by two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, one presented as a sin-offering, the second as a holocaust (Lev. V. 4—10). And another ordinance, supplementing our law, prescribed that the vows of dependent persons, such as daughters, wives, or slaves, might be annulled by those who have authority over them, and who may be supposed to possess greater experience and superior judgment, by their fathers, husbands, or masters; and it was promised that God would pardon the imprudent utterances (Num. XXX. 3—17). And lastly, the duties of the Nazarite, who by a solemn vow bound himself "to keep aloof" from certain things, and to devote himself entirely to God, were accurately specified, and surrounded with all the solemnity which they could derive from sacrificial ceremonies (Num. VI. 1—21).

As regards the spirit and date of our section, there can hardly be a doubt. When Jephthah made his vow to the effect, that the first who would meet him on his return "should belong to the Lord" (והיה ליהוה), he added as an explanation, "I will offer him up for a burnt-offering" (והעליתיהו עולה, Judg. XI. 31). And when Hannah prayed for a child, "she vowed a vow, and said, O Lord of hosts, if Thou ... wilt give to Thy handmaid a son, then I will give him to the Lord (ונתתיו ליהוה) all the days of his life, and then shall no razor come upon his head"; and when she brought her young son Samuel to Eli, the chief priest of the Sanctuary of Shilo, she declared, "I will lend him to the Lord (השאלתיהו ליהוה) as long as he lives, he shall be lent to the Lord" (1 Sam. I. 11, 27; III. 1). But the very first words of our section lay down this principle, "When a man shall utter a vow, the persons shall be for the Lord according to thy estimation" (ver. 2 בערכך נפשות ליהוה). To our author vowing a person to God meant neither offering him up as a sacrifice, nor dedicating him to the service of the Temple, and much less selling him as a slave, but simply redeeming him by money in favour of the sacred treasury: so foreign were the two former alternatives to his mind, that he utterly ignored them, and stated the third as a matter of course and as the only one to be at all considered. For in his time, human sacrifices, offered from whatever motive, were deemed an abomination, since then even that stage of the practice which underlies the story of Isaac's intended sacrifice, had long been passed; and in his time, the Levites were exclusively the appointed ministers of the Temple; any Hebrew of another tribe arrogating to himself priestly or levitical functions, was held guilty of death, and believed to bring fearful disasters upon the whole community (see Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 401, 412, 583). During many long ages women also seem to have served at the common Sanctuary, and might therefore dedicate themselves to God in the same manner as men; but by the levitical constitution they were utterly excluded from sacred ministrations, not only on account of the excesses to which their presence might give rise, but especially because their

**according to thy estimation. 3. And thy estimation shall**

condition of purity is periodically disturbed (comp. Exod. XXXVIII. 8; 1 Sam. II. 22). Now, as our law distinctly provides for the contingency that women vow themselves to God, it is evident, that redemption by money is invariably intended. The contrary opinion, which has been advocated by some, seems hardly to require a refutation, since it is opposed to the very spirit and tenour of our commands; but we may point out, that even the very poorest were to be "estimated" (ver. 8) and redeemed by any sum they might be able to afford, however much it fell short of the legal valuation; personal services were in no case demanded of them; and Hebrews who devoted themselves to God of their own free will, cannot be compared with the *Nethinim* or Temple servants, who, like the Gibeonites, were commonly foreigners or captives of war (comp. Comm. on Lev. I. 484, 485).

As early as in the remoter portions of the monarchical period, a certain practice with respect to the redemption of dedicated persons seems to have been established; for king Joash, in the instructions he gave as to the repairs of the Temple, mentioned "money of holy things, that was brought into the House of the Lord, current money, the money of every person according to his estimation" (2 Ki. XII. 5, איש כסף נפשות ערכו). But to our author was reserved that precise and systematic gradation in every detail, which is so striking a characteristic of the laws of sacrifice and purity, and which bespeaks the most advanced age of religious legislation. And this minuteness is couped with a depth of spiritual conception which is no less significant. For why was it necessary to enact ordinances on the dedication of persons, which in reality amounts to the payment of certain sums of money? But is it indeed nothing else than a free-will gift of silver? If a man dedicated himself to God, or if he dedicated to Him his child, he presented a holy offering of which the shekels he paid were merely a symbol; he gave up himself or the dearest treasure of his heart to Him whom he thereby acknowledged as the source of life and all happiness; the feeling which prompted this sacrifice hallowed his whole being and his future existence; and he was for ever a servant of the Lord. Therefore, it was expressly stated, that all estimations in reference to vows "should be according to the holy shekel" or "the shekel of the Sanctuary" (בשקל הקדש, ver. 25); if a clean sacrificial animal was vowed, it should not be redeemed at all, but remain sacred property (vers. 9, 10); and if an hereditary field, the owner should have no claim upon it before the next Jubilee (vers. 16—21). The dedication was meant to be an act of the most perfect devotion and self-denial. Who can fail to see, that laws so remarkably combining the claims of humanity and expediency, of spiritual life and a completely developed hierarchy, are the result of religious and political experience extending over many generations? If an additional proof were wanted, it might be found in the fact, that some of these ordinances are associated with the Jubilee (vers. 16—24), which, as we have shown, was the very latest of the great theocratic institutions, having been introduced even after the appointment of the Day of Atonement, with which it was brought into connection (see *supra* pp. 272, 539). And

**be of the male from twenty years old to sixty years**

this very late origin of our commands on votive gifts fully harmonises with the nature of the precepts on tithes (see notes on vers. 30—33). Our chapter has, therefore, been fitly placed at the end of the Book of Leviticus, of which it forms a most characteristic appendix.

Philological Remarks. — From these observations it will be evident, that an organic relation between this and the preceding sections cannot be discovered. The fact that in our chapter the Year or jubilee is incidentally mentioned, constitutes no internal connection with the twenty-fifth chapter, in which the Jubilee is elaborately discussed; and even if it did, both chapters are separated from each other by the announcement of blessings and curses (ch. XXVI). Another proof of unbroken continuity has been attempted by the following speculations. In the laws of the Sabbatical year and the Jubilee, God asserts His rights as the lord of the holy land; no less emphatically does He assert them in the law of tithes (vers. 30—33); and both laws have the identical object of securing to the people the true worship of God as their most precious privilege; now the tithes are meant to provide for the sustenance of the Levites, who principally help to uphold the covenant between God and Israel, and the same end is promoted by the ordinances on votive gifts; hence the laws of tithes and vows conclude appropriately the Sinaitic legislation, which can only be carried out by the aid of the Levites (comp. *Ranke*, Untersuch. I. 111; II. 121, 122). We admit, that the two principal subjects of our chapter fully accord with the tendency of the Book of Leviticus; for vows are a kind of offering, and the tithes support the priesthood; but the laws of sacrifice are virtually concluded in the seventh chapter, and the laws of the priesthood in the twenty-second; moreover, the ordinances on tithes do not refer to God as the Lord of the land, but as the Bestower of all wealth and prosperity, for they comprise the increase of flocks and herds also. The concluding formula at the end of the preceding chapter (XXVI. 46) unquestionably stamps our section as a later supplement added to the collection of Sinaitic laws; to suppose that it merely relates to the precepts on the Sabbatical year and the Jubilee, is impossible from its wording, "These are the statutes and the judgments and the laws" etc. (see *supra* p. 611). Hence some expositors, ready to concede the principal point, defend the supplementary character of our chapter by suggesting, that "vows and dedications form no integral part of the laws of the covenant, but being a voluntary exercise of piety common to all religions, lie properly beyond the sphere of the Law, and are here only meant to be harmonised with the legal codes of the Hebrews" (*Keil*, Lev. p. 165): but precisely the same might be said of a large portion of the sacrifices; they are voluntary, they are common to all ancient religions, and they are harmonised with the monotheistic conceptions of the Israelites. Bertheau (Gruppen, pp. 242—246) sees in the contents of Levit. XXVII. 1 to Numb. X. 10 a series of additions to the Sinaitic legislation, and observes, that our chapter (in which he counts two decades of laws) is joined with the preceding one "quite loosely and without any clear connection". Perowne admits, that it is "a later

**old, thy estimation shall be fifty shekels of silver, after the shekel of the Sanctuary. 4. And if it *be* a female, then thy estimation shall be thirty shekels. 5. And if *it be* from five years old to twenty years old, then thy**

appendix", and supposes, that "the transcriber considered it to be an integral part of the original Mosaic legislation, though he might be at a loss to assign it its place" (*Smith's* Dictionary of the Bible, II. 114; see on the other hand, *De Wette*, Beiträge, II. 286; *Vater*, Pentat. III. p. 477; *Nöldeke*, Untersuchungen, p. 71, etc.).

**2—8.** The scale of prices fixed for the redemption of persons, is sufficiently intelligible. As men were supposed to attain their full vigour in their twentieth year, the Israelites were, from this age, included in the national census, and from the same age the Levites were, at least in later times, admitted to their sacred ministrations (comp. Exod. XXX. 14; Num. I. 3; 1 Chr. XXIII. 27; 2 Chr. XXXI. 27; Ezra III. 8; see, however, Comm. on Lev. I. pp. 602, 603). And as the physical and intellectual powers were considered to remain essentially unimpaired to the sixtieth year, the highest sum of 50 shekels was demanded as a ransom for a man within those two epochs of life; while a woman of the same age, according to the current notions of woman as "the weaker vessel" (1 Pet. III. 7), had only to pay 30 shekels. From sixty years and upwards, about one third of the sums named was deemed sufficient, viz. 15 shekels for a man, and 10 for a woman. Before the expiration of the first month after their birth, children could not be dedicated to God at all; for till then they were not considered as fully developed, and as having attained a well secured existence; and for similar reasons, animals were not accepted as sacrifices before their eighth day (XXII. 27, p. 483). And as the life of infants up to their fifth year is precarious, and mortality among them is very considerable in the East, boys and girls between one month and five years old could be released for the small amounts of five and three shekels respectively. Lastly, males between five and twenty years might be redeemed for twenty shekels, a sum larger than any other ransom except the highest, while females of that age were only valued at the same price as women above sixty years.

These figures will be better appreciated if it be remembered, that one fourth of a shekel (or about 8[d]) was, in Samuel's time, deemed an acceptable present to be offered to a seer or "a man of God" for his advice and information (1 Sam. IX. 8); the expiation money paid by every individual when the census was taken, was half a shekel (Exod. XXX. 13); in seasons of abundance a seah (about one third of an ephah) of wheat, or double the quantity of barley, was sold for one shekel (2 Ki. VII. 1); a good vine was valued at the same price (Isai. VII. 23), and the annual produce of one of king Solomon's vineyards at a thousand shekels (Cant. VIII. 11); in the period of the Judges, a Levite might be hired as a family priest for the annual salary of ten shekels, besides board and clothing (Judg. XVII. 10); the ordinary price of a slave seems to have been thirty shekels, though lower sums were given (Exod. XXI. 32; comp. Gen. XXXVII. 28); oppressive

**estimation shall be of the male twenty shekels, and of the female ten shekels. 6. And if *it be* from a month old to five years old, then thy estimation shall be of the male five shekels of silver, and for the female thy**

governors exacted from the people an annual impost of forty shekels, besides requisitions of bread and wine (Neh. V. 15); a treshingfloor and an ox were deemed well paid by fifty shekels (2 Sam. XXIV. 24; comp. however, 1 Chr. XXI. 25); in the same amount a man was fined for dishonouring a virgin, and double that sum was imposed upon a husband for defaming his young wife (Deut. XXII. 19, 29); and in the reign of Solomon, an Egyptian horse, at that time a rare and almost extravagant luxury in Judea, was purchased at 150 shekels (1 Ki. X. 29; comp. Gen. XXIII. 15; Josh. XXIV. 32; see Comm. on Gen. p. 457).

But it is important to notice, that the redemption money was absolutely the same for all, for the rich and the needy, the free and the dependent, the healthy and the infirm; this proves again, that the money was a sacred symbol, rather than a real equivalent; and it is analogous to the older law that, when the people were numbered, "the rich should not give more, and the poor should not give less, than half a shekel ... to make an atonement for their souls" (Exod. XXX. 15, and notes in loc.). Philo assigns three reasons for the equality of the ransom — first, "because the importance of the vow is the same, whether it be made by a person of great or of little importance; secondly, because those who have dedicated themselves to God, should not be treated like slaves, who are valued at a high or at a low price, according to the good condition and comeliness of their bodies or the contrary; and thirdly, which is indeed the most weighty consideration of all, because inequality is upheld among men, but equality is honoured by God" (*Philo*, Specc. Legg. c. 8): the first reason together with the third seems to express most aptly the spirit of our law. The vows of abstinence, by which "a person binds his soul with a bond" (לאסר אסר), whether relating to the duties of the Nazarite, or to some special and more transitory privations, are treated of in later sections of the levitical legislation, and are based on religious principles of a somewhat different kind (see Num. VI. 1—21; XXX. 2—17).

It will suffice to mention a few of the numerous Rabbinical qualifications of our ordinances. If anyone omits to pay the money he owes to the Temple treasury for vows, his goods may be forcibly taken away; yet the officials are bound to leave him sufficient for his sustenance during thirty days, bedding for twelve months, his sandals and phylacteries — all this, however, only for himself, not for his wife and children; if he is a mechanic, they must leave him two sets of his necessary tools; if a husbandman, a yoke of oxen; and if a donkey driver his animal; nor must his wife's property or his children's clothes be touched (*Mishn.* Erach. VI. 3 — 5; comp. I. 1—3; II. 1; III. 1, 2; IV—VIII). — Men are permitted not only to dedicate the "estimation" of their own persons but of others also (הכל מעריכין ונערכין וכו'); and besides, all may vow "the value" of others, that is, the price which these would realise if sold in the slave market, and which in some cases might be higher, in

**estimation *shall be* three shekels of silver. 7. And if *it be* from sixty years old and above; if *it be* a male, thy estimation shall be fifteen shekels, and for the female ten shekels. 8. But if he be poorer than thy estimation,**

others lower than the uniform valuations fixed in our law (*Mishn.* Erach. I. 1; V. 3, 4).

Philological Remarks —The term הִפְלִיא נֶדֶר (ver. 2), like פַּלֵּא נֶדֶר (XXII. 21, see *supra* p. 480) seems indeed, as many, especially Jewish, interpreters suppose, to imply, that the vow must be distinctly pronounced in words, and not merely conceived in the mind; at least the Hebrew text, in treating of the subject, often employs such phrases as "the utterance of the mouth or the lips" (מוצא שפתיך, Deut. XXIII. 23; or כל היוצא מפיו, Num. XXX. 3; comp. Judg. XI. 35, 36, "I have opened my mouth"; Ps. LXVI. 14, "that which my lips have uttered and my mouth has spoken"; Lev. V. 4; Eccl. V. 1; hence Onkel. יפריש נדר, Jon. יפריש פירוש דנדרא, Rashi יפריש בפיו, Ebn Ezra פירש ויבאר, and still more explicitly Rashbam צריך לפרש באיזה הענין וכ'). However, the same notion is often expressed by the simple phrase נָדַר נֶדֶר (Deut. XXIII. 22, 23; Judg. XI. 30; 2 Sam. XV. 7, 8; Jon. I. 16; Eccl. V. 3, 4, etc.; therefore Sept. ὃς ἂν εὔξηται εὐχήν, Vulg. qui votum fecerit, Vater zum Gelübde bestimmen, Rosenm. quum quis devoverit Deo; comp. Num. VI. 1, where both terms are used conjointly כי יפליא לנדר נדר); we should probably not be warranted in laying stress on the verb פלא and in rendering, "When a man shall make a *singular* vow", i. e. besides the ordinary offerings (Engl. Vers., Luther a. o. ein besonderes or vorzügliches Gelübde thun; etc.); and it is certainly against the spirit of these laws to translate, "If a man is singular enough to make a vow", and to explain, that "the lawgiver seems to express his astonishment that anyone should impose upon himself exceptional and useless privations" (*Saalsch.* Mos. R. pp. 361, 364): it is true, the Hebrew legislators, as a rule, did not encourage vows, and similar was the tendency of the Rabbins, whose views are thus expressed by Maimonides: "Never did I hear from our sages a more judicious observation on the subject than that found in the ninth section of the Talmud of Jerusalem, in which those are censured who take upon themselves oaths and vows, and thereby become like fettered slaves; for Rabbi Ida said in the name of Rabbi Isaac, Is not that which the Law forbids, enough for thee, and must thou forbid to thyself other things besides"? (*Maimon.* Shemon. Perak. c. 4). Yet the minute precepts of the Biblical writers prove how much merit and holiness they attached to self-imposed sacrifices in favour of the Sanctuary and its ministers. — The suffix in בְּעֶרְכְּךָ and עֶרְכְּךָ (vers. 2 *sqq.*) cannot refer to the vowing Israelite, for we read in ver. 8, "but if he (the Israelite) be poorer than thy estimation"; nor can it properly refer to the priest who is not mentioned in the introductory words, and who seems to be different from the person who makes the valuation in the first instance, as we must infer from the words", if he be poorer than thy estimation, then he shall be brought before the priest" (ver. 8; see, however, *Ebn Ezra* in loc.); in fact, according to the plain syntactical construction, that suffix can only

**then he shall be brought before the priest, and the priest shall value him; according to the ability of him who vowed shall the priest value him.**

apply to Moses, who is the person addressed (comp. V. 15, 18, 25), and we must suppose, that some representative of the levitical order was meant to have the supervision of the transactions; a priest was probably not indispensable, as the amount was by the Law clearly fixed for every age and both sexes; only in cases when scope was left to personal decision, the matter was brought before an Aaronite (vers. 8, 11, 12, 14). It seems, that later Judaism gave in these and similar instances the right of estimation to any Israelite (comp. *Mishn.* Erach. I. 1; Sanh. I. 3; Meg. III. 3). It is, therefore, quite unnecessary to translate the suffix in בְּעֶרְכְּךָ by the *third* person, as the greater part of the ancient versions do (Sept. τὴν τιμὴν τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, Vulg. dabit, Jon. בעילוי, etc.), or to consider it as paragogic (as in בֹּאֲכָה Gen. XIII. 10), or as superfluous (see *Rashi* and *Ebn Ezra* in loc.), or as formative, after the analogy of לבן and לבמתיו (Rashbam; see the Rabbinical explanations in *Siphra* ad loc.; *Talm*. Erach. $4^b$; comp. Comm. on Levit.I.520,521). Rosenmüller renders ערכך aestimatio quae aestimaberis seu aestimandus eris, which is not suitable in the second verse. — The first clause of the sentence (ver. 2) is no doubt finished after נֶדֶר; but some take the whole of the second verse as the protasis, as if the Hebrews had been permitted to dedicate their persons to God otherwise than by substituting the appointed sums of money (so Targ. Onk. and Jon., Sept. ὥστε τιμὴν τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ, a. o.: the Vulgate, adding some words, combines both conceptions, et spoponderit Deo animam suam, sub aestimatione dabit pretium. — The term נְפָשֹׁת hardly includes the beasts (Ebn Ezra), since the case immediately following (ver. 9) is that of clean sacrificial animals, with respect to which substitution of money was not permitted. — On עֶרְכְּךָ הַזָּכָר (ver. 3) see *supra* p. 611, XXVI. 42 בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקוֹב. — About the value of the holy shekel (שֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ) see Comm. on Exod. p. 411; comp. also Comm. on Lev. I. 519. — The verb in והעמידו לפני הכהן (ver. 8) has impersonal meaning — he shall be placed before the priest: those who suppose, that in this entire portion Aaron or the priesthood is addressed, are compelled to render those words, "and he (the priest) shall place him before the priest" (Ebn Ezra יהעמידו הכהן לפני הכהן), which translation cannot be supported by any complete analogy. — According to the Mishnah (Erach. IV. 4), the last year of each period of life mentioned in the text, is reckoned with the preceding period, and valued accordingly, whether thus the amount be to the advantage or to the disadvantage of the treasury, f. i. a person sixty years old is bound to pay the price fixed for people "from twenty years old to sixty years old" (50 or 30 shekels); and a person just twenty years old has to pay the ransom demanded of people "from five years old to twenty years old" (20 or 10 shekels); if the estimation be made according to the next higher period, the treasury receives less in the first case (15 or 10 shekels), but more in the second (50 or 30 shekels). If we take the wording of our law in its plain sense, it would appear,

9. And if *it be* a beast, whereof *men* bring an offering to the Lord, all that *any one* gives of such to the Lord shall be holy. 10. It shall not be exchanged nor altered, a good for a bad, or a bad for a good; and if

that the new cycles begin with the fifth, the twentieth, and the sixtieth year, so that in terms like "from five years old to twenty years old" the last year is exclusive.

**9—13.** The principle of the ransom of persons becomes more strikingly clear if contrasted with the laws on vowed animals. With respect to these the idea of non-redemption was upheld not only with consistency but with rigour: a clean sacrificial animal was not to be redeemed on any account; and if the person who dedicated such a beast substituted another, were it even a more valuable one, both the one and the other belonged to the Sanctuary, because, as Philo observes, "God does not take delight in the size or fatness of animals, but in the blameless disposition of the man who has vowed it" (Specc. Legg. c. 9); while an unclean animal, because unfit for holy purposes, was indeed estimated by the priest, and the price was delivered into the sacred treasury; yet if the owner wished to have the animal back, he had to pay one fifth above the estimated value, to impress upon him by this fine that he ought properly to have left to the Sanctuary that which had once been destined for it. The intention of our command is thus explained by Maimonides: "The lawgiver, knowing the inclination of the human heart, was well aware, that people, having dedicated an animal, might, when the holy impulse has passed, from greed and avarice repent of their vow, and, if substitution were permitted, might give a worse for a better animal. He, therefore, forbade exchange altogether, in order to improve the character by the subjugation of selfishness; for all the precepts of the Law have but the one object of leading men, often apparently by circuitous roads, to wisdom and righteousness (comp. *Maimon.* De Bestiar. consecratar. mutatione, fin., p. 221 ed. De Veil; and the Rabbinical decisions on the whole subject see *ibid.* pp. 206—221). Many persons seem indeed at all times to have been tempted to evade their self-imposed obligations, or to fulfil them in an unfair and ungenerous spirit; and the very last of the prophets had occasion to pronounce the warning: "Cursed be the deceiver, who has in his flock a male, and vows and sacrifices to the Lord a corrupt beast" (Mal. I. 14).

In what manner the vowed sacrificial animals were used or disposed of, is not intimated; according to the Mishnah, they were sold to Israelites desirous of killing them as holocausts or thank-offerings; but some doctors believed, that the money so obtained was employed for the requirements of the Temple; while others held, that it was spent in buying beasts for holocausts; and elaborate directions were given respecting any other vowed object available for the Temple, such as frankincense and oil, flour and wine (see *Mishn.* Shekal. IV. 6—8). However, the firstlings of clean animals, which were likewise "holy" without permission being given to redeem them, were according to the levitical code killed in the manner of thank-offerings, their blood being sprinkled and their fat

**indeed beast be changed for beast, then it and its exchange shall be holy. 11. And if *it be* any unclean beast, of which *men* do not bring an offering to the Lord, then the beast shall be brought before the priest;**

burnt on the altar, while all the flesh belonged to the priests (Num. XVIII. 17, 18). This analogy seems to lead to the inference, that the vowed sacrificial animals, having been proceeded with in a similar manner, also fell virtually to the lot of the priests, in whose interest our laws, though collaterally aiming at high spiritual ends, were mainly framed. It is not probable, that the animals should have simply been appropriated by the priests and added to their herds and flocks (Num. XXXV. 3): they were "given to the Lord" and were "holy to Him"; they must, therefore, have been connected with His service in some direct way. — As regards the unclean animals, such as asses and mules, horses and camels, the fact that their redemption was not encouraged, and almost stamped as blameable, justifies the conclusion, that they were in many cases used for the purposes of the Temple, especially as beasts of burden; though, if not required, they were of course sold, the money being applied in harmony with the spirit of our ordinances. Be this as it may, we are not entitled to understand, with the Rabbins, the term "unclean animals" (בהמה טמאה) as "faulty animals", for any beast offered to God was no doubt required to be an unblemished specimen of its kind (comp. *Talm*. Temur. 33[a]; *Rashi* and *Rashbam* on ver. 11; a. o. — About the meaning of the *fifth* part see *supra* on XXII. 14, p. 476).

Philological Remarks.— The term בְּהֵמָה signifies here not merely the quadrupeds fit for the altar, but implies also the turtle-doves and young pigeons; in this comprehensive meaning, as denoting the entire animal creation, the word בְּהֵמָה (properly *dumb* creature) is used elsewhere also (XI. 2; Ps. XXXVI. 7, אדם ובהמה תושיע יהוה; see *supra* p. 50 note 4; Comm. on Levit. I. pp. 78, 79). Jewish tradition, however, takes the word in its more restricted sense. — According to the same authority, parts or individual limbs of beasts might be vowed (which opinion was deduced from the word מִמֶּנּוּ, ver. 9); in such cases the animal was sold, and so much of the money as the vowed portions were worth, was applied to sacred purposes (comp. *Talm*. Erach. 5[a]; *Rashi* on ver. 9). — Irregular alternations of the masculine and feminine like מִמֶּנּוּ (ver. 9) and הוא (ver. 10) referring to בהמה, have often been noticed before (comp. XXII. 6; etc.). — The term לא יחליפנו (ver. 10) may relate to redemption by money, and ימיר to substitution of another beast, both the one and the other being unlawful: some such difference the Masorites also seem to have intimated by the distinctive accent on יחליפנו; though indeed the two verbs may merely be intended for emphasis (comp. המר ימיר), and they are by the Sept. and Vulg. expressed by one word (ἀλλάξεις, mutari). — טוב ברע וכ' is "a good beast for a bad one", that is, a more valuable for a less valuable one, not "a perfect for a faulty one" (Jon. שלים בדביה מומא, Siphra, Rashi תם בבעל מום). — The words בין טוב ובין רע (ver. 12) are simply "whether it be good or bad";

**12. And the priest shall value it, whether it be good or bad; as thou valuest it, *who art* the priest, so shall it be. 13. And if *the man* wishes to redeem it, then he shall add a fifth *part* of it to thy estimation.**

**14. And when a man shall sanctify his house *to be* holy to the Lord, then the priest shall estimate it, whether it be good or bad; as the priest shall estimate**

the priest shall estimate the beast and ascertain its value, whatever it may be, so that, of course, the redemption money fluctuates according to the quality of the animal (Vulg. utrum bonum an malum sit, Luther obs gut oder böse sei, De Wette aptly wie gut oder wie schlecht es sei, etc.): those words cannot signify, that the priest shall fix "some middle or average price", neither declaring the animal to be very good nor very bad (so Knob., Keil, a. o.); if so, valuations for each individual beast would hardly be necessary, as some average price for each species might have been fixed beforehand. — כערכך הכהן is properly "according to thy estimation, namely that of the priest": we have observed before, that עֶרְכְּךָ seems, in later times, to have been understood as one notion, the suffix almost losing its proper force, so that the word was even provided with the article (הערכך, ver. 23; see *supra* on ver. 2, p. 620; Comm. on Lev. I. 521).

**14, 15.** *Houses* were vowed under exactly the same conditions as unclean animals: if not required for priestly dwellings or for some other purpose associated with the holy service, they were valued with all fairness, and sold at the price thus fixed; yet the proprietors had the alternative of redeeming them, but were, in this case also, obliged to pay one fifth more than anyone else, as a penalty for their fickleness and levity in matters appertaining to the Sanctuary. Whether the Temple officials ever *let* vowed houses, is not stated.

**16—25.** Less simple was the law if a *field* was consecrated to God. In this case conflicting interests were to be reconciled, and abstract principles of legislation to be considered. For fields were inalienable, and in the Year of jubilee they reverted to their original proprietors (XXV. 13, 23—28). They could, therefore, not properly be vowed to the Sanctuary in the same manner as houses, and their dedication was subjected to restrictions. First, it was necessary to make a distinction between hereditary and purchased fields. With regard to the latter, the proceedings were plain and obvious. The probable produce of the land from the time of the vow to the next Year of jubilee was by the owner paid into the sacred treasury at once and in one aggregate sum; and when the Jubilee came, the land was restored to the primitive possessor of whom it had been bought (vers. 22—24): whether redemption was permitted, is not mentioned. But if the dedicated field belonged to the hereditary property of the family, its produce during an entire Jubilee period was calculated, the value of the crops from the last Jubilee to the time of the vow was deducted from that sum, and the difference had to be paid to the Sanctuary by the pur-

it, so shall it stand. 15. And if he that sanctified *it* will redeem his house, then he shall add to it the fifth *part* of the money of thy estimation, and it shall be his.

16. And if a man shall sanctify to the Lord *some part* of the field of his inheritance, then thy estimation shall be according to its seed: a homer of barley seed

chaser of the field, which in the Jubilee was of course restored to the person who made the offering. If this person, by redeeming the land, desired to regain it at once for complete possession, he was bound to add a fifth part to its estimated price, as in the other cases referred to; but if he did not redeem it, and yet sold it surreptitiously to another, he forfeited by this fraud and recklessness not only the right of redemption, but every claim to the land, which in the Year of jubilee did not revert to him or his family, but, "like a devoted field", fell to the share of the priesthood, and thus became holy for ever (vers. 17—21). This seems to be the meaning of our ordinances, which are expressed with some obscurity, and have therefore been differently understood; and it remains only to be added, that the produce of the fields was valued according to the quantity of seed sown upon them, so that fifty shekels annually were reckoned for a piece of ground that can properly be sown with one homer of barley (about 101 43 Parisian cubic inches, or rather more than $4\frac{1}{2}$ imperial bushels, one bushel being 2218 cub. inch.; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 296, 297). For instance:—a man dedicated, in the 32nd year of the Jubilee period, a field requiring 2 homers of seed; as the annual produce was valued at twice 50, or 100, shekels, and a Jubilee period contains 42 harvest years, the crops secured during the whole time were estimated at 4200 shekels; and as, at the season of the vow, 27 crops had been gathered (the 31 years including 4 Sabbatical years), 2700 shekels were deducted from that sum, and the field was by the Temple authorities sold to any stranger for the difference, that is, for 1500 shekels, whereas the proprietor, if he wished to redeem it, had to add one fifth of that sum, or 300 shekels. The same result was of course obtained, if the years from the time of the vow to the *next* Jubilee were computed: for from the 32nd to the 50th year, there were 15 harvest years (as the 18 years include 3 Sabbatical years), and the crops were, therefore, valued at 15 times 100, or 1500 shekels. The calculation rested, in fact on the same principles as those applied in ascertaining the redemption money of *sold* fields (XXV. 23—28; see *supra* p. 559). If the land was promised to the Temple in the Year of jubilee itself, or in the next year before the harvest time, it was of course sold for the value of all the forty-two crops; which is thus expressed in our text, "It shall stand according to thy valuation" (ver. 17). The estimate by the quantity of seed used affords an easier and a more uniform standard than uncertain and fluctuating harvests; fifty shekels were invariably assumed to represent the annual yield of any piece

*shall be valued* at fifty shekels of silver. 17. If he
sanctify his field from the year of jubilee, it shall stand
according to thy estimation. 18. But if he sanctify his
field after the jubilee, then the priest shall reckon to
him the money according to the years that remain until
the year of the jubilee, and it shall be abated from thy
estimation. 19. And if he that sanctified the field wishes

of land of the stated dimensions; and the quality of the field was not taken into account.

In order to impress upon the reader, that instructions are here given about no mere transactions of sale and purchase, the author once more observes, that "the holy shekel" is to be employed in all these estimates and payments, and he is careful to mention its exact weight, which should remain unaltered in all future time, however the value of current money might vary.

Philological Remarks. — As we have observed above, our verses have in many respects been differently interpreted. Thus the words "a homer of barley seed shall be valued at fifty shekels of silver" (ver. 16), have been understood to mean, that fifty shekels were to be reckoned for the whole period from one Jubilee to another, or little more than one shekel for every year (סלע ופונדיון לשנה; so *Mishn.* Erach. VII. 1; *Talm.* Erach. 24[b]; comp. *Rashi* on vers. 16 and 18; *Saalsch.* Mos. R. p. 151; *Keil*, Levit. p. 167; a. o.): but we know, that, in good seasons, two seahs of barley were sold for one shekel (2 Ki. VII. 1); and it seems most improbable, that the *crops* resulting from 30 seahs (for so much does a homer contain) should have been valued no higher than the price of two seahs; even at 50 shekels they were probably not over-estimated, if the great fertility of Canaan be considered (comp. Gen. XXVI. 12): one shekel annually for the produce of such a quantity of seed would merely have been a nominal sum, whereas our law is everywhere so earnest in demanding just and exact estimates (comp. vers. 12, 14, etc., בין טוב ובין רע). If it had been understood that a man, in dedicating his field, virtually dedicated a sum of money, as was understood if *persons* were vowed to God, a nominal amount would, as in the latter contingency, have sufficed as a symbol of consecration. But such was not the case: a dedicated field was actually sold to anyone who might be induced to buy it for its intrinsic value; and it is impossible to suppose, that the officers of the Temple should have put upon it a price stamping the sale almost as a gift. The Mishnah (Erach. III. 2) supposes that, when a *purchased* field was dedicated, it was really sold for its full value; whereas in the case of *hereditary* property, fifty shekels only were demanded for the whole Jubilee period—which arbitrary distinction is unsupported by any Biblical allusion. — A person who vowed an hereditary field without redeeming it, no doubt received it back in the Jubilee, and that gratuitously he was neither compelled to leave it for ever to the Sanctuary (Clericus, Herxheim., Keil, a. o.), nor had he, in order to recover it, to pay the fifth part of the amount at which the field was valued at the time of the donation

to redeem it, then he shall add to it the fifth *part* of the money of thy estimation, and it shall remain his own. 20. And if he does not redeem the field, and if he *yet* sells the field to another man, it shall not be redeemed any more; 21. But the field, when it becomes free in the jubilee, shall be holy to the Lord, like a devoted field; the possession thereof shall be the priest's. —

(*Ewald*, Alterth. p. 387; see *Rashi* on ver. 16); for it was a matter of course, that he could never have meant to give up the possession of his family beyond the Year of jubilee, and he could, therefore, not be fined for taking it back at that epoch, after having exercised pious self-denial during a series of years. Some interpreters suppose indeed, that there is this distinction between an hereditary and a purchased field, that the former, if once dedicated, becomes in the Jubilee the property of the priests, whereas the latter returns to the family which has always owned it (comp. *Rashi* on ver. 22). But hereditary fields are only forfeited in the one case clearly stated in our passage (vers. 20, 21); in all others, they were inalienable. The Rabbinical views on the subject are these: Anyone redeeming a vowed field, receives it again in the Jubilee. If some other person redeems the land, and the donor redeems it from that person, it reverts to him in the Jubilee. If a priest redeems it, it becomes in the Jubilee the property of his whole order. If the field is not redeemed, then, according to some authorities, it falls to the share of the priesthood for a ransom of fifty shekels, or even without a ransom; but according to others, it does not become the property of the priests, but remains as "an abandoned field" (שׂדה רטושים), unappropriated to the next or even to the following Jubilee, till some one redeems it (see *Mishn.* Erach. VII. 1—4). How far these opinions coincide with the probable intention of the legislator, will be apparent from the preceding remarks. — The sense of זרע חמר (ver. 16) has been expressed by Onkel. בר זרע כור the produce of the seed of one cor, and still more distinctly by Jonath. אתר דמזדרע ביה כור the space on which one cor is sown.—The meaning of אם מִשְּׁנַת היובל יקדיש (ver. 18) "if he sanctify his field from the Year of jubilee", cannot be mistaken; it remains unaltered, whether we understand "from the Year of jubilee" to mean at the very beginning of that year (Vulg. statim ab anno incipientis jubilaei, Gesen., Maurer, a. o., Ebn Ezra בעצם השנה), or immediately after its expiration (so Knobel, Herxheim.; compare *Talm.* Erach. 24[b]); for the Year of jubilee itself, being a Sabbatical year, was not included in computing the value of the gift: the only material question was, whether the owner had already gathered a crop in the new period; if this was not the case, the aggregate value of all the forty-two harvests was charged to the purchaser, to whom it then "belonged" (יקום) or was left (comp. XXV. 30, *supra* p. 563). — A chief obscurity lies in the terms ונגרע מערכך (ver. 18) "and it shall be abated from thy estimation". What was to be abated? If we take the natural sense of the preceding words, it was the value of the produce from the time of dedication to the *next* Jubilee

22. And if *a man* sanctify to the Lord a field which he has bought, which *is* not of the field of his possession; 23. Then the priest shall reckon him the worth of thy estimation until the year of the jubilee, and he shall give thy estimation on that day, *as* a holy thing to the Lord. 24. In the year of the jubilee the field shall return to him of whom he bought it, to him to whom the possession of the land *belongs*.

— "the priest shall reckon to him the money according to the years that remain until the Year of jubilee" (השנים הנותרות עד שנת היבל) etc. But it was just the value of that produce which the owner consecrated to God. We must, therefore, suppose that the equivalent of the crops from the *last* Jubilee to the time of the donation was to be deducted from the total yield of the land within the entire period. The wording of the verse is indeed peculiar, as it conveys a very indirect and circuitous mode of computation, whereas below we have plainly, "the priest shall reckon to him the worth of thy estimation until the Year of jubilee" (ver. 23); yet no other interpretation is rationally possible than that stated (Ebn Ezra מה שהלך אחר היבל; Clericus, Rosenm. praeteritum tempus post Jobeleum; comp. also the brief expression in XXV. 27 והשיב את העדף לאיש וכ', *supra* p. 562). Rabbinical writers explain, "they deduct the number of years that have elapsed from the Jubilee to the year of redemption" (comp. *Rashi* on ver. 18); however, our verses refer to the *valuation* of the land, and not to its *ransom*, which is treated of in the next verses. — From the phrase השנים הנותרות, in the plural, Jewish tradition deduced the rule, that an hereditary field must be vowed at least two years before the Jubilee; and from the fact that our text never uses the word month, it was inferred, that such a field cannot be redeemed before a full year has passed after the Jubilee; though priests and Levites were permitted to vow and to redeem at any time (*Mishn.* Erach. VII. 1, 5). — The construction of the words ואם לא יגאל · · · ואם מכר וכ' (ver. 20) is clear; they do not involve two distinct cases, but one contingency taking place under two conditions, viz. a dedicated field becoming irrevocably the property of the priesthood, if the owner has not redeemed it, and has yet sold it to another; the second ואם is, therefore, not "*or if*" (Ebn Ezra טעמו או מכר, Engl. Vers., Herxheim., Keil, a. o.), but "*and if*"; and those words cannot be adduced to support the view above referred to, that vowed fields not redeemed before the Jubilee are for ever lost to the hereditary owner. — The subject of מכר, like that of יגאל, is the donor (המקדיש ver. 19), certainly not the priest or Temple treasurer (גזבר; comp. *Talm.* Erach. 25[b]; Rosenm.; Vater and De Wette und *man* verkauft das Feld; comp. Vulg. sed altèri cuilibet fuerit venumdatus; etc.). — The verb יצא (ver. 21) to go out free, generally employed with reference to persons, such as slaves (Exod. XXI. 2—7), is here used in connection with fields, instead of the more usual שוב (ver. 24), "when the field goes out, or becomes free in the Jubilee" (בצאתו ביבל); these words are inaccurately rendered by the Sept. and Vulg. (ἐξεληλυθυίας

25. And all thy estimation shall be according to the shekel of the Sanctuary; twenty gerahs shall be the shekel.

26. Only the firstling among the beasts, which is born as a firstling to the Lord, no man shall sanctify it, whether *it be* ox or sheep; it *is* the Lord's. 27. And if *it be* of an unclean beast, then it shall be redeemed

τῆς ἀφέσεως, as if reading בצאת היבל, and cum jubilaei venerit dies, in which translations neither the suffix of the first, nor the preposition of the second word is expressed. — The unredeemed field dishonestly sold by its owner became in the Jubilee "holy to the Lord, like a devoted field" (כשדה החרם); that is, as "everything devoted in Israel belonged to the priest" (Num. XVIII. 14), it was not applied to purposes of the Sanctuary, but was allotted to the priests themselves, and added to their pasture fields (comp. *Talm.* Erach. $28^{b}$). — About מִכְסָה (ver. 23) properly *number*, then *value* or *tax* (Onk. נסיב, Jon. סכום, Sept. τέλος), see on Exod. XII. 4, p. 192; and about הָעֶרְכְּךָ with the article, see *supra* on vers. 9—13. — The express addition, that the donor of a purchased piece of land should pay the estimated price "on that day" (ביום ההוא), seems to imply, that he had to furnish the whole sum at once, and not by annual instalments, which mode of settlement was perhaps allowed to a person consecrating his hereditary field; since the former, being able to buy landed property, might be supposed to possess the means of ready payment; yet the Mishnah imposes the same claim upon the latter also (*Mishn.* Erach. VII. 1, נותן את כלו כאחד).

**26, 27.** Any offering presented to God or His ministers must naturally be the property of him who presents it; but at the time when our section was written, the firstborn male animals legally belonged to the priests; the ordinances with respect to the firstborn had reached the last of the three stages, which we have pointed out elsewhere, and which, like so many similar laws, strikingly illustrate the gradual advance of hierarchical power. The male firstborn of *clean* animals were no longer to be sacrificed as holocausts, as was ordained in Exodus; nor were they to be presented as ordinary thank-offerings, of which the breast and right shoulder only were given over to the priests, while the remainder was left to the Israelites, as was prescribed in Deuteronomy: though killed as thank-offerings with the usual rites, they were by the levitical authors wholly assigned to the priesthood, to the utter exclusion of the original proprietors. And the male firstborn of *unclean* animals were no longer replaced by clean beasts, or killed if this was not done, as the oldest legislators demanded; but they were invariably redeemed with five holy shekels, and the money was handed over to the priests (see Comm. on Levit. I. pp. 609—613). Therefore, a firstborn of clean animals could on no account be offered as a vow, and the person who contravened this law, was no doubt regarded as having attempted to defraud the Sanctuary, and was treated accordingly (V. 15, 16); but if anyone, having once dedicated the firstborn of an unclean beast, was afterwards desirous of redeeming it, he

**according to thy estimation, and a fifth *part* of it shall be added thereto; and if it be not redeemed, then it shall be sold according to thy estimation.**

was bound, as a penalty for his fickleness, to pay one fifth above its estimated value; whereas no more than this value was required of anyone else who bought it of the Temple officers.

PHILOLOGICAL REMARKS. — As the verb בכר in Piel and Hiphil means to bring forth firstfruits (Ezek. XLVII. 12) or the firstborn (Jer. IV. 31; comp. Deut. XXI. 16), the passive Pual בֻּכַּר signifies to be brought forth or to be born as the first, and the phrase בְּכוֹר אשר יְבֻכַּר ליהוה (ver. 26) is intelligible — "a firstborn that is born as a firstling to the Lord", that is, one which, as such and by its very birth, belongs to God: ליהוה is a complement to יבכר, and does not begin the second clause (as the Sept. renders ἔσται τῷ Κυρίῳ, Vulg. better, though freely, primogenita quae ad Dominum pertinent; Ebn Ezra explains נודע שהוא לשם; Luther aptly die Erstgeburt unter dem Vieh, die dem Herrn sonst gebührt; etc.). — בבהמה in ver. 27 is co-ordinate to the same word in the preceding verse, being also governed by יבכר. — The Mishnah (Erach. VIII. 7) discusses, in what sense a firstborn animal might be "dedicated", and in what sense not. — It is well known, that from early times attempts have been made to harmonise in some measure the statements of the Pentateuch with respect to the firstborn of unclean animals; thus the Septuagint renders in the old law of Exodus (XIII. 13; XXXIV. 20) the word וַעֲרַפְתּוֹ "and thou shalt break its neck" by λυτρώσῃ αὐτό "thou shalt redeem it", or τιμὴν δώσεις αὐτοῦ "thou shalt give its value", evidently having our passage in mind, and reading וַעֲרַכְתּוֹ, which is indeed found in the Bible fragment recently discovered by the Karaite Rabbi Firkowitsch (comp. *Geiger*, Jüd. Zeitschr. II. 288; III. 232; *Steinschneider*, Hebr. Bibliograph. IV. 62): however, ערך in Kal is usually either to arrange or to prepare, and not to estimate; in this latter sense the Hiphil is always employed, as constantly in our chapter (vers. 8, 12, 14; comp. 2 Ki. XXIII. 35; in the one poetical passage Job XXXVI. 19 the Kal occurs in the same meaning, היערך שועך). The later Biblical writers and the translators considered "breaking the neck" of useful animals not only cruel, but wantonly wasteful; the former, therefore, abstained from enjoining it, and the latter endeavoured to remove the injunction where they found it in the earlier portions of the Law, the more so as they believed they might thus reconcile a striking discrepancy. Jewish tradition meant to attain this end by declaring, that our precept does not apply at all to firstborn animals, but to unclean beasts dedicated for "the repairs of the Sanctuary" (לבדק הבית; comp. *Talm.* Menach. 101[a]; *Rashi* on ver. 27; see, however, *Ebn Ezra* in loc.); which is evidently against the context; and some translate the first words of the twenty-seventh verse, "and if there is in the beast some uncleanness" (*e. g.* Luther, a. o.), which construction cannot be attached to the Hebrew words ואם בבהמה טמאה (Sept. correctly ἐὰν δὲ τῶν τετραπόδων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων, Vulg. quod si immundum est animal). A modern interpreter suggests, that our text might refer to the case that an unclean animal was by the owner dedicated to the

28. Yet no devoted thing, that a man shall devote to the

Temple, after he had given for it a lamb to the priest (Herxheim. in loc.) — an ingenious but improbable conjecture, in support of which no Biblical allusion whatever can be adduced. And the latest English commentator believes, that the difficulty might be removed by remarks like these: "The earlier law in Exodus ... is here modified for the advantage of the Sanctuary; a change of circumstances may have rendered this alteration expedient; the priesthood and the regular service of the Tabernacle were now established and needed support" (*Cook's* Holy Bible, p. 646). But the earlier law in Exodus is introduced by the words, "And it shall be when the Lord shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanites" (Exod. XIII. 11); it was, therefore, intended to be valid in future ages, and yet this Divinely revealed law is supposed to have been modified by another revelation scarcely one year after it had been enjoined (comp. Exod. XXXIV. 20 and Num. I. 1): was "the change of circumstances", that is, the institution of the priesthood and of the regular service, not foreseen and considered? — The masculine suffixes in המשירתו and עליו, and the masculine forms of the following verbs, refer to the male animals implied in בבהמה טמאה, such as the ass and the mule; exactly as אתו in ver. 26 has, by way of prolepsis, the masculine suffix referring to the following אם שור אם שה. — The Deuteronomist (XXIII. 19) has this command: "Thou shalt not bring the hire of an unchaste woman (אתנן זונה) or the earnings of a dog (מחיר כלב, i. e. a sodomite) into the house of the Lord thy God for a vow" (see *supra* p. 431): the gifts vowed to God must be the property of the donor, acquired by righteous and honourable means.

**28, 29.** We must confess, that the ruthlessness which breathes in these verses, stands in surprising contrast to the spiritual refinement which characterises our entire section. The command, "None devoted (חֵרֶם) that shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed, but shall surely be put to death", seems like an echo from a rude and barbarous age very unlike that in which even the killing of unclean animals in the service of religion was deemed objectionable. It is true, that it by no means involves a sanction of human sacrifices; for the "devoted" persons were not to be offered up to God, that is, to be "brought near Him" (הקריב), but on the contrary, they were to be removed out of His sight; they were not to be kept in pious remembrance, but utterly effaced and forgotten; and their blood was not shed at the altar for atonement, but their death was required, in order that "the evil might be removed from the land". They were called "most holy to the Lord", not in the same sense as the highest classes of offering, but merely because, having been irretrievably withdrawn from the power of men, they passed into the unconditional subjection of God. As we have shown in another place, our law applied only to malefactors, religious offenders, and political enemies dangerous to the existence or the faith of the Hebrew community, in fact, not to Godfearing but to impious persons; it was executed, not by private persons, but by the recognised authorities and representatives of the people, acting in the name of God; it is, in this

**Lord of all that he has, *both* of man and beast, and of the field of his possession, shall be sold or redeemed: every devoted thing *is* most holy to the Lord. 29. None devoted**

form, not elsewhere introduced; and it is here stated so briefly, that the author evidently knew he was alluding to a subject on which he could not possibly be misunderstood. Indeed in the long list of "devoted" people mentioned in the historical records of the Hebrews, there are none whatever who, according to the historians, had not drawn down upon themselves the wrath of God; and the readers of the precept, general and unqualified as it seems, "all devoted men shall be put to death", could not for a moment be supposed to believe, that they might, like Jephthah of old, vow and offer up in honour of God some innocent Hebrew, whether child or slave. It has been well observed, that "the *cherem* involves the compulsory consecration of that which defies or impedes sanctification; whenever, therefore, it was carried out by the community or by the legal authorities, it bore the character of a theocratic judgment, and was an act of judicial retribution manifesting the Divine holiness" (*Keil*, Levit. p. 170; comp. *Hengstenb.* Authent. des Pentat. II. 128). Yet even so, and just because the *cherem* did not, like the vow, rest on spontaneity, but on compulsion, the law gave a terrible weapon to fanaticism and vindictiveness; and it appears like a singular anachronism at a time which promulgated the precept, "Thou shalt love the stranger like thyself".

The prophet Ezekiel, whom the levitical writers so frequently followed, prescribed in general terms, that "every devoted thing in Israel shall belong to the priests" (Ezek. XLIV. 29); the same command is enforced within the same words in the Book of Numbers (XVIII. 14); and in both cases it occurs among the measures devised for the sustenance of the priests, and is meant to add to their revenues; but in our passage men are specified among the "devoted things", and they are expressly debarred from the right of redemption, which might have yielded considerable sums: they were to be of no advantage to the priests; and their lives were inexorably demanded (see Comm. on Levit. I. 409).

While hereditary fields simply vowed (הקדיש) reverted to the owners in the Year of jubilee, those "devoted" to God (החרים) remained for ever sacred property (comp. ver. 21), and were also "most holy"; they could neither be redeemed by the proprietors nor sold by the priesthood; for the *cherem* implied an absolute and indefeasible renunciation of some possession or gain in favour of the Divine Ruler and Master. Hence among the objects thus given up, purchased fields are not mentioned; for these were in the Jubilee restored to the families to which they had originally been allotted.

Philological Remarks. — The Targum of Jonathan, desirous of mitigating the harshness of our command, renders the 29th verse thus: "Every vow that shall be vowed of man, shall not be redeemed with money, but with burnt-offerings, and with hallowed victims, and with supplications for mercy before the Lord, for such should be put to death". The Mishnah and Talmud show the same

that shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed, *but* shall surely be put to death.

30. And all the tithe of the land, *whether* of the

tendency; for they teach, that a man may devote a part of his flock or herd, a few of his heathen slaves, or a portion of his hereditary field, but not the whole; and that no one is allowed to devote his son, his daughter, or his Hebrew servant. — Discussions were raised, whether property which was devoted without its object being specified, was applied to the requirements of the Temple, or fell to the share of the priests; the latter alternative, which was finally adopted, is the probable intention of the law, if we consider the two passages of Numbers and Ezekiel above referred to (*Mishn.* Erach. VIII. 4—6). But the precept cannot mean, "if a person was devoted to God by *cherem*, he remained sanctified for ever, and was given over to the Sanctuary, to aid in its service and assist the priests" (*Saalsch.* Mos. R. p. 371): in the 28th verse men are mentioned among the objects that may be devoted to God without the right of redemption; and the 29th verse declares, that men so devoted shall invariably be put to death; so that no doubt is left about the meaning of the command. It is true, that the wording of the two verses is in some respects different; the 29th does not mention, that the devoted men are "most holy"; it speaks simply of "men devoted", not "devoted to the Lord"; and it employs the word "releasing" (פדה), not "redeeming" (גאל): but it would be hazardous to assume, on the strength of these reasons, that the two verses do not belong together, but treat of different laws — the first of the vows of private individuals surrendering persons to the service of the Temple, and the second of the *cherem* executed by the authorities on public grounds. We have above admitted, that the tenor of the 29th verse is surprising, and we would fain believe, that it originated in some rude and early period, and was here only inserted because it seemed to supplement the preceding verse; or else we would believe that the 28th verse relates to the consecration of Temple servants, not unusual in the ancient world (see Comm. on. Lev. I. p. 585; comp. *Aeschin.* Adv. Ctesiph. §§ 110, 111, ed. Becker): but we see no foundation for these suppositions. — This is not the place for entering into the post-Biblical development of the *cherem*, which was by the Talmudical teachers applied, in many gradations, to a great variety of offences, but was by them, on the whole, divested of the terrible rigour of the Biblical *cherem*, since they aimed, not at the death of the offender, but at his removal from the Jewish community, or his repentance and reformation (comp. *Maimon.* Hilch. Erach. Vacher.; *Yor. Deah* § 334; *Selden*, De Jur. Nat. et Gent. pp. 498—536; *Winer*, Real-Wört. I. 134—137; *Ewald*, Alterth. pp. 81—87; *Saalsch.* Mos. R. pp. 368—372; *Hamburger*, Real-Encycl. I. 149—155; etc.).

**30—33.** Like the firstborn animals, the tithes, whether of cattle or of vegetable produce, could not be dedicated to God by a vow, and precisely for the same reason — namely, because even as tithes they belonged to God and were holy to Him; they were surrendered to the Levites in return for their services at the national Temple; and the

seed of the land *or* of the fruit of the tree, *is* the Lord's:
*it is* holy to the Lord. 31. And if a man wishes to
redeem *ought* of his tithes, he shall add thereto the
fifth *part* thereof. 32. And *concerning* all the tithe of
the herd or of the flock, of whatsoever passes under the
rod, the tenth shall be holy to the Lord. 33. It shall not

Levites, on their part, had to give a tenth of the received tithes to the priests or Aaronites. Yet redemption of the tithes was permitted to the owner, on the usual condition that he added one fifth to their value, by which arrangement so disadvantageous to him he was to be deterred from denying to the Sanctuary a portion of the wealth itself with which he had been blessed: for though the tithes were an impost appropriated by the priesthood, it was never forgotten, that they were properly dedicated to God, the Lord of the land and the Bestower of all prosperity; and this holy character was partially destroyed by their conversion into money. On the same grounds, every animal which happened to be the tenth according to the usual mode of counting flocks and herds, "by letting them pass under the rod", was to be given over to the Levites, and like a dedicated beast (ver. 10), was not to be changed even for a better one; if the proprietor attempted to substitute another, he forfeited both, and also lost the right of redemption. So consistently were the material and spiritual objects of the precept blended. We have before fully discussed the successive stages in the laws of tithes, and we need in this place hardly point out again, how high a degree of priestly influence is reflected in the command of our passage, which requires not merely the tenth part of the annual produce of the soil and the trees, as the law of Deuteronomy does, but also the tenth part of the annual increase of the herds and flocks. Other fluctuations in the same ordinances are no less instructive and significant (see Comm. on Lev. I. 604—609).

Philological Remarks. — The tithes here so familiarly introduced, though no law concerning them occurs in the anterior portions of the Pentateuch, are not "the second tithes" (מעשר שני), that is, those consumed in Jerusalem both by the proprietors and the Levites, as the Rabbins assume (comp. *Mishn.* Maas. Schen. IV. 3; *Talm.* Kidd. 54[b]); for the distinction of different kinds of tithes is evidently disregarded by our legislator, who plainly demands the tenth part of all vegetable and animal increase for the exclusive use of the priesthood (see Comm. on Lev. I. 609; *George*, Jüd. Feste, pp. 67, 68; *Geiger*, Urschrift, pp. 176—181; Jüd. Zeitschr. IV. 108). — According to Jewish tradition, anyone might redeem the tithes of another person for their exact value, without the addition of the fifth part; in this case, he was permitted to eat them at any place he might choose; but the money given for them was to be taken to Jerusalem and expended in convivial repasts in the company of invited Levites (comp. *Talm.* Kidd. 24[a]; *Talm. Jer.* Maas. Shen. c. 4; *Rashi* on ver. 31). These decisions also resulted from combining the laws of Deuteronomy with those of the middle Books, instead of separating the one from the others. This con-

be searched whether it be good or bad, nor shall it be changed; and if it be changed, then both it and its exchange shall be holy, it shall not be redeemed.

34. These *are* the commandments, which the Lord commanded Moses for the children of Israel in Mount Sinai.

fusion engendered strange explanations, which may be best illustrated by the remarks of Rashi on ver. 32: "Every tenth animal is holy, that is, its blood and fat are brought to the altar, while the flesh is eaten by the owners; ... for we do not find, that the flesh was surrendered to the priests". However, to be "holy to the Lord" means to be given over entirely to His Sanctuary or His ministers. — זרע הארץ (ver. 30) the seed of the land, that is, the produce of the seed, for תבואת זרע (as in Deut. XIV. 22). — On the custom of numbering cattle by means of the shepherd's staff (כל אשר יעבר תחת השבט), see Comm. on Lev. I. p. 605 note 13; comp. *Rashi* on ver. 32. Another mode of controlling cattle usual among African tribes, as the Latookas on the white Nile, has been described by a recent traveller: "The entrance of each cattle kraal is a small archway sufficiently wide to admit an ox at a time; suspended from the arch is a bell, against which every animal, on entering the kraal, must strike either its horns or back; and thus the herds are counted every evening when brought home from pasture" (see *S. W. Baker*, Alb. N'Yanza, pp. 208, 209).

**34.** The final reviser of the Book of Leviticus, finding, or adding, our chapter as an appendix after the comprehensive formula of conclusion with which the preceding chapter terminates, deemed it appropriate here to affix another, though somewhat briefer conclusion of a similar import; he states likewise, that the Divine commands (הַמִּצְוֹת) given at Mount Sinai are completed; but he represents these commands simply as having been revealed to Moses and communicated by him to the Hebrews (אל־בני ישראל), whereas the original conclusion (XXVI. 46) more specially describes the Sinaitic "statutes and judgments and laws" as the terms and conditions of the eternal covenant entered into between God and the children of Israel, and binding upon both as long as these terms are adhered to.

# ON THE ECONOMY, DATE, AND AUTHORSHIP OF LEVITICUS.

Holiness is the aim and object of the Book of Leviticus — the holiness of the Tabernacle and its servants, the holiness of public worship and private life, of the people and the land. The Book contains hardly a precept, a narrative, or a historical allusion, which is not meant to promote that one great end. It sets forth elaborate codes on sacrifices, offerings, and votive gifts[1]; it furnishes a full account of the consecration of Aaron and his sons, of the national Sanctuary and its vessels[2]; commands relating to purity in diet and person follow[3]; and supplementary laws are repeatedly added concerning the principal subjects — the sacrifices, the priesthood, and purity[4]; the minutest injunctions are given in reference to the sanctity of marriage, rectitude in every relation of life, and the duties of love and charity[5], respecting the holy days, seasons, and periods — the Sabbath and the Festivals, the Sabbatical year and the Year of jubilee[6]; and finally blessings are promised to those who obey, dire punishments threatened to those who disregard, these laws[7]. And in every instance, the holiness of God is the foundation upon which the institutions are built, and

---

[1] Ch. I—VII, XXVII.
[2] Ch. VIII—X.
[3] Ch. XI—XV.
[4] Ch. XVI, XVII; XXI, XXII; XXIV. [5] Ch. XVIII—XX.
[6] Ch. XXIII, XXV.
[7] Ch. XXVI. — See the admirable analysis of the contents of Leviticus in *Davidson's* Introduction to the Old Testament, I. pp. 256—292.

it is the ideal after which the Hebrews, destined to be a priestly nation, must strive.

This is the true unity of the Book — a unity of principle, which suggested and determined the selection of subjects.

But the notion of a holy God governing a holy people in a holy land, was the latest product of religious thought. We have tried to prove throughout the present and the preceding volume, that nearly all the chief ordinances of the Hebrews passed through three successive stages — the physical or natural, the historical, and the theocratic or spiritual. We have endeavoured to point out this uniform development with respect to the sacrificial and the dietary laws, the precepts of purity, and the festivals. But the different phases are separated from each other by long intervals, and the last pre-supposes a singular degree of moral refinement and religious training; it certainly pre-supposes an age very far in advance of that in which the people danced round the golden image of the calf Apis, exclaiming, "These are thy gods, O Israel, who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt"; or of that in which Jephthah believed he was presenting an acceptable offering to God by slaughtering his daughter as a holocaust.

But we need not be satisfied with a vague estimate of the date of Leviticus; there are fortunately traces which enable us more and more to narrow the circle of probabilities, till at last the final compilation and revision of the Book may be fixed almost within a single generation.

We trust we have succeeded in demonstrating, that the laws of Leviticus in reference to every particular subject are of later origin than the corresponding enactments of Deuteronomy; we have at least spared no pains to establish this point; for upon it hinges the true insight not only into the composition of the Pentateuch, but into the entire history of Hebrew theology: we have shown the priority of the Deuteronomist in the laws of the priesthood[8]

---

[8] Part I. pp. 598—601.

and the sacrifices[1], in those of the firstborn and the firstfruits[2], of tithes and other priestly revenues[3], in the laws of purity[4] and diet[5], the Sabbath and the annual festivals, the Sabbatical year and the Jubilee[6], and in many moral precepts, such as the treatment of slaves and strangers[7]. In every case Leviticus, compared with Deuteronomy, manifests a most decided progress in hierarchical power and organisation, in spiritual depth and moral culture; but it manifests, on the other hand, a no less decided decline in freedom and largeness of conception. The buoyant and refreshing spirit of prophecy, which breathes in Deuteronomy, is in the later Book replaced by a severe and rigid ceremonialism; the manifold political and social interests which engage the one, are in the other absorbed by a purely religious legislation; and the State is merged in the Church. Therefore, Leviticus must be placed later than the seventh century — the date which critics almost unanimously assign to Deuteronomy.

The laws which Ezekiel, in delineating the restored commonwealth, propounds with respet to the rights and duties of priests, the sacrificial service, and the festivals, are greatly at variance with those of Leviticus, and we have been careful to call attention to these differences in the proper place[8]. If, in the prophet's time, the commands of Leviticus had existed, or had been known as a part of the holy "Book of the Law", he would assuredly not have ignored and overthrown them by substituting others devised by himself. We must therefore conclude, that the Book of Leviticus did not exist, or had at least no Divine authority, in the earlier years of the Babylonian captivity.

The destruction both of the northern and the southern kingdom, and the misery of the people scattered in the countries of the Euphrates and Tigris, are in one of the last chapters (the XXVIth) vividly and most accurately described. This part of the Book, there-

---

[1] Part I. pp. 39—44.
[2] Part I. pp. 609—614.
[3] Part I. pp. 604—616.
[4] *Supra* pp. 190, 191.
[5] *Supra* pp. 101 *sqq.*
[6] *Supra* pp. 535—539.
[7] *Supra* pp. 435—437.
[8] See *supra* pp. 268, 454, etc.

fore, leads us on to an advanced period of the Babylonian rule[9].

The contemporaries of Nehemiah (about B. C. 440), were unacquainted with the Law of Moses; when the people heard it read, they wept, exactly as, about 200 years before, king Josiah had wept when portions of Deuteronomy were read to him; and they were grieved for the same reason — because they had not lived in accordance with the precepts of that Law[10].

Leviticus contains ordinances respecting several institutions, the existence or full development of which cannot be proved until long after the captivity — such as the sin-offerings and the High-priesthood, the Day of Atonement and the Year of jubilee, institutions of all others the most characteristic or most important. Now it has been shown above,[11] that the Day of Atonement was unknown in the time of Nehemiah; and as the Year of jubilee was associated with the Day of Atonement[12], the compilation of the Book must fall later than that date; and we shall probably be near the truth, if, considering the spirit of the concluding chapter on votive offerings and tithes, we place the final revision of Leviticus and of the Pentateuch at about B. C. 400[13].

We have admitted, that the Book discloses unity of principle; but it is entirely without unity of composition; its arrangement is so irregular, its component parts are so different in style and tone, and it offers so many repetitions on the same subjects, that its authorship by one writer is out of the question. It was, in fact, the product of many minds writing at different times and with special objects in view, and it received but very gradually its present form and dimensions.[14]

---

[9] *Supra* pp. 582—585.

[10] See Neh. VIII. 9; comp. 2 Ki. XXII. 11.

[11] See pp. 271, 272.

[12] See p. 548.

[13] Hence a widely-spread view that Ezra finally revised the Pentateuch, must be modified; comp. f. i. *Vatke*, Bibl. Theolog. I. 559; *Nöldeke*, Untersuchungen, p. 127; Alttestamentl. Literatur, pp. 31, 32; etc. etc.

[14] See Part I. pp. XVII—XXVIII; *supra* p. 440; etc. Recent apologists are compelled to make significant

Read in this light, the ordinances of the Book are more throughly understood, and the numerous difficulties disappear, which have called forth such fierce controversies, and given rise to so many singular opinions and conjectures. It is not too much to contend that, unless the older portions of Exodus, the enactments of Deuteronomy, and those of the middle Books (Leviticus and Numbers), be viewed as so many successive stages of legislation, the grand spiritual and political history of the ancient Hebrews, which extends over a period of more than a thousand years, can neither be comprehended nor adequately appreciated. Wherever an occasion presented itself in the preceding volumes, we have attempted to unfold that history as far as was feasible from the nature of our sources, which, limited and fragmentary as they are, may by this process almost be reduced to continuity and organic order.

In abandoning the traditional conceptions of the origin of the Pentateuch, we gain a great and most valuable boon; for in viewing the marvellous religious edifice of the Hebrews as their own and patiently achieved creation, their intellectual life and struggles are brought home to our understandings and our human sympathies, and thus cannot fail to inspire us with a new interest and a higher admiration.

---

concessions like these: "There appear to be in Leviticus, as well as in other Books of the Pentateuch, prae-Mosaic fragments incorporated with the more recent matter . . . It is by no means unlikely that there are insertions of a later date which were written, or sanctioned, by the Prophets and holy men who, after the Captivity, arranged and edited the Scriptures of the Old Testament" (*Cook's* Holy Bible, Levit. p. 494).

לַיהוָֽה׃ 29 כָּל־חֵ֗רֶם אֲשֶׁ֧ר יָחֳרַ֛ם מִן־הָֽאָדָ֖ם לֹ֣א יִפָּדֶ֑ה מ֖וֹת
יוּמָֽת׃ 30 וְכָל־מַעְשַׂ֨ר הָאָ֜רֶץ מִזֶּ֤רַע הָאָ֙רֶץ֙ מִפְּרִ֣י הָעֵ֔ץ
לַֽיהוָ֖ה ה֑וּא קֹ֖דֶשׁ לַֽיהוָֽה׃ 31 וְאִם־גָּאֹ֥ל יִגְאַ֛ל אִ֖ישׁ מִמַּֽעַשְׂר֑וֹ
חֲמִשִׁית֖וֹ יֹסֵ֥ף עָלָֽיו׃ 32 וְכָל־מַעְשַׂ֤ר בָּקָר֙ וָצֹ֔אן כֹּ֥ל אֲשֶׁר־
יַעֲבֹ֖ר תַּ֣חַת הַשָּׁ֑בֶט הָֽעֲשִׂירִ֕י יִֽהְיֶה־קֹּ֖דֶשׁ לַיהוָֽה׃ 33 לֹ֧א
יְבַקֵּ֛ר בֵּֽין־ט֥וֹב לָרַ֖ע וְלֹ֣א יְמִירֶ֑נּוּ וְאִם־הָמֵ֣ר יְמִירֶ֔נּוּ וְהָֽיָה־
ה֧וּא וּתְמוּרָת֛וֹ יִֽהְיֶה־קֹּ֖דֶשׁ לֹ֥א יִגָּאֵֽל׃ 34 אֵ֣לֶּה הַמִּצְוֺ֗ת אֲשֶׁ֨ר
צִוָּ֧ה יְהוָ֛ה אֶת־מֹשֶׁ֖ה אֶל־בְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֑ל בְּהַ֖ר סִינָֽי׃

ח ז ק

וּבֵין רָע כְּעֶרְכְּךָ הַכֹּהֵן כֵּן יִהְיֶה׃ 13 וְאִם־גָּאֹל יִגְאָלֶנָּה
וְיָסַף חֲמִישִׁתוֹ עַל־עֶרְכֶּךָ׃ 14 וְאִישׁ כִּי־יַקְדִּשׁ אֶת־בֵּיתוֹ
קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה וְהֶעֱרִיכוֹ הַכֹּהֵן בֵּין טוֹב וּבֵין רָע כַּאֲשֶׁר
יַעֲרִיךְ אֹתוֹ הַכֹּהֵן כֵּן יָקוּם׃ 15 וְאִם־הַמַּקְדִּישׁ יִגְאַל אֶת־
בֵּיתוֹ וְיָסַף חֲמִישִׁית כֶּסֶף־עֶרְכְּךָ עָלָיו וְהָיָה לוֹ׃ 16 וְאִם ׀
מִשְּׂדֵה אֲחֻזָּתוֹ יַקְדִּישׁ אִישׁ לַיהוָה וְהָיָה עֶרְכְּךָ לְפִי זַרְעוֹ
זֶרַע חֹמֶר שְׂעֹרִים בַּחֲמִשִּׁים שֶׁקֶל כָּסֶף׃ 17 אִם־מִשְּׁנַת
הַיֹּבֵל יַקְדִּישׁ שָׂדֵהוּ כְּעֶרְכְּךָ יָקוּם׃ 18 וְאִם־אַחַר הַיֹּבֵל
יַקְדִּישׁ שָׂדֵהוּ וְחִשַּׁב־לוֹ הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַכֶּסֶף עַל־פִּי הַשָּׁנִים
הַנּוֹתָרֹת עַד שְׁנַת הַיֹּבֵל וְנִגְרַע מֵעֶרְכֶּךָ׃ 19 וְאִם־גָּאֹל
יִגְאַל אֶת־הַשָּׂדֶה הַמַּקְדִּישׁ אֹתוֹ וְיָסַף חֲמִשִׁית כֶּסֶף־עֶרְכְּךָ
עָלָיו וְקָם לוֹ׃ 20 וְאִם־לֹא יִגְאַל אֶת־הַשָּׂדֶה וְאִם־מָכַר
אֶת־הַשָּׂדֶה לְאִישׁ אַחֵר לֹא־יִגָּאֵל עוֹד׃ 21 וְהָיָה הַשָּׂדֶה
בְּצֵאתוֹ בַיֹּבֵל קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה כִּשְׂדֵה הַחֵרֶם לַכֹּהֵן תִּהְיֶה
אֲחֻזָּתוֹ׃ 22 וְאִם אֶת־שְׂדֵה מִקְנָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר לֹא מִשְּׂדֵה אֲחֻזָּתוֹ
יַקְדִּישׁ לַיהוָה׃ 23 וְחִשַּׁב־לוֹ הַכֹּהֵן אֵת מִכְסַת הָעֶרְכְּךָ
עַד שְׁנַת הַיֹּבֵל וְנָתַן אֶת־הָעֶרְכְּךָ בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה׃
24 בִּשְׁנַת הַיּוֹבֵל יָשׁוּב הַשָּׂדֶה לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ מֵאִתּוֹ לַאֲשֶׁר־
לוֹ אֲחֻזַּת הָאָרֶץ׃ 25 וְכָל־עֶרְכְּךָ יִהְיֶה בְּשֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ
עֶשְׂרִים גֵּרָה יִהְיֶה הַשָּׁקֶל׃ 26 אַךְ־בְּכוֹר אֲשֶׁר יְבֻכַּר לַיהוָה
בִּבְהֵמָה לֹא־יַקְדִּישׁ אִישׁ אֹתוֹ אִם־שׁוֹר אִם־שֶׂה לַיהוָה
הוּא׃ 27 וְאִם בַּבְּהֵמָה הַטְּמֵאָה וּפָדָה בְעֶרְכֶּךָ וְיָסַף חֲמִשִׁתוֹ
עָלָיו וְאִם־לֹא יִגָּאֵל וְנִמְכַּר בְּעֶרְכֶּךָ׃ 28 אַךְ כָּל־חֵרֶם אֲשֶׁר
יַחֲרִם אִישׁ לַיהוָה מִכָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ מֵאָדָם וּבְהֵמָה וּמִשְּׂדֵה
אֲחֻזָּתוֹ לֹא יִמָּכֵר וְלֹא יִגָּאֵל כָּל־חֵרֶם קֹדֶשׁ־קָדָשִׁים הוּא

רִאשֹׁנִ֑ים אֲשֶׁ֣ר הוֹצֵֽאתִי־אֹתָם֩ מֵאֶ֨רֶץ מִצְרַ֜יִם לְעֵינֵ֣י הַגּוֹיִ֗ם
לִהְי֥וֹת לָהֶ֛ם לֵאלֹהִ֖ים אֲנִ֥י יְהוָֽה׃ 46 אֵ֠לֶּה הַֽחֻקִּ֣ים
וְהַמִּשְׁפָּטִים֮ וְהַתּוֹרֹת֒ אֲשֶׁר֙ נָתַ֣ן יְהוָ֔ה בֵּינ֕וֹ וּבֵ֖ין בְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֑ל
בְּהַ֥ר סִינַ֖י בְּיַד־מֹשֶֽׁה׃ פ

## CHAPTER XXVII.

1 וַיְדַבֵּ֥ר יְהוָ֖ה אֶל־מֹשֶׁ֥ה לֵּאמֹֽר׃ 2 דַּבֵּ֞ר אֶל־בְּנֵ֤י
יִשְׂרָאֵל֙ וְאָמַרְתָּ֣ אֲלֵהֶ֔ם אִ֕ישׁ כִּ֥י יַפְלִ֖א נֶ֑דֶר בְּעֶרְכְּךָ֥ נְפָשֹׁ֖ת
לַיהוָֽה׃ 3 וְהָיָ֤ה עֶרְכְּךָ֙ הַזָּכָ֔ר מִבֶּן֙ עֶשְׂרִ֣ים שָׁנָ֔ה וְעַ֖ד בֶּן־
שִׁשִּׁ֣ים שָׁנָ֑ה וְהָיָ֣ה עֶרְכְּךָ֗ חֲמִשִּׁ֛ים שֶׁ֥קֶל כֶּ֖סֶף בְּשֶׁ֥קֶל
הַקֹּֽדֶשׁ׃ 4 וְאִם־נְקֵבָ֖ה הִ֑וא וְהָיָ֥ה עֶרְכְּךָ֖ שְׁלֹשִׁ֥ים שָֽׁקֶל׃
5 וְאִ֨ם מִבֶּן־חָמֵ֜שׁ שָׁנִ֗ים וְעַד֙ בֶּן־עֶשְׂרִ֣ים שָׁנָ֔ה וְהָיָ֧ה עֶרְכְּךָ֛
הַזָּכָ֖ר עֶשְׂרִ֣ים שְׁקָלִ֑ים וְלַנְּקֵבָ֖ה עֲשֶׂ֥רֶת שְׁקָלִֽים׃ 6 וְאִ֣ם
מִבֶּן־חֹ֗דֶשׁ וְעַד֙ בֶּן־חָמֵ֣שׁ שָׁנִ֔ים וְהָיָ֤ה עֶרְכְּךָ֙ הַזָּכָ֔ר חֲמִשָּׁ֥ה
שְׁקָלִ֖ים כָּ֑סֶף וְלַנְּקֵבָה֙ עֶרְכְּךָ֔ שְׁלֹ֥שֶׁת שְׁקָלִ֖ים כָּֽסֶף׃ 7 וְאִ֡ם
מִבֶּן־שִׁשִּׁ֨ים שָׁנָ֤ה וָמַ֙עְלָה֙ אִם־זָכָ֔ר וְהָיָ֣ה עֶרְכְּךָ֔ חֲמִשָּׁ֥ה
עָשָׂ֖ר שָׁ֑קֶל וְלַנְּקֵבָ֖ה עֲשָׂרָ֥ה שְׁקָלִֽים׃ 8 וְאִם־מָ֥ךְ הוּא֙
מֵֽעֶרְכֶּ֔ךָ וְהֶֽעֱמִידוֹ֙ לִפְנֵ֣י הַכֹּהֵ֔ן וְהֶעֱרִ֥יךְ אֹת֖וֹ הַכֹּהֵ֑ן עַל־פִּ֗י
אֲשֶׁ֤ר תַּשִּׂיג֙ יַ֣ד הַנֹּדֵ֔ר יַעֲרִיכֶ֖נּוּ הַכֹּהֵֽן׃ ס 9 וְאִם־
בְּהֵמָ֔ה אֲשֶׁ֨ר יַקְרִ֧יבוּ מִמֶּ֛נָּה קָרְבָּ֖ן לַיהוָ֑ה כֹּל֩ אֲשֶׁ֨ר יִתֵּ֥ן
מִמֶּ֛נּוּ לַיהוָ֖ה יִֽהְיֶה־קֹּֽדֶשׁ׃ 10 לֹ֣א יַחֲלִיפֶ֗נּוּ וְלֹֽא־יָמִ֥יר אֹת֛וֹ
ט֣וֹב בְּרָ֔ע אוֹ־רַ֖ע בְּט֑וֹב וְאִם־הָמֵ֨ר יָמִ֤יר בְּהֵמָה֙ בִּבְהֵמָ֔ה
וְהָֽיָה־ה֥וּא וּתְמוּרָת֖וֹ יִֽהְיֶה־קֹּֽדֶשׁ׃ 11 וְאִם֙ כָּל־בְּהֵמָ֣ה
טְמֵאָ֔ה אֲשֶׁ֛ר לֹא־יַקְרִ֥יבוּ מִמֶּ֛נָּה קָרְבָּ֖ן לַיהוָ֑ה וְהֶֽעֱמִ֥יד אֶת־
הַבְּהֵמָ֖ה לִפְנֵ֥י הַכֹּהֵֽן׃ 12 וְהֶעֱרִ֤יךְ הַכֹּהֵן֙ אֹתָ֔הּ בֵּ֥ין ט֖וֹב

וְהִכְרַתִּ֗י אֶת־חַמָּ֣נֵיכֶ֔ם וְנָתַתִּי֙ אֶת־פִּגְרֵיכֶ֔ם עַל־פִּגְרֵ֖י גִּלּֽוּלֵיכֶ֑ם
וְגָעֲלָ֥ה נַפְשִׁ֖י אֶתְכֶֽם׃ 31 וְנָתַתִּ֤י אֶת־עָרֵיכֶם֙ חָרְבָּ֔ה וַהֲשִׁמּוֹתִ֖י
אֶת־מִקְדְּשֵׁיכֶ֑ם וְלֹ֣א אָרִ֔יחַ בְּרֵ֖יחַ נִיחֹֽחֲכֶֽם׃ 32 וַהֲשִׁמֹּתִ֥י
אֲנִ֖י אֶת־הָאָ֑רֶץ וְשָֽׁמְמ֤וּ עָלֶ֙יהָ֙ אֹֽיְבֵיכֶ֔ם הַיֹּשְׁבִ֖ים בָּֽהּ׃
33 וְאֶתְכֶם֙ אֱזָרֶ֣ה בַגּוֹיִ֔ם וַהֲרִיקֹתִ֥י אַחֲרֵיכֶ֖ם חָ֑רֶב וְהָיְתָ֤ה
אַרְצְכֶם֙ שְׁמָמָ֔ה וְעָרֵיכֶ֖ם יִהְי֥וּ חָרְבָּֽה׃ 34 אָז֩ תִּרְצֶ֨ה הָאָ֜רֶץ
אֶת־שַׁבְּתֹתֶ֗יהָ כֹּ֚ל יְמֵ֣י הֳשַּׁמָּ֔ה וְאַתֶּ֖ם בְּאֶ֣רֶץ אֹיְבֵיכֶ֑ם אָ֚ז
תִּשְׁבַּ֣ת הָאָ֔רֶץ וְהִרְצָ֖ת אֶת־שַׁבְּתֹתֶֽיהָ׃ 35 כָּל־יְמֵ֥י הָשַּׁמָּ֖ה
תִּשְׁבֹּ֑ת אֵ֣ת אֲשֶׁ֧ר לֹא־שָֽׁבְתָ֛ה בְּשַׁבְּתֹתֵיכֶ֖ם בְּשִׁבְתְּכֶ֥ם עָלֶֽיהָ׃
36 וְהַנִּשְׁאָרִ֣ים בָּכֶ֔ם וְהֵבֵ֤אתִי מֹ֙רֶךְ֙ בִּלְבָבָ֔ם בְּאַרְצֹ֖ת אֹיְבֵיהֶ֑ם
וְרָדַ֣ף אֹתָ֗ם ק֚וֹל עָלֶ֣ה נִדָּ֔ף וְנָס֧וּ מְנֻֽסַת־חֶ֛רֶב וְנָפְל֖וּ וְאֵ֥ין
רֹדֵֽף׃ 37 וְכָשְׁל֧וּ אִישׁ־בְּאָחִ֛יו כְּמִפְּנֵי־חֶ֖רֶב וְרֹדֵ֣ף אָ֑יִן
וְלֹא־תִהְיֶ֤ה לָכֶם֙ תְּקוּמָ֔ה לִפְנֵ֖י אֹיְבֵיכֶֽם׃ 38 וַאֲבַדְתֶּ֖ם בַּגּוֹיִ֑ם
וְאָכְלָ֣ה אֶתְכֶ֔ם אֶ֖רֶץ אֹיְבֵיכֶֽם׃ 39 וְהַנִּשְׁאָרִ֣ים בָּכֶ֗ם יִמַּ֙קּוּ֙
בַּעֲוֺנָ֔ם בְּאַרְצֹ֖ת אֹיְבֵיכֶ֑ם וְאַ֛ף בַּעֲוֺנֹ֥ת אֲבֹתָ֖ם אִתָּ֥ם יִמָּֽקּוּ׃
40 וְהִתְוַדּ֤וּ אֶת־עֲוֺנָם֙ וְאֶת־עֲוֺ֣ן אֲבֹתָ֔ם בְּמַעֲלָ֖ם אֲשֶׁ֣ר מָֽעֲלוּ־
בִ֑י וְאַ֕ף אֲשֶׁר־הָלְכ֥וּ עִמִּ֖י בְּקֶֽרִי׃ 41 אַף־אֲנִ֗י אֵלֵ֤ךְ עִמָּם֙
בְּקֶ֔רִי וְהֵבֵאתִ֣י אֹתָ֔ם בְּאֶ֖רֶץ אֹיְבֵיהֶ֑ם אוֹ־אָ֣ז יִכָּנַ֗ע לְבָבָם֙
הֶֽעָרֵ֔ל וְאָ֖ז יִרְצ֥וּ אֶת־עֲוֺנָֽם׃ 42 וְזָכַרְתִּ֖י אֶת־בְּרִיתִ֣י יַעֲק֑וֹב
וְאַף֩ אֶת־בְּרִיתִ֨י יִצְחָ֜ק וְאַ֨ף אֶת־בְּרִיתִ֧י אַבְרָהָ֛ם אֶזְכֹּ֖ר
וְהָאָ֥רֶץ אֶזְכֹּֽר׃ 43 וְהָאָ֩רֶץ֩ תֵּעָזֵ֨ב מֵהֶ֜ם וְתִ֣רֶץ אֶת־שַׁבְּתֹתֶ֗יהָ
בָּהְשַׁמָּה֙ מֵהֶ֔ם וְהֵ֖ם יִרְצ֣וּ אֶת־עֲוֺנָ֑ם יַ֣עַן וּבְיַ֔עַן בְּמִשְׁפָּטַ֣י
מָאָ֔סוּ וְאֶת־חֻקֹּתַ֖י גָּעֲלָ֥ה נַפְשָֽׁם׃ 44 וְאַף־גַּם־זֹ֠את בִּֽהְיוֹתָ֞ם
בְּאֶ֣רֶץ אֹיְבֵיהֶ֗ם לֹֽא־מְאַסְתִּ֤ים וְלֹֽא־גְעַלְתִּים֙ לְכַלֹּתָ֔ם לְהָפֵ֥ר
בְּרִיתִ֖י אִתָּ֑ם כִּ֛י אֲנִ֥י יְהוָ֖ה אֱלֹהֵיהֶֽם׃ 45 וְזָכַרְתִּ֥י לָהֶ֖ם בְּרִ֣ית

תִשְׁמְעוּ לִי וְלֹא תַעֲשׂוּ אֵת כָּל־הַמִּצְוֹת הָאֵלֶּה׃ 15 וְאִם־
בְּחֻקֹּתַי תִּמְאָסוּ וְאִם אֶת־מִשְׁפָּטַי תִּגְעַל נַפְשְׁכֶם לְבִלְתִּי
עֲשׂוֹת אֶת־כָּל־מִצְוֹתַי לְהַפְרְכֶם אֶת־בְּרִיתִי׃ 16 אַף־אֲנִי
אֶעֱשֶׂה־זֹּאת לָכֶם וְהִפְקַדְתִּי עֲלֵיכֶם בֶּהָלָה אֶת־הַשַּׁחֶפֶת
וְאֶת־הַקַּדַּחַת מְכַלּוֹת עֵינַיִם וּמְדִיבֹת נָפֶשׁ וּזְרַעְתֶּם לָרִיק
זַרְעֲכֶם וַאֲכָלֻהוּ אֹיְבֵיכֶם׃ 17 וְנָתַתִּי פָנַי בָּכֶם וְנִגַּפְתֶּם
לִפְנֵי אֹיְבֵיכֶם וְרָדוּ בָכֶם שֹׂנְאֵיכֶם וְנַסְתֶּם וְאֵין־רֹדֵף
אֶתְכֶם׃ 18 וְאִם־עַד־אֵלֶּה לֹא תִשְׁמְעוּ לִי וְיָסַפְתִּי לְיַסְּרָה
אֶתְכֶם שֶׁבַע עַל־חַטֹּאתֵיכֶם׃ 19 וְשָׁבַרְתִּי אֶת־גְּאוֹן עֻזְּכֶם
וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־שְׁמֵיכֶם כַּבַּרְזֶל וְאֶת־אַרְצְכֶם כַּנְּחֻשָׁה׃ 20 וְתַם
לָרִיק כֹּחֲכֶם וְלֹא־תִתֵּן אַרְצְכֶם אֶת־יְבוּלָהּ וְעֵץ הָאָרֶץ לֹא
יִתֵּן פִּרְיוֹ׃ 21 וְאִם־תֵּלְכוּ עִמִּי קֶרִי וְלֹא תֹאבוּ לִשְׁמֹעַ לִי
וְיָסַפְתִּי עֲלֵיכֶם מַכָּה שֶׁבַע כְּחַטֹּאתֵיכֶם׃ 22 וְהִשְׁלַחְתִּי
בָכֶם אֶת־חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה וְשִׁכְּלָה אֶתְכֶם וְהִכְרִיתָה אֶת־
בְּהֶמְתְּכֶם וְהִמְעִיטָה אֶתְכֶם וְנָשַׁמּוּ דַּרְכֵיכֶם׃ 23 וְאִם־
בְּאֵלֶּה לֹא תִוָּסְרוּ לִי וַהֲלַכְתֶּם עִמִּי קֶרִי׃ 24 וְהָלַכְתִּי
אַף־אֲנִי עִמָּכֶם בְּקֶרִי וְהִכֵּיתִי אֶתְכֶם גַּם־אָנִי שֶׁבַע עַל־
חַטֹּאתֵיכֶם׃ 25 וְהֵבֵאתִי עֲלֵיכֶם חֶרֶב נֹקֶמֶת נְקַם־בְּרִית
וְנֶאֱסַפְתֶּם אֶל־עָרֵיכֶם וְשִׁלַּחְתִּי דֶבֶר בְּתוֹכְכֶם וְנִתַּתֶּם
בְּיַד־אוֹיֵב׃ 26 בְּשִׁבְרִי לָכֶם מַטֵּה־לֶחֶם וְאָפוּ עֶשֶׂר נָשִׁים
לַחְמְכֶם בְּתַנּוּר אֶחָד וְהֵשִׁיבוּ לַחְמְכֶם בַּמִּשְׁקָל וַאֲכַלְתֶּם
וְלֹא תִשְׂבָּעוּ׃ ס 27 וְאִם־בְּזֹאת לֹא תִשְׁמְעוּ לִי וַהֲלַכְתֶּם
עִמִּי בְּקֶרִי׃ 28 וְהָלַכְתִּי עִמָּכֶם בַּחֲמַת־קֶרִי וְיִסַּרְתִּי
אֶתְכֶם אַף־אָנִי שֶׁבַע עַל־חַטֹּאתֵיכֶם׃ 29 וַאֲכַלְתֶּם בְּשַׂר
בְּנֵיכֶם וּבְשַׂר בְּנֹתֵיכֶם תֹּאכֵלוּ׃ 30 וְהִשְׁמַדְתִּי אֶת־בָּמֹתֵיכֶם

עֲבָדַי הֵם אֲשֶׁר־הוֹצֵאתִי אוֹתָם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם אֲנִי
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃

## CHAPTER XXVI.

1 לֹא־תַעֲשׂוּ לָכֶם אֱלִילִם וּפֶסֶל וּמַצֵּבָה לֹא־תָקִימוּ
לָכֶם וְאֶבֶן מַשְׂכִּית לֹא תִתְּנוּ בְּאַרְצְכֶם לְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת עָלֶיהָ
כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 2 אֶת־שַׁבְּתֹתַי תִּשְׁמֹרוּ וּמִקְדָּשִׁי
תִּירָאוּ אֲנִי יְהוָה׃

פ פ פ

3 אִם־בְּחֻקֹּתַי תֵּלֵכוּ וְאֶת־מִצְוֺתַי תִּשְׁמְרוּ וַעֲשִׂיתֶם אֹתָם׃
4 וְנָתַתִּי גִשְׁמֵיכֶם בְּעִתָּם וְנָתְנָה הָאָרֶץ יְבוּלָהּ וְעֵץ
הַשָּׂדֶה יִתֵּן פִּרְיוֹ׃ 5 וְהִשִּׂיג לָכֶם דַּיִשׁ אֶת־בָּצִיר וּבָצִיר
יַשִּׂיג אֶת־זָרַע וַאֲכַלְתֶּם לַחְמְכֶם לָשֹׂבַע וִישַׁבְתֶּם לָבֶטַח
בְּאַרְצְכֶם׃ 6 וְנָתַתִּי שָׁלוֹם בָּאָרֶץ וּשְׁכַבְתֶּם וְאֵין מַחֲרִיד
וְהִשְׁבַּתִּי חַיָּה רָעָה מִן־הָאָרֶץ וְחֶרֶב לֹא־תַעֲבֹר בְּאַרְצְכֶם׃
7 וּרְדַפְתֶּם אֶת־אֹיְבֵיכֶם וְנָפְלוּ לִפְנֵיכֶם לֶחָרֶב׃ 8 וְרָדְפוּ
מִכֶּם חֲמִשָּׁה מֵאָה וּמֵאָה מִכֶּם רְבָבָה יִרְדֹּפוּ וְנָפְלוּ
אֹיְבֵיכֶם לִפְנֵיכֶם לֶחָרֶב׃ 9 וּפָנִיתִי אֲלֵיכֶם וְהִפְרֵיתִי
אֶתְכֶם וְהִרְבֵּיתִי אֶתְכֶם וַהֲקִימֹתִי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אִתְּכֶם׃
10 וַאֲכַלְתֶּם יָשָׁן נוֹשָׁן וְיָשָׁן מִפְּנֵי חָדָשׁ תּוֹצִיאוּ׃
11 וְנָתַתִּי מִשְׁכָּנִי בְּתוֹכְכֶם וְלֹא־תִגְעַל נַפְשִׁי אֶתְכֶם׃
12 וְהִתְהַלַּכְתִּי בְּתוֹכְכֶם וְהָיִיתִי לָכֶם לֵאלֹהִים וְאַתֶּם
תִּהְיוּ־לִי לְעָם׃ 13 אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִי
אֶתְכֶם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִהְיֹת לָהֶם עֲבָדִים וָאֶשְׁבֹּר מֹטֹת
עֻלְּכֶם וָאוֹלֵךְ אֶתְכֶם קוֹמְמִיּוּת׃ פ 14 וְאִם־לֹא

לָכֶם֙ אֶת־אֶ֣רֶץ כְּנָ֔עַן לִהְי֥וֹת לָכֶ֖ם לֵאלֹהִֽים׃ ס
39 וְכִֽי־יָמ֥וּךְ אָחִ֛יךָ עִמָּ֖ךְ וְנִמְכַּר־לָ֑ךְ לֹא־תַעֲבֹ֥ד בּ֖וֹ עֲבֹ֥דַת
עָֽבֶד׃ 40 כְּשָׂכִ֥יר כְּתוֹשָׁ֖ב יִהְיֶ֣ה עִמָּ֑ךְ עַד־שְׁנַ֥ת הַיֹּבֵ֖ל
יַעֲבֹ֥ד עִמָּֽךְ׃ 41 וְיָצָא֙ מֵֽעִמָּ֔ךְ ה֖וּא וּבָנָ֣יו עִמּ֑וֹ וְשָׁב֙ אֶל־
מִשְׁפַּחְתּ֔וֹ וְאֶל־אֲחֻזַּ֥ת אֲבֹתָ֖יו יָשֽׁוּב׃ 42 כִּֽי־עֲבָדַ֣י הֵ֔ם
אֲשֶׁר־הוֹצֵ֥אתִי אֹתָ֖ם מֵאֶ֣רֶץ מִצְרָ֑יִם לֹ֥א יִמָּכְר֖וּ מִמְכֶּ֥רֶת
עָֽבֶד׃ 43 לֹא־תִרְדֶּ֥ה ב֖וֹ בְּפָ֑רֶךְ וְיָרֵ֖אתָ מֵאֱלֹהֶֽיךָ׃ 44 וְעַבְדְּךָ֥
וַאֲמָתְךָ֖ אֲשֶׁ֣ר יִהְיוּ־לָ֑ךְ מֵאֵ֣ת הַגּוֹיִ֗ם אֲשֶׁר֙ סְבִיבֹ֣תֵיכֶ֔ם
מֵהֶ֥ם תִּקְנ֖וּ עֶ֥בֶד וְאָמָֽה׃ 45 וְגַ֨ם מִבְּנֵ֜י הַתּוֹשָׁבִ֨ים הַגָּרִ֤ים
עִמָּכֶם֙ מֵהֶ֣ם תִּקְנ֔וּ וּמִמִּשְׁפַּחְתָּם֙ אֲשֶׁ֣ר עִמָּכֶ֔ם אֲשֶׁ֥ר הוֹלִ֖ידוּ
בְּאַרְצְכֶ֑ם וְהָי֥וּ לָכֶ֖ם לַאֲחֻזָּֽה׃ 46 וְהִתְנַחַלְתֶּ֨ם אֹתָ֜ם לִבְנֵיכֶ֤ם
אַחֲרֵיכֶם֙ לָרֶ֣שֶׁת אֲחֻזָּ֔ה לְעֹלָ֖ם בָּהֶ֣ם תַּעֲבֹ֑דוּ וּבְאַ֨חֵיכֶ֤ם
בְּנֵֽי־יִשְׂרָאֵל֙ אִ֣ישׁ בְּאָחִ֔יו לֹא־תִרְדֶּ֥ה ב֖וֹ בְּפָֽרֶךְ׃ ס
47 וְכִ֣י תַשִּׂ֗יג יַ֣ד גֵּ֤ר וְתוֹשָׁב֙ עִמָּ֔ךְ וּמָ֥ךְ אָחִ֖יךָ עִמּ֑וֹ וְנִמְכַּ֗ר
לְגֵ֤ר תּוֹשָׁב֙ עִמָּ֔ךְ א֥וֹ לְעֵ֖קֶר מִשְׁפַּ֥חַת גֵּֽר׃ 48 אַחֲרֵ֣י נִמְכַּ֔ר
גְּאֻלָּ֖ה תִּהְיֶה־לּ֑וֹ אֶחָ֥ד מֵאֶחָ֖יו יִגְאָלֶֽנּוּ׃ 49 אֽוֹ־דֹד֞וֹ א֣וֹ
בֶן־דֹּדוֹ֙ יִגְאָלֶ֔נּוּ אֽוֹ־מִשְּׁאֵ֧ר בְּשָׂר֛וֹ מִמִּשְׁפַּחְתּ֖וֹ יִגְאָלֶ֑נּוּ אֽוֹ־
הִשִּׂ֥יגָה יָד֖וֹ וְנִגְאָֽל׃ 50 וְחִשַּׁב֙ עִם־קֹנֵ֔הוּ מִשְּׁנַת֙ הִמָּ֣כְרוֹ ל֔וֹ
עַ֖ד שְׁנַ֣ת הַיֹּבֵ֑ל וְהָיָ֞ה כֶּ֤סֶף מִמְכָּרוֹ֙ בְּמִסְפַּ֣ר שָׁנִ֔ים כִּימֵ֥י
שָׂכִ֖יר יִהְיֶ֥ה עִמּֽוֹ׃ 51 אִם־ע֥וֹד רַבּ֖וֹת בַּשָּׁנִ֑ים לְפִיהֶן֙
יָשִׁ֣יב גְּאֻלָּת֔וֹ מִכֶּ֖סֶף מִקְנָתֽוֹ׃ 52 וְאִם־מְעַ֞ט נִשְׁאַ֧ר
בַּשָּׁנִ֛ים עַד־שְׁנַ֥ת הַיֹּבֵ֖ל וְחִשַּׁב־ל֑וֹ כְּפִ֣י שָׁנָ֔יו יָשִׁ֖יב אֶת־
גְּאֻלָּתֽוֹ׃ 53 כִּשְׂכִ֥יר שָׁנָ֛ה בְּשָׁנָ֖ה יִהְיֶ֣ה עִמּ֑וֹ לֹֽא־יִרְדֶּ֥נּוּ
בְּפֶ֖רֶךְ לְעֵינֶֽיךָ׃ 54 וְאִם־לֹ֥א יִגָּאֵ֖ל בְּאֵ֑לֶּה וְיָצָא֙ בִּשְׁנַ֣ת
הַיֹּבֵ֔ל ה֖וּא וּבָנָ֥יו עִמּֽוֹ׃ 55 כִּֽי־לִ֤י בְנֵֽי־יִשְׂרָאֵל֙ עֲבָדִ֔ים

יָשָׁן עַד הַשָּׁנָה הַתְּשִׁיעִת עַד־בּוֹא תְּבוּאָתָהּ תֹּאכְלוּ יָשָׁן׃
23 וְהָאָרֶץ לֹא תִמָּכֵר לִצְמִתֻת כִּי־לִי הָאָרֶץ כִּי־גֵרִים
וְתוֹשָׁבִים אַתֶּם עִמָּדִי׃ 24 וּבְכֹל אֶרֶץ אֲחֻזַּתְכֶם גְּאֻלָּה
תִּתְּנוּ לָאָרֶץ׃ ס 25 כִּי־יָמוּךְ אָחִיךָ וּמָכַר מֵאֲחֻזָּתוֹ
וּבָא גֹאֲלוֹ הַקָּרֹב אֵלָיו וְגָאַל אֵת מִמְכַּר אָחִיו׃ 26 וְאִישׁ
כִּי לֹא יִהְיֶה־לּוֹ גֹּאֵל וְהִשִּׂיגָה יָדוֹ וּמָצָא כְּדֵי גְאֻלָּתוֹ׃
27 וְחִשַּׁב אֶת־שְׁנֵי מִמְכָּרוֹ וְהֵשִׁיב אֶת־הָעֹדֵף לָאִישׁ
אֲשֶׁר מָכַר־לוֹ וְשָׁב לַאֲחֻזָּתוֹ׃ 28 וְאִם־לֹא מָצְאָה יָדוֹ דֵּי
הָשִׁיב לוֹ וְהָיָה מִמְכָּרוֹ בְּיַד הַקֹּנֶה אֹתוֹ עַד שְׁנַת הַיּוֹבֵל
וְיָצָא בַּיֹּבֵל וְשָׁב לַאֲחֻזָּתוֹ׃ ס 29 וְאִישׁ כִּי־יִמְכֹּר בֵּית־
מוֹשַׁב עִיר חוֹמָה וְהָיְתָה גְּאֻלָּתוֹ עַד־תֹּם שְׁנַת מִמְכָּרוֹ
יָמִים תִּהְיֶה גְאֻלָּתוֹ׃ 30 וְאִם לֹא־יִגָּאֵל עַד־מְלֹאת לוֹ
שָׁנָה תְמִימָה וְקָם הַבַּיִת אֲשֶׁר־בָּעִיר אֲשֶׁר־לֹא חֹמָה
לַצְּמִיתֻת לַקֹּנֶה אֹתוֹ לְדֹרֹתָיו לֹא יֵצֵא בַּיֹּבֵל׃ 31 וּבָתֵּי
הַחֲצֵרִים אֲשֶׁר אֵין־לָהֶם חֹמָה סָבִיב עַל־שְׂדֵה הָאָרֶץ
יֵחָשֵׁב גְּאֻלָּה תִּהְיֶה־לּוֹ וּבַיֹּבֵל יֵצֵא׃ 32 וְעָרֵי הַלְוִיִּם
בָּתֵּי עָרֵי אֲחֻזָּתָם גְּאֻלַּת עוֹלָם תִּהְיֶה לַלְוִיִּם׃ 33 וַאֲשֶׁר
יִגְאַל מִן־הַלְוִיִּם וְיָצָא מִמְכַּר־בַּיִת וְעִיר אֲחֻזָּתוֹ בַּיֹּבֵל
כִּי בָתֵּי עָרֵי הַלְוִיִּם הִוא אֲחֻזָּתָם בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃
34 וּשְׂדֵה מִגְרַשׁ עָרֵיהֶם לֹא יִמָּכֵר כִּי־אֲחֻזַּת עוֹלָם הוּא
לָהֶם׃ ס 35 וְכִי־יָמוּךְ אָחִיךָ וּמָטָה יָדוֹ עִמָּךְ וְהֶחֱזַקְתָּ
בּוֹ גֵּר וְתוֹשָׁב וָחַי עִמָּךְ׃ 36 אַל־תִּקַּח מֵאִתּוֹ נֶשֶׁךְ
וְתַרְבִּית וְיָרֵאתָ מֵאֱלֹהֶיךָ וְחֵי אָחִיךָ עִמָּךְ׃ 37 אֶת־כַּסְפְּךָ
לֹא־תִתֵּן לוֹ בְּנֶשֶׁךְ וּבְמַרְבִּית לֹא־תִתֵּן אָכְלֶךָ׃ 38 אֲנִי
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר־הוֹצֵאתִי אֶתְכֶם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם לָתֵת

וְלַאֲמָתֶךָ וְלִשְׂכִירְךָ וּלְתוֹשָׁבְךָ הַגָּרִים עִמָּךְ׃ 7 וְלִבְהֶמְתְּךָ
וְלַחַיָּה אֲשֶׁר בְּאַרְצֶךָ תִּהְיֶה כָל־תְּבוּאָתָהּ לֶאֱכֹל׃ ס
8 וְסָפַרְתָּ לְךָ שֶׁבַע שַׁבְּתֹת שָׁנִים שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים
וְהָיוּ לְךָ יְמֵי שֶׁבַע שַׁבְּתֹת הַשָּׁנִים תֵּשַׁע וְאַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה׃
9 וְהַעֲבַרְתָּ שׁוֹפַר תְּרוּעָה בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִעִי בֶּעָשׂוֹר לַחֹדֶשׁ
בְּיוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים תַּעֲבִירוּ שׁוֹפָר בְּכָל־אַרְצְכֶם׃ 10 וְקִדַּשְׁתֶּם
אֵת שְׁנַת הַחֲמִשִּׁים שָׁנָה וּקְרָאתֶם דְּרוֹר בָּאָרֶץ לְכָל־
יֹשְׁבֶיהָ יוֹבֵל הִוא תִּהְיֶה לָכֶם וְשַׁבְתֶּם אִישׁ אֶל־אֲחֻזָּתוֹ
וְאִישׁ אֶל־מִשְׁפַּחְתּוֹ תָּשֻׁבוּ׃ 11 יוֹבֵל הִוא שְׁנַת הַחֲמִשִּׁים
שָׁנָה תִּהְיֶה לָכֶם לֹא תִזְרָעוּ וְלֹא תִקְצְרוּ אֶת־סְפִיחֶיהָ וְלֹא
תִבְצְרוּ אֶת־נְזִרֶיהָ׃ 12 כִּי יוֹבֵל הִוא קֹדֶשׁ תִּהְיֶה לָכֶם
מִן־הַשָּׂדֶה תֹּאכְלוּ אֶת־תְּבוּאָתָהּ׃ 13 בִּשְׁנַת הַיּוֹבֵל הַזֹּאת
תָּשֻׁבוּ אִישׁ אֶל־אֲחֻזָּתוֹ׃ 14 וְכִי־תִמְכְּרוּ מִמְכָּר לַעֲמִיתֶךָ
אוֹ קָנֹה מִיַּד עֲמִיתֶךָ אַל־תּוֹנוּ אִישׁ אֶת־אָחִיו׃ 15 בְּמִסְפַּר
שָׁנִים אַחַר הַיּוֹבֵל תִּקְנֶה מֵאֵת עֲמִיתֶךָ בְּמִסְפַּר שְׁנֵי־
תְבוּאֹת יִמְכָּר־לָךְ׃ 16 לְפִי ׀ רֹב הַשָּׁנִים תַּרְבֶּה מִקְנָתוֹ
וּלְפִי מְעֹט הַשָּׁנִים תַּמְעִיט מִקְנָתוֹ כִּי מִסְפַּר תְּבוּאֹת הוּא
מֹכֵר לָךְ׃ 17 וְלֹא תוֹנוּ אִישׁ אֶת־עֲמִיתוֹ וְיָרֵאתָ מֵאֱלֹהֶיךָ
כִּי אֲנִי יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 18 וַעֲשִׂיתֶם אֶת־חֻקֹּתַי וְאֶת־
מִשְׁפָּטַי תִּשְׁמְרוּ וַעֲשִׂיתֶם אֹתָם וִישַׁבְתֶּם עַל־הָאָרֶץ לָבֶטַח׃
19 וְנָתְנָה הָאָרֶץ פִּרְיָהּ וַאֲכַלְתֶּם לָשֹׂבַע וִישַׁבְתֶּם לָבֶטַח
עָלֶיהָ׃ 20 וְכִי תֹאמְרוּ מַה־נֹּאכַל בַּשָּׁנָה הַשְּׁבִיעִת הֵן לֹא
נִזְרָע וְלֹא נֶאֱסֹף אֶת־תְּבוּאָתֵנוּ׃ 21 וְצִוִּיתִי אֶת־בִּרְכָתִי
לָכֶם בַּשָּׁנָה הַשִּׁשִּׁית וְעָשָׂת אֶת־הַתְּבוּאָה לִשְׁלֹשׁ הַשָּׁנִים׃
22 וּזְרַעְתֶּם אֵת הַשָּׁנָה הַשְּׁמִינִת וַאֲכַלְתֶּם מִן־הַתְּבוּאָה

אֶל־מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה וְסָמְכוּ כָל־הַשֹּׁמְעִים אֶת־יְדֵיהֶם עַל־
רֹאשׁוֹ וְרָגְמוּ אֹתוֹ כָּל־הָעֵדָה׃ 15 וְאֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל תְּדַבֵּר
לֵאמֹר אִישׁ אִישׁ כִּי־יְקַלֵּל אֱלֹהָיו וְנָשָׂא חֶטְאוֹ׃ 16 וְנֹקֵב
שֵׁם־יְהוָה מוֹת יוּמָת רָגוֹם יִרְגְּמוּ־בוֹ כָּל־הָעֵדָה כַּגֵּר
כָּאֶזְרָח בְּנָקְבוֹ שֵׁם יוּמָת׃ 17 וְאִישׁ כִּי יַכֶּה כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ
אָדָם מוֹת יוּמָת׃ 18 וּמַכֵּה נֶפֶשׁ־בְּהֵמָה יְשַׁלְּמֶנָּה נֶפֶשׁ
תַּחַת נָפֶשׁ׃ 19 וְאִישׁ כִּי־יִתֵּן מוּם בַּעֲמִיתוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה
כֵּן יֵעָשֶׂה לּוֹ׃ 20 שֶׁבֶר תַּחַת שֶׁבֶר עַיִן תַּחַת עַיִן שֵׁן תַּחַת
שֵׁן כַּאֲשֶׁר יִתֵּן מוּם בָּאָדָם כֵּן יִנָּתֶן בּוֹ׃ 21 וּמַכֵּה בְהֵמָה
יְשַׁלְּמֶנָּה וּמַכֵּה אָדָם יוּמָת׃ 22 מִשְׁפַּט אֶחָד יִהְיֶה לָכֶם
כַּגֵּר כָּאֶזְרָח יִהְיֶה כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 23 וַיְדַבֵּר מֹשֶׁה
אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיּוֹצִיאוּ אֶת־הַמְקַלֵּל אֶל־מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה
וַיִּרְגְּמוּ אֹתוֹ אָבֶן וּבְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל עָשׂוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה
אֶת־מֹשֶׁה׃

פ פ פ

## CHAPTER XXV.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה בְּהַר סִינַי לֵאמֹר׃ 2 דַּבֵּר
אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם כִּי תָבֹאוּ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר
אֲנִי נֹתֵן לָכֶם וְשָׁבְתָה הָאָרֶץ שַׁבָּת לַיהוָה׃ 3 שֵׁשׁ שָׁנִים
תִּזְרַע שָׂדֶךָ וְשֵׁשׁ שָׁנִים תִּזְמֹר כַּרְמֶךָ וְאָסַפְתָּ אֶת־תְּבוּאָתָהּ׃
4 וּבַשָּׁנָה הַשְּׁבִיעִת שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן יִהְיֶה לָאָרֶץ שַׁבָּת לַיהוָה
שָׂדְךָ לֹא תִזְרָע וְכַרְמְךָ לֹא תִזְמֹר׃ 5 אֵת סְפִיחַ קְצִירְךָ
לֹא תִקְצוֹר וְאֶת־עִנְּבֵי נְזִירֶךָ לֹא תִבְצֹר שְׁנַת שַׁבָּתוֹן יִהְיֶה
לָאָרֶץ׃ 6 וְהָיְתָה שַׁבַּת הָאָרֶץ לָכֶם לְאָכְלָה לְךָ וּלְעַבְדְּךָ

תֵּשְׁבוּ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים כָּל־הָאֶזְרָח בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל יֵשְׁבוּ בַּסֻּכֹּת׃
43 לְמַעַן יֵדְעוּ דֹרֹתֵיכֶם כִּי בַסֻּכּוֹת הוֹשַׁבְתִּי אֶת־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּהוֹצִיאִי אוֹתָם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃
44 וַיְדַבֵּר מֹשֶׁה אֶת־מֹעֲדֵי יְהוָה אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ פ

## CHAPTER XXIV.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 צַו אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְיִקְחוּ אֵלֶיךָ שֶׁמֶן זַיִת זָךְ כָּתִית לַמָּאוֹר לְהַעֲלֹת נֵר תָּמִיד׃
3 מִחוּץ לְפָרֹכֶת הָעֵדֻת בְּאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד יַעֲרֹךְ אֹתוֹ אַהֲרֹן
מֵעֶרֶב עַד־בֹּקֶר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה תָּמִיד חֻקַּת עוֹלָם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם׃
4 עַל הַמְּנֹרָה הַטְּהֹרָה יַעֲרֹךְ אֶת־הַנֵּרוֹת לִפְנֵי יְהוָה
תָּמִיד׃ פ 5 וְלָקַחְתָּ סֹלֶת וְאָפִיתָ אֹתָהּ שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה
חַלּוֹת שְׁנֵי עֶשְׂרֹנִים יִהְיֶה הַחַלָּה הָאֶחָת׃ 6 וְשַׂמְתָּ
אוֹתָם שְׁתַּיִם מַעֲרָכוֹת שֵׁשׁ הַמַּעֲרָכֶת עַל הַשֻּׁלְחָן הַטָּהֹר
לִפְנֵי יְהוָה׃ 7 וְנָתַתָּ עַל־הַמַּעֲרֶכֶת לְבֹנָה זַכָּה וְהָיְתָה לַלֶּחֶם
לְאַזְכָּרָה אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה׃ 8 בְּיוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת בְּיוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת
יַעַרְכֶנּוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה תָּמִיד מֵאֵת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרִית עוֹלָם׃
9 וְהָיְתָה לְאַהֲרֹן וּלְבָנָיו וַאֲכָלֻהוּ בְּמָקוֹם קָדֹשׁ כִּי קֹדֶשׁ
קָדָשִׁים הוּא לוֹ מֵאִשֵּׁי יְהוָה חָק־עוֹלָם׃ ס 10 וַיֵּצֵא
בֶּן־אִשָּׁה יִשְׂרְאֵלִית וְהוּא בֶּן־אִישׁ מִצְרִי בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּנָּצוּ בַּמַּחֲנֶה בֶּן הַיִּשְׂרְאֵלִית וְאִישׁ הַיִּשְׂרְאֵלִי׃
11 וַיִּקֹּב בֶּן־הָאִשָּׁה הַיִּשְׂרְאֵלִית אֶת־הַשֵּׁם וַיְקַלֵּל וַיָּבִיאוּ
אֹתוֹ אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְשֵׁם אִמּוֹ שְׁלֹמִית בַּת־דִּבְרִי לְמַטֵּה־דָן׃
12 וַיַּנִּיחֻהוּ בַּמִּשְׁמָר לִפְרֹשׁ לָהֶם עַל־פִּי יְהוָה׃ פ
13 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 14 הוֹצֵא אֶת־הַמְקַלֵּל

תַעֲשׂוּ בְּעֶצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה כִּי יוֹם כִּפֻּרִים הוּא לְכַפֵּר עֲלֵיכֶם
לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 29 כִּי כָל־הַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תְעֻנֶּה
בְּעֶצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְנִכְרְתָה מֵעַמֶּיהָ׃ 30 וְכָל־הַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר
תַּעֲשֶׂה כָּל־מְלָאכָה בְּעֶצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְהַאֲבַדְתִּי אֶת־הַנֶּפֶשׁ
הַהִוא מִקֶּרֶב עַמָּהּ׃ 31 כָּל־מְלָאכָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ חֻקַּת
עוֹלָם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם בְּכֹל מֹשְׁבֹתֵיכֶם׃ 32 שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן הוּא
לָכֶם וְעִנִּיתֶם אֶת־נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם בְּתִשְׁעָה לַחֹדֶשׁ בָּעֶרֶב מֵעֶרֶב
עַד־עֶרֶב תִּשְׁבְּתוּ שַׁבַּתְּכֶם׃ פ 33 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־
מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 34 דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר בַּחֲמִשָּׁה
עָשָׂר יוֹם לַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי הַזֶּה חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת שִׁבְעַת יָמִים
לַיהוָה׃ 35 בַּיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ כָּל־מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה
לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ׃ 36 שִׁבְעַת יָמִים תַּקְרִיבוּ אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה בַּיּוֹם
הַשְּׁמִינִי מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ יִהְיֶה לָכֶם וְהִקְרַבְתֶּם אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה
עֲצֶרֶת הִוא כָּל־מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ׃ 37 אֵלֶּה מוֹעֲדֵי
יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר־תִּקְרְאוּ אֹתָם מִקְרָאֵי קֹדֶשׁ לְהַקְרִיב אִשֶּׁה
לַיהוָה עֹלָה וּמִנְחָה זֶבַח וּנְסָכִים דְּבַר־יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ׃
38 מִלְּבַד שַׁבְּתֹת יְהוָה וּמִלְּבַד מַתְּנוֹתֵיכֶם וּמִלְּבַד כָּל־
נִדְרֵיכֶם וּמִלְּבַד כָּל־נִדְבֹתֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר תִּתְּנוּ לַיהוָה׃ 39 אַךְ
בַּחֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר יוֹם לַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי בְּאָסְפְּכֶם אֶת־תְּבוּאַת
הָאָרֶץ תָּחֹגּוּ אֶת־חַג־יְהוָה שִׁבְעַת יָמִים בַּיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן
שַׁבָּתוֹן וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי שַׁבָּתוֹן׃ 40 וּלְקַחְתֶּם לָכֶם בַּיּוֹם
הָרִאשׁוֹן פְּרִי עֵץ הָדָר כַּפֹּת תְּמָרִים וַעֲנַף עֵץ־עָבֹת
וְעַרְבֵי־נָחַל וּשְׂמַחְתֶּם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם שִׁבְעַת יָמִים׃
41 וְחַגֹּתֶם אֹתוֹ חַג לַיהוָה שִׁבְעַת יָמִים בַּשָּׁנָה חֻקַּת
עוֹלָם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי תָּחֹגּוּ אֹתוֹ׃ 42 בַּסֻּכֹּת

וְכַרְמֶל לֹא תֹאכְלוּ עַד־עֶצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה עַד הֲבִיאֲכֶם אֶת־
קָרְבַּן אֱלֹהֵיכֶם חֻקַּת עוֹלָם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם בְּכֹל מֹשְׁבֹתֵיכֶם׃ ס
15 וּסְפַרְתֶּם לָכֶם מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת מִיּוֹם הֲבִיאֲכֶם אֶת־
עֹמֶר הַתְּנוּפָה שֶׁבַע שַׁבָּתוֹת תְּמִימֹת תִּהְיֶינָה׃ 16 עַד
מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת הַשְּׁבִיעִת תִּסְפְּרוּ חֲמִשִּׁים יוֹם וְהִקְרַבְתֶּם
מִנְחָה חֲדָשָׁה לַיהוָה׃ 17 מִמּוֹשְׁבֹתֵיכֶם תָּבִיאוּ ׀ לֶחֶם תְּנוּפָה
שְׁתַּיִם שְׁנֵי עֶשְׂרֹנִים סֹלֶת תִּהְיֶינָה חָמֵץ תֵּאָפֶינָה בִּכּוּרִים
לַיהוָה׃ 18 וְהִקְרַבְתֶּם עַל־הַלֶּחֶם שִׁבְעַת כְּבָשִׂים תְּמִימִם
בְּנֵי שָׁנָה וּפַר בֶּן־בָּקָר אֶחָד וְאֵילִם שְׁנָיִם יִהְיוּ עֹלָה
לַיהוָה וּמִנְחָתָם וְנִסְכֵּיהֶם אִשֵּׁה רֵיחַ־נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה׃
19 וַעֲשִׂיתֶם שְׂעִיר־עִזִּים אֶחָד לְחַטָּאת וּשְׁנֵי כְבָשִׂים בְּנֵי
שָׁנָה לְזֶבַח שְׁלָמִים׃ 20 וְהֵנִיף הַכֹּהֵן ׀ אֹתָם עַל לֶחֶם
הַבִּכֻּרִים תְּנוּפָה לִפְנֵי יְהוָה עַל־שְׁנֵי כְּבָשִׂים קֹדֶשׁ יִהְיוּ
לַיהוָה לַכֹּהֵן׃ 21 וּקְרָאתֶם בְּעֶצֶם ׀ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ
יִהְיֶה לָכֶם כָּל־מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ חֻקַּת עוֹלָם
בְּכָל־מוֹשְׁבֹתֵיכֶם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם׃ 22 וּבְקֻצְרְכֶם אֶת־קְצִיר
אַרְצְכֶם לֹא־תְכַלֶּה פְּאַת שָׂדְךָ בְּקֻצְרֶךָ וְלֶקֶט קְצִירְךָ לֹא
תְלַקֵּט לֶעָנִי וְלַגֵּר תַּעֲזֹב אֹתָם אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ פ
23 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 24 דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
לֵאמֹר בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי בְּאֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ יִהְיֶה לָכֶם שַׁבָּתוֹן
זִכְרוֹן תְּרוּעָה מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ׃ 25 כָּל־מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה לֹא
תַעֲשׂוּ וְהִקְרַבְתֶּם אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה׃ ס 26 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה
אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 27 אַךְ בֶּעָשׂוֹר לַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי הַזֶּה
יוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים הוּא מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ יִהְיֶה לָכֶם וְעִנִּיתֶם אֶת־
נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם וְהִקְרַבְתֶּם אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה׃ 28 וְכָל־מְלָאכָה לֹא

אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ 32 וְלֹא תְחַלְּלוּ אֶת־שֵׁם קָדְשִׁי וְנִקְדַּשְׁתִּי בְּתוֹךְ
בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲנִי יְהוָה מְקַדִּשְׁכֶם׃ 33 הַמּוֹצִיא אֶתְכֶם
מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם לִהְיוֹת לָכֶם לֵאלֹהִים אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ פ

## CHAPTER XXIII.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם מוֹעֲדֵי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר־תִּקְרְאוּ אֹתָם
מִקְרָאֵי קֹדֶשׁ אֵלֶּה הֵם מוֹעֲדָי׃ 3 שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תֵּעָשֶׂה
מְלָאכָה וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ כָּל־
מְלָאכָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ שַׁבָּת הִוא לַיהוָה בְּכֹל מוֹשְׁבֹתֵיכֶם׃
פ 4 אֵלֶּה מוֹעֲדֵי יְהוָה מִקְרָאֵי קֹדֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר־תִּקְרְאוּ
אֹתָם בְּמוֹעֲדָם׃ 5 בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָרִאשׁוֹן בְּאַרְבָּעָה עָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ
בֵּין הָעַרְבָּיִם פֶּסַח לַיהוָה׃ 6 וּבַחֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר יוֹם לַחֹדֶשׁ
הַזֶּה חַג הַמַּצּוֹת לַיהוָה שִׁבְעַת יָמִים מַצּוֹת תֹּאכֵלוּ׃
7 בַּיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ יִהְיֶה לָכֶם כָּל־מְלֶאכֶת
עֲבֹדָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ׃ 8 וְהִקְרַבְתֶּם אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה שִׁבְעַת יָמִים
בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ כָּל־מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ׃
פ 9 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 10 דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם כִּי־תָבֹאוּ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי נֹתֵן
לָכֶם וּקְצַרְתֶּם אֶת־קְצִירָהּ וַהֲבֵאתֶם אֶת־עֹמֶר רֵאשִׁית
קְצִירְכֶם אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן׃ 11 וְהֵנִיף אֶת־הָעֹמֶר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה
לִרְצֹנְכֶם מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת יְנִיפֶנּוּ הַכֹּהֵן׃ 12 וַעֲשִׂיתֶם
בְּיוֹם הֲנִיפְכֶם אֶת־הָעֹמֶר כֶּבֶשׂ תָּמִים בֶּן־שְׁנָתוֹ לְעֹלָה
לַיהוָה׃ 13 וּמִנְחָתוֹ שְׁנֵי עֶשְׂרֹנִים סֹלֶת בְּלוּלָה בַשֶּׁמֶן אִשֶּׁה
לַיהוָה רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ וְנִסְכֹּה יַיִן רְבִיעִת הַהִין׃ 14 וְלֶחֶם וְקָלִי

יֹאכַל בּוֹ׃ 14 וְאִישׁ כִּי־יֹאכַל קֹדֶשׁ בִּשְׁגָגָה וְיָסַף חֲמִשִׁיתוֹ
עָלָיו וְנָתַן לַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַקֹּדֶשׁ׃ 15 וְלֹא יְחַלְּלוּ אֶת־קָדְשֵׁי
בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵת אֲשֶׁר־יָרִימוּ לַיהוָֹה׃ 16 וְהִשִּׂיאוּ אוֹתָם
עֲוֹן אַשְׁמָה בְּאָכְלָם אֶת־קָדְשֵׁיהֶם כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָֹה מְקַדְּשָׁם׃
פ 17 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָֹה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 18 דַּבֵּר אֶל־
אַהֲרֹן וְאֶל־בָּנָיו וְאֶל כָּל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם אִישׁ
אִישׁ מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמִן־הַגֵּר בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יַקְרִיב קָרְבָּנוֹ
לְכָל־נִדְרֵיהֶם וּלְכָל־נִדְבוֹתָם אֲשֶׁר־יַקְרִיבוּ לַיהוָֹה לְעֹלָה׃
19 לִרְצֹנְכֶם תָּמִים זָכָר בַּבָּקָר בַּכְּשָׂבִים וּבָעִזִּים׃ 20 כֹּל
אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ מוּם לֹא תַקְרִיבוּ כִּי־לֹא לְרָצוֹן יִהְיֶה לָכֶם׃
21 וְאִישׁ כִּי־יַקְרִיב זֶבַח־שְׁלָמִים לַיהוָֹה לְפַלֵּא־נֶדֶר אוֹ
לִנְדָבָה בַּבָּקָר אוֹ בַצֹּאן תָּמִים יִהְיֶה לְרָצוֹן כָּל־מוּם לֹא
יִהְיֶה־בּוֹ׃ 22 עַוֶּרֶת אוֹ שָׁבוּר אוֹ־חָרוּץ אוֹ־יַבֶּלֶת אוֹ גָרָב
אוֹ יַלֶּפֶת לֹא־תַקְרִיבוּ אֵלֶּה לַיהוָֹה וְאִשֶּׁה לֹא־תִתְּנוּ מֵהֶם
עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָֹה׃ 23 וְשׁוֹר וָשֶׂה שָׂרוּעַ וְקָלוּט נְדָבָה
תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתוֹ וּלְנֵדֶר לֹא יֵרָצֶה׃ 24 וּמָעוּךְ וְכָתוּת וְנָתוּק
וְכָרוּת לֹא תַקְרִיבוּ לַיהוָֹה וּבְאַרְצְכֶם לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ׃ 25 וּמִיַּד
בֶּן־נֵכָר לֹא תַקְרִיבוּ אֶת־לֶחֶם אֱלֹהֵיכֶם מִכָּל־אֵלֶּה כִּי
מָשְׁחָתָם בָּהֶם מוּם בָּם לֹא יֵרָצוּ לָכֶם׃ ס 26 וַיְדַבֵּר
יְהוָֹה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 27 שׁוֹר אוֹ־כֶשֶׂב אוֹ־עֵז כִּי יִוָּלֵד
וְהָיָה שִׁבְעַת יָמִים תַּחַת אִמּוֹ וּמִיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי וָהָלְאָה
יֵרָצֶה לְקָרְבַּן אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָֹה׃ 28 וְשׁוֹר אוֹ־שֶׂה אֹתוֹ וְאֶת־בְּנוֹ
לֹא תִשְׁחֲטוּ בְּיוֹם אֶחָד׃ 29 וְכִי־תִזְבְּחוּ זֶבַח־תּוֹדָה לַיהוָֹה
לִרְצֹנְכֶם תִּזְבָּחוּ׃ 30 בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יֵאָכֵל לֹא־תוֹתִירוּ מִמֶּנּוּ
עַד־בֹּקֶר אֲנִי יְהוָֹה׃ 31 וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם מִצְוֹתַי וַעֲשִׂיתֶם אֹתָם

בּוֹ וְלֹא יְחַלֵּל אֶת־מִקְדָּשַׁי כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה מְקַדְּשָׁם׃ 24 וַיְדַבֵּר
מֹשֶׁה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן וְאֶל־בָּנָיו וְאֶל־כָּל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ פ

## CHAPTER XXII.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 דַּבֵּר אֶל־אַהֲרֹן
וְאֶל־בָּנָיו וְיִנָּזְרוּ מִקָּדְשֵׁי בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלֹא יְחַלְּלוּ אֶת־שֵׁם
קָדְשִׁי אֲשֶׁר הֵם מַקְדִּשִׁים לִי אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ 3 אֱמֹר אֲלֵהֶם
לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם כָּל־אִישׁ ׀ אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרַב מִכָּל־זַרְעֲכֶם אֶל־הַקֳּדָשִׁים
אֲשֶׁר יַקְדִּישׁוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל לַיהוָה וְטֻמְאָתוֹ עָלָיו וְנִכְרְתָה
הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא מִלְּפָנַי אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ 4 אִישׁ אִישׁ מִזֶּרַע אַהֲרֹן
וְהוּא צָרוּעַ אוֹ זָב בַּקֳּדָשִׁים לֹא יֹאכַל עַד אֲשֶׁר יִטְהָר
וְהַנֹּגֵעַ בְּכָל־טְמֵא־נֶפֶשׁ אוֹ אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־תֵּצֵא מִמֶּנּוּ שִׁכְבַת־
זָרַע׃ 5 אוֹ־אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִגַּע בְּכָל־שֶׁרֶץ אֲשֶׁר יִטְמָא־לוֹ אוֹ
בְאָדָם אֲשֶׁר יִטְמָא־לוֹ לְכֹל טֻמְאָתוֹ׃ 6 נֶפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר תִּגַּע־
בּוֹ וְטָמְאָה עַד־הָעָרֶב וְלֹא יֹאכַל מִן־הַקֳּדָשִׁים כִּי אִם־
רָחַץ בְּשָׂרוֹ בַּמָּיִם׃ 7 וּבָא הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וְטָהֵר וְאַחַר יֹאכַל מִן־
הַקֳּדָשִׁים כִּי לַחְמוֹ הוּא׃ 8 נְבֵלָה וּטְרֵפָה לֹא יֹאכַל
לְטָמְאָה־בָהּ אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ 9 וְשָׁמְרוּ אֶת־מִשְׁמַרְתִּי וְלֹא־
יִשְׂאוּ עָלָיו חֵטְא וּמֵתוּ בוֹ כִּי יְחַלְּלֻהוּ אֲנִי יְהוָה מְקַדְּשָׁם׃
10 וְכָל־זָר לֹא־יֹאכַל קֹדֶשׁ תּוֹשַׁב כֹּהֵן וְשָׂכִיר לֹא־יֹאכַל
קֹדֶשׁ 11 וְכֹהֵן כִּי־יִקְנֶה נֶפֶשׁ קִנְיַן כַּסְפּוֹ הוּא יֹאכַל בּוֹ
וִילִיד בֵּיתוֹ הֵם יֹאכְלוּ בְלַחְמוֹ׃ 12 וּבַת־כֹּהֵן כִּי תִהְיֶה
לְאִישׁ זָר הִוא בִּתְרוּמַת הַקֳּדָשִׁים לֹא תֹאכֵל׃ 13 וּבַת־
כֹּהֵן כִּי תִהְיֶה אַלְמָנָה וּגְרוּשָׁה וְזֶרַע אֵין לָהּ וְשָׁבָה אֶל־
בֵּית אָבִיהָ כִּנְעוּרֶיהָ מִלֶּחֶם אָבִיהָ תֹּאכֵל וְכָל־זָר לֹא־

אֶת־אִשֵּׁי יְהוָה לֶחֶם אֱלֹהֵיהֶם הֵם מַקְרִיבִם וְהָיוּ קֹדֶשׁ׃
7 אִשָּׁה זֹנָה וַחֲלָלָה לֹא יִקָּחוּ וְאִשָּׁה גְּרוּשָׁה מֵאִישָׁהּ
לֹא יִקָּחוּ כִּי־קָדֹשׁ הוּא לֵאלֹהָיו׃ 8 וְקִדַּשְׁתּוֹ כִּי־אֶת־
לֶחֶם אֱלֹהֶיךָ הוּא מַקְרִיב קָדֹשׁ יִהְיֶה־לָּךְ כִּי קָדוֹשׁ
אֲנִי יְהוָה מְקַדִּשְׁכֶם׃ 9 וּבַת אִישׁ כֹּהֵן כִּי תֵחֵל לִזְנוֹת
אֶת־אָבִיהָ הִיא מְחַלֶּלֶת בָּאֵשׁ תִּשָּׂרֵף׃ ס 10 וְהַכֹּהֵן
הַגָּדוֹל מֵאֶחָיו אֲשֶׁר־יוּצַק עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ ׀ שֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה
וּמִלֵּא אֶת־יָדוֹ לִלְבֹּשׁ אֶת־הַבְּגָדִים אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ לֹא יִפְרָע
וּבְגָדָיו לֹא יִפְרֹם׃ 11 וְעַל כָּל־נַפְשֹׁת מֵת לֹא יָבֹא לְאָבִיו
וּלְאִמּוֹ לֹא יִטַּמָּא׃ 12 וּמִן־הַמִּקְדָּשׁ לֹא יֵצֵא וְלֹא
יְחַלֵּל אֵת מִקְדַּשׁ אֱלֹהָיו כִּי נֵזֶר שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת אֱלֹהָיו
עָלָיו אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ 13 וְהוּא אִשָּׁה בִבְתוּלֶיהָ יִקָּח׃
14 אַלְמָנָה וּגְרוּשָׁה וַחֲלָלָה זֹנָה אֶת־אֵלֶּה לֹא יִקָּח כִּי
אִם־בְּתוּלָה מֵעַמָּיו יִקַּח אִשָּׁה׃ 15 וְלֹא־יְחַלֵּל זַרְעוֹ בְּעַמָּיו
כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה מְקַדְּשׁוֹ׃ ס 16 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה
לֵּאמֹר׃ 17 דַּבֵּר אֶל־אַהֲרֹן לֵאמֹר אִישׁ מִזַּרְעֲךָ לְדֹרֹתָם
אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה בוֹ מוּם לֹא יִקְרַב לְהַקְרִיב לֶחֶם אֱלֹהָיו׃
18 כִּי כָל־אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ מוּם לֹא יִקְרָב אִישׁ עִוֵּר אוֹ
פִסֵּחַ אוֹ חָרֻם אוֹ שָׂרוּעַ׃ 19 אוֹ אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־יִהְיֶה בוֹ
שֶׁבֶר רָגֶל אוֹ שֶׁבֶר יָד׃ 20 אוֹ־גִבֵּן אוֹ־דַק אוֹ תְּבַלֻּל
בְּעֵינוֹ אוֹ גָרָב אוֹ יַלֶּפֶת אוֹ מְרוֹחַ אָשֶׁךְ׃ 21 כָּל־אִישׁ
אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ מוּם מִזֶּרַע אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן לֹא יִגַּשׁ לְהַקְרִיב אֶת־
אִשֵּׁי יְהוָה מוּם בּוֹ אֵת לֶחֶם אֱלֹהָיו לֹא יִגַּשׁ לְהַקְרִיב׃
22 לֶחֶם אֱלֹהָיו מִקָּדְשֵׁי הַקֳּדָשִׁים וּמִן־הַקֳּדָשִׁים יֹאכֵל׃
23 אַךְ אֶל־הַפָּרֹכֶת לֹא יָבֹא וְאֶל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לֹא יִגַּשׁ כִּי־מוּם

גִּלָּ֑ה חֶטְאָ֥ם יִשָּׂ֖אוּ עֲרִירִ֥ים יָמֻֽתוּ׃ 21 וְאִ֗ישׁ אֲשֶׁ֥ר יִקַּ֛ח אֶת
אֵ֥שֶׁת אָחִ֖יו נִדָּ֣ה הִ֑וא עֶרְוַ֥ת אָחִ֛יו גִּלָּ֖ה עֲרִירִ֥ים יִהְיֽוּ׃
22 וּשְׁמַרְתֶּ֤ם אֶת־כָּל־חֻקֹּתַי֙ וְאֶת־כָּל־מִשְׁפָּטַ֔י וַעֲשִׂיתֶ֖ם
אֹתָ֑ם וְלֹא־תָקִ֤יא אֶתְכֶם֙ הָאָ֔רֶץ אֲשֶׁ֨ר אֲנִ֜י מֵבִ֥יא אֶתְכֶ֛ם שָׁ֖מָּה
לָשֶׁ֥בֶת בָּֽהּ׃ 23 וְלֹ֤א תֵֽלְכוּ֙ בְּחֻקֹּ֣ת הַגּ֔וֹי אֲשֶׁר־אֲנִ֥י מְשַׁלֵּ֖חַ
מִפְּנֵיכֶ֑ם כִּ֤י אֶת־כָּל־אֵ֙לֶּה֙ עָשׂ֔וּ וָאָקֻ֖ץ בָּֽם׃ 24 וָאֹמַ֣ר לָכֶ֗ם
אַתֶּם֮ תִּירְשׁ֣וּ אֶת־אַדְמָתָם֒ וַאֲנִ֞י אֶתְּנֶ֤נָּה לָכֶם֙ לָרֶ֣שֶׁת אֹתָ֔הּ
אֶ֛רֶץ זָבַ֥ת חָלָ֖ב וּדְבָ֑שׁ אֲנִי֙ יְהוָ֣ה אֱלֹהֵיכֶ֔ם אֲשֶׁר־הִבְדַּ֥לְתִּי
אֶתְכֶ֖ם מִן־הָֽעַמִּֽים׃ 25 וְהִבְדַּלְתֶּ֞ם בֵּֽין־הַבְּהֵמָ֤ה הַטְּהֹרָה֙
לַטְּמֵאָ֔ה וּבֵין־הָע֥וֹף הַטָּמֵ֖א לַטָּהֹ֑ר וְלֹֽא־תְשַׁקְּצ֨וּ אֶת־
נַפְשֹֽׁתֵיכֶ֜ם בַּבְּהֵמָ֣ה וּבָע֗וֹף וּבְכֹל֙ אֲשֶׁ֣ר תִּרְמֹ֣שׂ הָֽאֲדָמָ֔ה
אֲשֶׁר־הִבְדַּ֥לְתִּי לָכֶ֖ם לְטַמֵּֽא׃ 26 וִהְיִ֤יתֶם לִי֙ קְדֹשִׁ֔ים
כִּ֥י קָד֖וֹשׁ אֲנִ֣י יְהוָ֑ה וָאַבְדִּ֥ל אֶתְכֶ֛ם מִן־הָֽעַמִּ֖ים לִהְי֥וֹת
לִֽי׃ 27 וְאִ֣ישׁ אֽוֹ־אִשָּׁ֗ה כִּֽי־יִהְיֶ֨ה בָהֶ֥ם א֛וֹב א֥וֹ יִדְּעֹנִ֖י מ֣וֹת
יוּמָ֑תוּ בָּאֶ֛בֶן יִרְגְּמ֥וּ אֹתָ֖ם דְּמֵיהֶ֥ם בָּֽם׃

פ פ פ

## CHAPTER XXI.

1 וַיֹּ֤אמֶר יְהוָה֙ אֶל־מֹשֶׁ֔ה אֱמֹ֥ר אֶל־הַכֹּהֲנִ֖ים בְּנֵ֣י אַהֲרֹ֑ן
וְאָמַרְתָּ֣ אֲלֵהֶ֔ם לְנֶ֥פֶשׁ לֹֽא־יִטַּמָּ֖א בְּעַמָּֽיו׃ 2 כִּ֚י אִם־לִשְׁאֵר֔וֹ
הַקָּרֹ֖ב אֵלָ֑יו לְאִמּ֣וֹ וּלְאָבִ֔יו וְלִבְנ֥וֹ וּלְבִתּ֖וֹ וּלְאָחִֽיו׃ 3 וְלַאֲחֹת֤וֹ
הַבְּתוּלָה֙ הַקְּרוֹבָ֣ה אֵלָ֔יו אֲשֶׁ֥ר לֹא־הָיְתָ֖ה לְאִ֑ישׁ לָ֖הּ יִטַּמָּֽא׃
4 לֹ֥א יִטַּמָּ֖א בַּ֣עַל בְּעַמָּ֑יו לְהֵ֖חַלּֽוֹ׃ 5 לֹא־יִקְרְח֤וּ קָרְחָה֙
בְּרֹאשָׁ֔ם וּפְאַ֥ת זְקָנָ֖ם לֹ֣א יְגַלֵּ֑חוּ וּבִ֨בְשָׂרָ֔ם לֹ֥א יִשְׂרְט֖וּ שָׂרָֽטֶת׃
6 קְדֹשִׁ֤ים יִהְיוּ֙ לֵאלֹ֣הֵיהֶ֔ם וְלֹ֣א יְחַלְּל֔וּ שֵׁ֖ם אֱלֹהֵיהֶ֑ם כִּ֡י

אַחֲרֵי הַמֹּלֶךְ מִקֶּרֶב עַמָּם׃ 6 וְהַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר תִּפְנֶה אֶל־
הָאֹבֹת וְאֶל־הַיִּדְּעֹנִים לִזְנֹת אַחֲרֵיהֶם וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־פָּנַי בַּנֶּפֶשׁ
הַהִוא וְהִכְרַתִּי אֹתוֹ מִקֶּרֶב עַמּוֹ׃ 7 וְהִתְקַדִּשְׁתֶּם וִהְיִיתֶם
קְדֹשִׁים כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 8 וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־חֻקֹּתַי
וַעֲשִׂיתֶם אֹתָם אֲנִי יְהוָה מְקַדִּשְׁכֶם׃ 9 כִּי־אִישׁ אִישׁ
אֲשֶׁר יְקַלֵּל אֶת־אָבִיו וְאֶת־אִמּוֹ מוֹת יוּמָת אָבִיו וְאִמּוֹ
קִלֵּל דָּמָיו בּוֹ׃ 10 וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִנְאַף אֶת־אֵשֶׁת אִישׁ
אֲשֶׁר יִנְאַף אֶת־אֵשֶׁת רֵעֵהוּ מוֹת־יוּמַת הַנֹּאֵף וְהַנֹּאָפֶת׃
11 וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכַּב אֶת־אֵשֶׁת אָבִיו עֶרְוַת אָבִיו גִּלָּה
מוֹת־יוּמְתוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם דְּמֵיהֶם בָּם׃ 12 וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכַּב
אֶת־כַּלָּתוֹ מוֹת יוּמְתוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם תֶּבֶל עָשׂוּ דְּמֵיהֶם בָּם׃
13 וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכַּב אֶת־זָכָר מִשְׁכְּבֵי אִשָּׁה תּוֹעֵבָה עָשׂוּ
שְׁנֵיהֶם מוֹת יוּמָתוּ דְּמֵיהֶם בָּם׃ 14 וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִקַּח אֶת־
אִשָּׁה וְאֶת־אִמָּהּ זִמָּה הִוא בָּאֵשׁ יִשְׂרְפוּ אֹתוֹ וְאֶתְהֶן
וְלֹא־תִהְיֶה זִמָּה בְּתוֹכְכֶם׃ 15 וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִתֵּן שְׁכָבְתּוֹ
בִּבְהֵמָה מוֹת יוּמָת וְאֶת־הַבְּהֵמָה תַּהֲרֹגוּ׃ 16 וְאִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר
תִּקְרַב אֶל־כָּל־בְּהֵמָה לְרִבְעָה אֹתָהּ וְהָרַגְתָּ אֶת־הָאִשָּׁה
וְאֶת־הַבְּהֵמָה מוֹת יוּמָתוּ דְּמֵיהֶם בָּם׃ 17 וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־יִקַּח
אֶת־אֲחֹתוֹ בַּת־אָבִיו אוֹ־בַת־אִמּוֹ וְרָאָה אֶת־עֶרְוָתָהּ וְהִיא
תִרְאֶה אֶת־עֶרְוָתוֹ חֶסֶד הוּא וְנִכְרְתוּ לְעֵינֵי בְּנֵי עַמָּם
עֶרְוַת אֲחֹתוֹ גִּלָּה עֲוֺנוֹ יִשָּׂא׃ 18 וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׁכַּב אֶת־
אִשָּׁה דָּוָה וְגִלָּה אֶת־עֶרְוָתָהּ אֶת־מְקֹרָהּ הֶעֱרָה וְהִוא גִּלְּתָה
אֶת־מְקוֹר דָּמֶיהָ וְנִכְרְתוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם מִקֶּרֶב עַמָּם׃ 19 וְעֶרְוַת
אֲחוֹת אִמְּךָ וַאֲחוֹת אָבִיךָ לֹא תְגַלֵּה כִּי אֶת־שְׁאֵרוֹ הֶעֱרָה
עֲוֺנָם יִשָּׂאוּ׃ 20 וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכַּב אֶת־דֹּדָתוֹ עֶרְוַת דֹּדוֹ

קַֽעֲקַ֔ע לֹ֥א תִתְּנ֖וּ בָּכֶ֑ם אֲנִ֖י יְהֹוָֽה׃ 29 אַל־תְּחַלֵּ֥ל אֶֽת־בִּתְּךָ֖
לְהַזְנוֹתָ֑הּ וְלֹא־תִזְנֶ֣ה הָאָ֔רֶץ וּמָלְאָ֥ה הָאָ֖רֶץ זִמָּֽה׃ 30 אֶת־
שַׁבְּתֹתַ֣י תִּשְׁמֹ֔רוּ וּמִקְדָּשִׁ֖י תִּירָ֑אוּ אֲנִ֖י יְהֹוָֽה׃ 31 אַל־תִּפְנ֤וּ
אֶל־הָאֹבֹת֙ וְאֶל־הַיִּדְּעֹנִ֔ים אַל־תְּבַקְשׁ֖וּ לְטָמְאָ֣ה בָהֶ֑ם אֲנִ֖י
יְהֹוָ֥ה אֱלֹהֵיכֶֽם׃ 32 מִפְּנֵ֤י שֵׂיבָה֙ תָּק֔וּם וְהָדַרְתָּ֖ פְּנֵ֣י זָקֵ֑ן
וְיָרֵ֥אתָ מֵּאֱלֹהֶ֖יךָ אֲנִ֥י יְהֹוָֽה׃ ס 33 וְכִֽי־יָג֧וּר אִתְּךָ֛ גֵּ֖ר
בְּאַרְצְכֶ֑ם לֹ֥א תוֹנ֖וּ אֹתֽוֹ׃ 34 כְּאֶזְרָ֣ח מִכֶּם֩ יִהְיֶ֨ה לָכֶ֜ם
הַגֵּ֣ר ׀ הַגָּ֣ר אִתְּכֶ֗ם וְאָהַבְתָּ֥ לוֹ֙ כָּמ֔וֹךָ כִּֽי־גֵרִ֥ים הֱיִיתֶ֖ם
בְּאֶ֣רֶץ מִצְרָ֑יִם אֲנִ֖י יְהֹוָ֥ה אֱלֹהֵיכֶֽם׃ 35 לֹא־תַעֲשׂ֥וּ עָ֖וֶל
בַּמִּשְׁפָּ֑ט בַּמִּדָּ֕ה בַּמִּשְׁקָ֖ל וּבַמְּשׂוּרָֽה׃ 36 מֹ֧אזְנֵי צֶ֣דֶק אַבְנֵי־
צֶ֗דֶק אֵ֥יפַת צֶ֛דֶק וְהִ֥ין צֶ֖דֶק יִהְיֶ֣ה לָכֶ֑ם אֲנִי֙ יְהֹוָ֣ה
אֱלֹהֵיכֶ֔ם אֲשֶׁר־הוֹצֵ֥אתִי אֶתְכֶ֖ם מֵאֶ֥רֶץ מִצְרָֽיִם׃
37 וּשְׁמַרְתֶּ֤ם אֶת־כָּל־חֻקֹּתַי֙ וְאֶת־כָּל־מִשְׁפָּטַ֔י וַעֲשִׂיתֶ֖ם
אֹתָ֑ם אֲנִ֖י יְהֹוָֽה׃ פ

## CHAPTER XX.

1 וַיְדַבֵּ֥ר יְהֹוָ֖ה אֶל־מֹשֶׁ֥ה לֵּאמֹֽר׃ 2 וְאֶל־בְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵל֮
תֹּאמַר֒ אִ֨ישׁ אִ֜ישׁ מִבְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֗ל וּמִן־הַגֵּ֣ר ׀ הַגָּ֣ר בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֗ל
אֲשֶׁ֨ר יִתֵּ֧ן מִזַּרְע֛וֹ לַמֹּ֖לֶךְ מ֣וֹת יוּמָ֑ת עַ֥ם הָאָ֖רֶץ יִרְגְּמֻ֥הוּ
בָאָֽבֶן׃ 3 וַאֲנִ֞י אֶתֵּ֤ן אֶת־פָּנַי֙ בָּאִ֣ישׁ הַה֔וּא וְהִכְרַתִּ֥י אֹת֖וֹ
מִקֶּ֣רֶב עַמּ֑וֹ כִּ֤י מִזַּרְעוֹ֙ נָתַ֣ן לַמֹּ֔לֶךְ לְמַ֗עַן טַמֵּא֙ אֶת־מִקְדָּשִׁ֔י
וּלְחַלֵּ֖ל אֶת־שֵׁ֥ם קָדְשִֽׁי׃ 4 וְאִ֡ם הַעְלֵ֣ם יַעְלִימוּ֩ עַ֨ם הָאָ֜רֶץ
אֶת־עֵֽינֵיהֶם֙ מִן־הָאִ֣ישׁ הַה֔וּא בְּתִתּ֥וֹ מִזַּרְע֖וֹ לַמֹּ֑לֶךְ לְבִלְתִּ֖י
הָמִ֥ית אֹתֽוֹ׃ 5 וְשַׂמְתִּ֨י אֲנִ֧י אֶת־פָּנַ֛י בָּאִ֥ישׁ הַה֖וּא
וּבְמִשְׁפַּחְתּ֑וֹ וְהִכְרַתִּ֨י אֹת֜וֹ וְאֵ֣ת ׀ כָּל־הַזֹּנִ֣ים אַחֲרָ֗יו לִזְנ֛וֹת

וְלֹא־תְכַחֲשׁוּ וְלֹא־תְשַׁקְּרוּ אִישׁ בַּעֲמִיתוֹ׃ 12 וְלֹא־תִשָּׁבְעוּ
בִשְׁמִי לַשָּׁקֶר וְחִלַּלְתָּ אֶת־שֵׁם אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ 13 לֹא־
תַעֲשֹׁק אֶת־רֵעֲךָ וְלֹא תִגְזֹל לֹא־תָלִין פְּעֻלַּת שָׂכִיר אִתְּךָ
עַד־בֹּקֶר׃ 14 לֹא־תְקַלֵּל חֵרֵשׁ וְלִפְנֵי עִוֵּר לֹא תִתֵּן מִכְשֹׁל
וְיָרֵאתָ מֵּאֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ 15 לֹא־תַעֲשׂוּ עָוֶל בַּמִּשְׁפָּט
לֹא־תִשָּׂא פְנֵי־דָל וְלֹא תֶהְדַּר פְּנֵי גָדוֹל בְּצֶדֶק תִּשְׁפֹּט
עֲמִיתֶךָ׃ 16 לֹא־תֵלֵךְ רָכִיל בְּעַמֶּיךָ לֹא תַעֲמֹד עַל־דַּם
רֵעֶךָ אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ 17 לֹא־תִשְׂנָא אֶת־אָחִיךָ בִּלְבָבֶךָ הוֹכֵחַ
תּוֹכִיחַ אֶת־עֲמִיתֶךָ וְלֹא־תִשָּׂא עָלָיו חֵטְא׃ 18 לֹא־תִקֹּם
וְלֹא־תִטֹּר אֶת־בְּנֵי עַמֶּךָ וְאָהַבְתָּ לְרֵעֲךָ כָּמוֹךָ אֲנִי יְהוָה׃
19 אֶת־חֻקֹּתַי תִּשְׁמֹרוּ בְּהֶמְתְּךָ לֹא־תַרְבִּיעַ כִּלְאַיִם שָׂדְךָ
לֹא־תִזְרַע כִּלְאָיִם וּבֶגֶד כִּלְאַיִם שַׁעַטְנֵז לֹא יַעֲלֶה עָלֶיךָ׃
20 וְאִישׁ כִּי־יִשְׁכַּב אֶת־אִשָּׁה שִׁכְבַת־זֶרַע וְהִוא שִׁפְחָה
נֶחֱרֶפֶת לְאִישׁ וְהָפְדֵּה לֹא נִפְדָּתָה אוֹ חֻפְשָׁה לֹא נִתַּן־לָהּ
בִּקֹּרֶת תִּהְיֶה לֹא יוּמְתוּ כִּי־לֹא חֻפָּשָׁה׃ 21 וְהֵבִיא אֶת־
אֲשָׁמוֹ לַיהוָה אֶל־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד אֵיל אָשָׁם׃ 22 וְכִפֶּר
עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן בְּאֵיל הָאָשָׁם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה עַל־חַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר
חָטָא וְנִסְלַח לוֹ מֵחַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָטָא׃ פ 23 וְכִי־תָבֹאוּ
אֶל־הָאָרֶץ וּנְטַעְתֶּם כָּל־עֵץ מַאֲכָל וַעֲרַלְתֶּם עָרְלָתוֹ אֶת־
פִּרְיוֹ שָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים יִהְיֶה לָכֶם עֲרֵלִים לֹא יֵאָכֵל׃ 24 וּבַשָּׁנָה
הָרְבִיעִת יִהְיֶה כָּל־פִּרְיוֹ קֹדֶשׁ הִלּוּלִים לַיהוָה׃ 25 וּבַשָּׁנָה
הַחֲמִישִׁת תֹּאכְלוּ אֶת־פִּרְיוֹ לְהוֹסִיף לָכֶם תְּבוּאָתוֹ אֲנִי
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 26 לֹא תֹאכְלוּ עַל־הַדָּם לֹא תְנַחֲשׁוּ וְלֹא
תְעוֹנֵנוּ׃ 27 לֹא תַקִּפוּ פְּאַת רֹאשְׁכֶם וְלֹא תַשְׁחִית אֵת
פְּאַת זְקָנֶךָ׃ 28 וְשֶׂרֶט לָנֶפֶשׁ לֹא תִתְּנוּ בִּבְשַׂרְכֶם וּכְתֹבֶת

הָאָרֶץ אֶת־יֹשְׁבֶיהָ׃ 26 וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אַתֶּם אֶת־חֻקֹּתַי וְאֶת־
מִשְׁפָּטַי וְלֹא תַעֲשׂוּ מִכֹּל הַתּוֹעֵבֹת הָאֵלֶּה הָאֶזְרָח וְהַגֵּר
הַגָּר בְּתוֹכְכֶם׃ 27 כִּי אֶת־כָּל־הַתּוֹעֵבֹת הָאֵל עָשׂוּ אַנְשֵׁי־
הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵיכֶם וַתִּטְמָא הָאָרֶץ׃ 28 וְלֹא־תָקִיא
הָאָרֶץ אֶתְכֶם בְּטַמַּאֲכֶם אֹתָהּ כַּאֲשֶׁר קָאָה אֶת־הַגּוֹי אֲשֶׁר
לִפְנֵיכֶם׃ 29 כִּי כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה מִכֹּל הַתּוֹעֵבֹת הָאֵלֶּה
וְנִכְרְתוּ הַנְּפָשׁוֹת הָעֹשֹׂת מִקֶּרֶב עַמָּם׃ 30 וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־
מִשְׁמַרְתִּי לְבִלְתִּי עֲשׂוֹת מֵחֻקּוֹת הַתּוֹעֵבֹת אֲשֶׁר נַעֲשׂוּ
לִפְנֵיכֶם וְלֹא תִטַּמְּאוּ בָּהֶם אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃

פ פ פ

## CHAPTER XIX.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 דַּבֵּר אֶל־כָּל־עֲדַת
בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם קְדֹשִׁים תִּהְיוּ כִּי קָדוֹשׁ אֲנִי
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 3 אִישׁ אִמּוֹ וְאָבִיו תִּירָאוּ וְאֶת־שַׁבְּתֹתַי
תִּשְׁמֹרוּ אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 4 אַל־תִּפְנוּ אֶל־הָאֱלִילִם
וֵאלֹהֵי מַסֵּכָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ לָכֶם אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 5 וְכִי
תִזְבְּחוּ זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים לַיהוָה לִרְצֹנְכֶם תִּזְבָּחֻהוּ׃ 6 בְּיוֹם
זִבְחֲכֶם יֵאָכֵל וּמִמָּחֳרָת וְהַנּוֹתָר עַד־יוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי בָּאֵשׁ
יִשָּׂרֵף׃ 7 וְאִם הֵאָכֹל יֵאָכֵל בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי פִּגּוּל הוּא
לֹא יֵרָצֶה׃ 8 וְאֹכְלָיו עֲוֹנוֹ יִשָּׂא כִּי אֶת־קֹדֶשׁ יְהוָה חִלֵּל
וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא מֵעַמֶּיהָ׃ 9 וּבְקֻצְרְכֶם אֶת־קְצִיר
אַרְצְכֶם לֹא תְכַלֶּה פְּאַת שָׂדְךָ לִקְצֹר וְלֶקֶט קְצִירְךָ לֹא
תְלַקֵּט׃ 10 וְכַרְמְךָ לֹא תְעוֹלֵל וּפֶרֶט כַּרְמְךָ לֹא תְלַקֵּט
לֶעָנִי וְלַגֵּר תַּעֲזֹב אֹתָם אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 11 לֹא תִּגְנֹבוּ

תִקְרְבוּ לְגַלּוֹת עֶרְוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה׃ ס 7 עֶרְוַת אָבִיךָ
וְעֶרְוַת אִמְּךָ לֹא תְגַלֵּה אִמְּךָ הִוא לֹא תְגַלֶּה עֶרְוָתָהּ׃ ס
8 עֶרְוַת אֵשֶׁת־אָבִיךָ לֹא תְגַלֵּה עֶרְוַת אָבִיךָ הִוא׃ ס
9 עֶרְוַת אֲחוֹתְךָ בַת־אָבִיךָ אוֹ בַת־אִמֶּךָ מוֹלֶדֶת בַּיִת
אוֹ מוֹלֶדֶת חוּץ לֹא תְגַלֶּה עֶרְוָתָן׃ ס 10 עֶרְוַת בַּת־
בִּנְךָ אוֹ בַת־בִּתְּךָ לֹא תְגַלֶּה עֶרְוָתָן כִּי עֶרְוָתְךָ הֵנָּה׃ ס
11 עֶרְוַת בַּת־אֵשֶׁת אָבִיךָ מוֹלֶדֶת אָבִיךָ אֲחוֹתְךָ הִוא
לֹא תְגַלֶּה עֶרְוָתָהּ; ס 12 עֶרְוַת אֲחוֹת־אָבִיךָ לֹא
תְגַלֵּה שְׁאֵר אָבִיךָ הִוא׃ ס 13 עֶרְוַת אֲחוֹת־אִמְּךָ לֹא
תְגַלֵּה כִּי־שְׁאֵר אִמְּךָ הִוא׃ ס 14 עֶרְוַת אֲחִי־אָבִיךָ
לֹא תְגַלֵּה אֶל־אִשְׁתּוֹ לֹא תִקְרָב דֹּדָתְךָ הִוא׃ ס
15 עֶרְוַת כַּלָּתְךָ לֹא תְגַלֵּה אֵשֶׁת בִּנְךָ הִוא לֹא תְגַלֶּה
עֶרְוָתָהּ׃ ס 16 עֶרְוַת אֵשֶׁת־אָחִיךָ לֹא תְגַלֵּה עֶרְוַת
אָחִיךָ הִוא׃ ס 17 עֶרְוַת אִשָּׁה וּבִתָּהּ לֹא תְגַלֵּה אֶת־
בַּת־בְּנָהּ וְאֶת־בַּת־בִּתָּהּ לֹא תִקַּח לְגַלּוֹת עֶרְוָתָהּ שַׁאֲרָה
הֵנָּה זִמָּה הִוא׃ 18 וְאִשָּׁה אֶל־אֲחֹתָהּ לֹא תִקָּח לִצְרֹר
לְגַלּוֹת עֶרְוָתָהּ עָלֶיהָ בְּחַיֶּיהָ׃ 19 וְאֶל־אִשָּׁה בְּנִדַּת טֻמְאָתָהּ
לֹא תִקְרַב לְגַלּוֹת עֶרְוָתָהּ׃ 20 וְאֶל־אֵשֶׁת עֲמִיתְךָ לֹא־
תִתֵּן שְׁכָבְתְּךָ לְזָרַע לְטָמְאָה־בָהּ׃ 21 וּמִזַּרְעֲךָ לֹא־תִתֵּן
לְהַעֲבִיר לַמֹּלֶךְ וְלֹא תְחַלֵּל אֶת־שֵׁם אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲנִי יְהוָה׃
22 וְאֶת־זָכָר לֹא תִשְׁכַּב מִשְׁכְּבֵי אִשָּׁה תּוֹעֵבָה הִוא׃
23 וּבְכָל־בְּהֵמָה לֹא־תִתֵּן שְׁכָבְתְּךָ לְטָמְאָה־בָהּ וְאִשָּׁה
לֹא־תַעֲמֹד לִפְנֵי בְהֵמָה לְרִבְעָהּ תֶּבֶל הוּא׃ 24 אַל־תִּטַּמְּאוּ
בְּכָל־אֵלֶּה כִּי בְכָל־אֵלֶּה נִטְמְאוּ הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר־אֲנִי מְשַׁלֵּחַ
מִפְּנֵיכֶם׃ 25 וַתִּטְמָא הָאָרֶץ וָאֶפְקֹד עֲוֺנָהּ עָלֶיהָ וַתָּקִא

לַעֲשׂוֹת אֹתוֹ לַיהוָה וְנִכְרַת הָאִישׁ הַהוּא מֵעַמָּיו׃ 10 וְאִישׁ
אִישׁ מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמִן־הַגֵּר הַגָּר בְּתוֹכָם אֲשֶׁר יֹאכַל
כָּל־דָּם וְנָתַתִּי פָנַי בַּנֶּפֶשׁ הָאֹכֶלֶת אֶת־הַדָּם וְהִכְרַתִּי אֹתָהּ
מִקֶּרֶב עַמָּהּ׃ 11 כִּי־נֶפֶשׁ הַבָּשָׂר בַּדָּם הִוא וַאֲנִי נְתַתִּיו
לָכֶם עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְכַפֵּר עַל־נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם כִּי־הַדָּם הוּא בַּנֶּפֶשׁ
יְכַפֵּר׃ 12 עַל־כֵּן אָמַרְתִּי לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ מִכֶּם
לֹא־תֹאכַל דָּם וְהַגֵּר הַגָּר בְּתוֹכְכֶם לֹא־יֹאכַל דָּם׃ 13 וְאִישׁ
אִישׁ מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמִן־הַגֵּר הַגָּר בְּתוֹכָם אֲשֶׁר יָצוּד צֵיד
חַיָּה אוֹ־עוֹף אֲשֶׁר יֵאָכֵל וְשָׁפַךְ אֶת־דָּמוֹ וְכִסָּהוּ בֶּעָפָר׃
14 כִּי־נֶפֶשׁ כָּל־בָּשָׂר דָּמוֹ בְנַפְשׁוֹ הוּא וָאֹמַר לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
דַּם כָּל־בָּשָׂר לֹא תֹאכֵלוּ כִּי נֶפֶשׁ כָּל־בָּשָׂר דָּמוֹ הִוא
כָּל־אֹכְלָיו יִכָּרֵת׃ 15 וְכָל־נֶפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר תֹּאכַל נְבֵלָה
וּטְרֵפָה בָּאֶזְרָח וּבַגֵּר וְכִבֶּס בְּגָדָיו וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם וְטָמֵא
עַד־הָעֶרֶב וְטָהֵר׃ 16 וְאִם לֹא יְכַבֵּס וּבְשָׂרוֹ לֹא יִרְחָץ
וְנָשָׂא עֲוֺנוֹ׃ פ

## CHAPTER XVIII.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 3 כְּמַעֲשֵׂה
אֶרֶץ־מִצְרַיִם אֲשֶׁר יְשַׁבְתֶּם־בָּהּ לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ וּכְמַעֲשֵׂה אֶרֶץ
כְּנַעַן אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי מֵבִיא אֶתְכֶם שָׁמָּה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ וּבְחֻקֹּתֵיהֶם
לֹא תֵלֵכוּ׃ 4 אֶת־מִשְׁפָּטַי תַּעֲשׂוּ וְאֶת־חֻקֹּתַי תִּשְׁמְרוּ
לָלֶכֶת בָּהֶם אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ 5 וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־חֻקֹּתַי
וְאֶת־מִשְׁפָּטַי אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה אֹתָם הָאָדָם וָחַי בָּהֶם אֲנִי
יְהוָה׃ ס 6 אִישׁ אִישׁ אֶל־כָּל־שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ לֹא

שַׁבַּתּ֨וֹן הִיא֙ לָכֶ֔ם וְעִנִּיתֶ֖ם אֶת־נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶ֑ם חֻקַּ֖ת עוֹלָֽם׃
32 וְכִפֶּ֨ר הַכֹּהֵ֜ן אֲשֶׁר־יִמְשַׁ֣ח אֹת֗וֹ וַאֲשֶׁ֤ר יְמַלֵּא֙ אֶת־יָד֔וֹ
לְכַהֵ֖ן תַּ֣חַת אָבִ֑יו וְלָבַ֛שׁ אֶת־בִּגְדֵ֥י הַבָּ֖ד בִּגְדֵ֥י הַקֹּֽדֶשׁ׃
33 וְכִפֶּר֙ אֶת־מִקְדַּ֣שׁ הַקֹּ֔דֶשׁ וְאֶת־אֹ֧הֶל מוֹעֵ֛ד וְאֶת־הַמִּזְבֵּ֖חַ
יְכַפֵּ֑ר וְעַ֧ל הַכֹּהֲנִ֛ים וְעַל־כָּל־עַ֥ם הַקָּהָ֖ל יְכַפֵּֽר׃ 34 וְהָֽיְתָה־
זֹּ֨את לָכֶ֜ם לְחֻקַּ֣ת עוֹלָ֗ם לְכַפֵּ֞ר עַל־בְּנֵ֤י יִשְׂרָאֵל֙ מִכָּל־
חַטֹּאתָ֔ם אַחַ֖ת בַּשָּׁנָ֑ה וַיַּ֕עַשׂ כַּאֲשֶׁ֛ר צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה אֶת־מֹשֶֽׁה׃ פ

## CHAPTER XVII.

1 וַיְדַבֵּ֥ר יְהוָ֖ה אֶל־מֹשֶׁ֥ה לֵּאמֹֽר׃ 2 דַּבֵּ֨ר אֶֽל־אַהֲרֹ֜ן וְאֶל־
בָּנָ֗יו וְאֶל֙ כָּל־בְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל וְאָמַרְתָּ֖ אֲלֵיהֶ֑ם זֶ֣ה הַדָּבָ֔ר
אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּ֥ה יְהוָ֖ה לֵאמֹֽר׃ 3 אִ֥ישׁ אִישׁ֙ מִבֵּ֣ית יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל
אֲשֶׁ֨ר יִשְׁחַ֜ט שׁ֥וֹר אוֹ־כֶ֛שֶׂב אוֹ־עֵ֖ז בַּֽמַּחֲנֶ֑ה א֚וֹ אֲשֶׁ֣ר יִשְׁחַ֔ט
מִח֖וּץ לַֽמַּחֲנֶֽה׃ 4 וְאֶל־פֶּ֜תַח אֹ֣הֶל מוֹעֵד֮ לֹ֣א הֱבִיאוֹ֒
לְהַקְרִ֤יב קָרְבָּן֙ לַֽיהוָ֔ה לִפְנֵ֖י מִשְׁכַּ֣ן יְהוָ֑ה דָּ֣ם יֵחָשֵׁ֞ב
לָאִ֤ישׁ הַהוּא֙ דָּ֣ם שָׁפָ֔ךְ וְנִכְרַ֛ת הָאִ֥ישׁ הַה֖וּא מִקֶּ֥רֶב עַמּֽוֹ׃
5 לְמַ֡עַן אֲשֶׁר֩ יָבִ֨יאוּ בְּנֵ֜י יִשְׂרָאֵ֗ל אֶת־זִבְחֵיהֶם֮ אֲשֶׁ֣ר הֵ֣ם
זֹבְחִים֮ עַל־פְּנֵ֣י הַשָּׂדֶה֒ וֶהֱבִיאֻ֣ם לַֽיהוָ֗ה אֶל־פֶּ֛תַח אֹ֥הֶל
מוֹעֵ֖ד אֶל־הַכֹּהֵ֑ן וְזָבְח֞וּ זִבְחֵ֧י שְׁלָמִ֛ים לַֽיהוָ֖ה אוֹתָֽם׃ 6 וְזָרַ֨ק
הַכֹּהֵ֤ן אֶת־הַדָּם֙ עַל־מִזְבַּ֣ח יְהוָ֔ה פֶּ֖תַח אֹ֣הֶל מוֹעֵ֑ד וְהִקְטִ֣יר
הַחֵ֔לֶב לְרֵ֥יחַ נִיחֹ֖חַ לַֽיהוָֽה׃ 7 וְלֹא־יִזְבְּח֥וּ עוֹד֙ אֶת־
זִבְחֵיהֶ֔ם לַשְּׂעִירִ֕ם אֲשֶׁ֛ר הֵ֥ם זֹנִ֖ים אַחֲרֵיהֶ֑ם חֻקַּ֥ת עוֹלָ֛ם
תִּֽהְיֶה־זֹּ֥את לָהֶ֖ם לְדֹרֹתָֽם׃ 8 וַאֲלֵהֶ֣ם תֹּאמַ֔ר אִ֥ישׁ אִישׁ֙
מִבֵּ֣ית יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל וּמִן־הַגֵּ֖ר אֲשֶׁר־יָג֣וּר בְּתוֹכָ֑ם אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲלֶ֥ה
עֹלָ֖ה אוֹ־זָֽבַח׃ 9 וְאֶל־פֶּ֜תַח אֹ֤הֶל מוֹעֵד֙ לֹ֣א יְבִיאֶ֔נּוּ

וּבְעַד בֵּיתוֹ וּבְעַד כָּל־קְהַל יִשְׂרָאֵל: 18 וְיָצָא אֶל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ
אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי־יְהוָה וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו וְלָקַח מִדַּם הַפָּר וּמִדַּם
הַשָּׂעִיר וְנָתַן עַל־קַרְנוֹת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב: 19 וְהִזָּה עָלָיו
מִן־הַדָּם בְּאֶצְבָּעוֹ שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים וְטִהֲרוֹ וְקִדְּשׁוֹ מִטֻּמְאֹת
בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל: 20 וְכִלָּה מִכַּפֵּר אֶת־הַקֹּדֶשׁ וְאֶת־אֹהֶל
מוֹעֵד וְאֶת־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְהִקְרִיב אֶת־הַשָּׂעִיר הֶחָי: 21 וְסָמַךְ
אַהֲרֹן אֶת־שְׁתֵּי יָדָו עַל־רֹאשׁ הַשָּׂעִיר הַחַי וְהִתְוַדָּה עָלָיו
אֶת־כָּל־עֲוֹנֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֶת־כָּל־פִּשְׁעֵיהֶם לְכָל־חַטֹּאתָם
וְנָתַן אֹתָם עַל־רֹאשׁ הַשָּׂעִיר וְשִׁלַּח בְּיַד־אִישׁ עִתִּי הַמִּדְבָּרָה:
22 וְנָשָׂא הַשָּׂעִיר עָלָיו אֶת־כָּל־עֲוֹנֹתָם אֶל־אֶרֶץ גְּזֵרָה וְשִׁלַּח
אֶת־הַשָּׂעִיר בַּמִּדְבָּר: 23 וּבָא אַהֲרֹן אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וּפָשַׁט
אֶת־בִּגְדֵי הַבָּד אֲשֶׁר לָבַשׁ בְּבֹאוֹ אֶל־הַקֹּדֶשׁ וְהִנִּיחָם שָׁם:
24 וְרָחַץ אֶת־בְּשָׂרוֹ בַמַּיִם בְּמָקוֹם קָדוֹשׁ וְלָבַשׁ אֶת־
בְּגָדָיו וְיָצָא וְעָשָׂה אֶת־עֹלָתוֹ וְאֶת־עֹלַת הָעָם וְכִפֶּר בַּעֲדוֹ
וּבְעַד הָעָם: 25 וְאֵת חֵלֶב הַחַטָּאת יַקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחָה:
26 וְהַמְשַׁלֵּחַ אֶת־הַשָּׂעִיר לַעֲזָאזֵל יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְרָחַץ אֶת־
בְּשָׂרוֹ בַּמָּיִם וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן יָבוֹא אֶל־הַמַּחֲנֶה: 27 וְאֵת פַּר
הַחַטָּאת וְאֵת ׀ שְׂעִיר הַחַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר הוּבָא אֶת־דָּמָם לְכַפֵּר
בַּקֹּדֶשׁ יוֹצִיא אֶל־מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה וְשָׂרְפוּ בָאֵשׁ אֶת־עֹרֹתָם
וְאֶת־בְּשָׂרָם וְאֶת־פִּרְשָׁם: 28 וְהַשֹּׂרֵף אֹתָם יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו
וְרָחַץ אֶת־בְּשָׂרוֹ בַּמָּיִם וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן יָבוֹא אֶל־הַמַּחֲנֶה:
29 וְהָיְתָה לָכֶם לְחֻקַּת עוֹלָם בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי בֶּעָשׂוֹר לַחֹדֶשׁ
תְּעַנּוּ אֶת־נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם וְכָל־מְלָאכָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ הָאֶזְרָח וְהַגֵּר
הַגָּר בְּתוֹכְכֶם: 30 כִּי־בַיּוֹם הַזֶּה יְכַפֵּר עֲלֵיכֶם לְטַהֵר
אֶתְכֶם מִכֹּל חַטֹּאתֵיכֶם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה תִּטְהָרוּ: 31 שַׁבַּת

יִלְבָּשׁ וּמִכְנְסֵי־בַד יִהְיוּ עַל־בְּשָׂרוֹ וּבְאַבְנֵט בַּד יַחְגֹּר
וּבְמִצְנֶפֶת בַּד יִצְנֹף בִּגְדֵי־קֹדֶשׁ הֵם וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם אֶת־
בְּשָׂרוֹ וּלְבֵשָׁם׃ 5 וּמֵאֵת עֲדַת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִקַּח שְׁנֵי־
שְׂעִירֵי עִזִּים לְחַטָּאת וְאַיִל אֶחָד לְעֹלָה׃ 6 וְהִקְרִיב אַהֲרֹן
אֶת־פַּר הַחַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ וְכִפֶּר בַּעֲדוֹ וּבְעַד בֵּיתוֹ׃ 7 וְלָקַח
אֶת־שְׁנֵי הַשְּׂעִירִם וְהֶעֱמִיד אֹתָם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה פֶּתַח אֹהֶל
מוֹעֵד׃ 8 וְנָתַן אַהֲרֹן עַל־שְׁנֵי הַשְּׂעִירִם גֹּרָלוֹת גּוֹרָל
אֶחָד לַיהוָה וְגוֹרָל אֶחָד לַעֲזָאזֵל׃ 9 וְהִקְרִיב אַהֲרֹן אֶת־
הַשָּׂעִיר אֲשֶׁר עָלָה עָלָיו הַגּוֹרָל לַיהוָה וְעָשָׂהוּ חַטָּאת׃
10 וְהַשָּׂעִיר אֲשֶׁר עָלָה עָלָיו הַגּוֹרָל לַעֲזָאזֵל יָעֳמַד־חַי לִפְנֵי
יְהוָה לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו לְשַׁלַּח אֹתוֹ לַעֲזָאזֵל הַמִּדְבָּרָה׃ 11 וְהִקְרִיב
אַהֲרֹן אֶת־פַּר הַחַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ וְכִפֶּר בַּעֲדוֹ וּבְעַד בֵּיתוֹ
וְשָׁחַט אֶת־פַּר הַחַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ׃ 12 וְלָקַח מְלֹא־
הַמַּחְתָּה גַּחֲלֵי־אֵשׁ מֵעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ מִלִּפְנֵי יְהוָה וּמְלֹא
חָפְנָיו קְטֹרֶת סַמִּים דַּקָּה וְהֵבִיא מִבֵּית לַפָּרֹכֶת׃ 13 וְנָתַן
אֶת־הַקְּטֹרֶת עַל־הָאֵשׁ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וְכִסָּה ׀ עֲנַן הַקְּטֹרֶת
אֶת־הַכַּפֹּרֶת אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָעֵדוּת וְלֹא יָמוּת׃ 14 וְלָקַח מִדַּם
הַפָּר וְהִזָּה בְאֶצְבָּעוֹ עַל־פְּנֵי הַכַּפֹּרֶת קֵדְמָה וְלִפְנֵי הַכַּפֹּרֶת
יַזֶּה שֶׁבַע־פְּעָמִים מִן־הַדָּם בְּאֶצְבָּעוֹ׃ 15 וְשָׁחַט אֶת־שְׂעִיר
הַחַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר לָעָם וְהֵבִיא אֶת־דָּמוֹ אֶל־מִבֵּית לַפָּרֹכֶת
וְעָשָׂה אֶת־דָּמוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לְדַם הַפָּר וְהִזָּה אֹתוֹ עַל־
הַכַּפֹּרֶת וְלִפְנֵי הַכַּפֹּרֶת׃ 16 וְכִפֶּר עַל־הַקֹּדֶשׁ מִטֻּמְאֹת
בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמִפִּשְׁעֵיהֶם לְכָל־חַטֹּאתָם וְכֵן יַעֲשֶׂה לְאֹהֶל
מוֹעֵד הַשֹּׁכֵן אִתָּם בְּתוֹךְ טֻמְאֹתָם׃ 17 וְכָל־אָדָם לֹא־יִהְיֶה ׀
בְּאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד בְּבֹאוֹ לְכַפֵּר בַּקֹּדֶשׁ עַד־צֵאתוֹ וְכִפֶּר בַּעֲדוֹ

יִטְמָא׃ ס 25 וְאִשָּׁה כִּי־יָזוּב זוֹב דָּמָהּ יָמִים רַבִּים
בְּלֹא עֶת־נִדָּתָהּ אוֹ כִי־תָזוּב עַל־נִדָּתָהּ כָּל־יְמֵי זוֹב טֻמְאָתָהּ
כִּימֵי נִדָּתָהּ תִּהְיֶה טְמֵאָה הִוא׃ 26 כָּל־הַמִּשְׁכָּב אֲשֶׁר־
תִּשְׁכַּב עָלָיו כָּל־יְמֵי זוֹבָהּ כְּמִשְׁכַּב נִדָּתָהּ יִהְיֶה־לָּהּ וְכָל־
הַכְּלִי אֲשֶׁר־תֵּשֵׁב עָלָיו טָמֵא יִהְיֶה כְּטֻמְאַת נִדָּתָהּ׃ 27 וְכָל־
הַנּוֹגֵעַ בָּם יִטְמָא וְכִבֶּס בְּגָדָיו וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם וְטָמֵא עַד־
הָעָרֶב׃ 28 וְאִם־טָהֲרָה מִזּוֹבָהּ וְסָפְרָה לָּהּ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים
וְאַחַר תִּטְהָר׃ 29 וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי תִּקַּח־לָהּ שְׁתֵּי תֹרִים
אוֹ שְׁנֵי בְּנֵי יוֹנָה וְהֵבִיאָה אוֹתָם אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן אֶל־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל
מוֹעֵד׃ 30 וְעָשָׂה הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הָאֶחָד חַטָּאת וְאֶת־הָאֶחָד
עֹלָה וְכִפֶּר עָלֶיהָ הַכֹּהֵן לִפְנֵי יְהוָה מִזּוֹב טֻמְאָתָהּ׃
31 וְהִזַּרְתֶּם אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִטֻּמְאָתָם וְלֹא יָמֻתוּ בְּטֻמְאָתָם
בְּטַמְּאָם אֶת־מִשְׁכָּנִי אֲשֶׁר בְּתוֹכָם׃ 32 זֹאת תּוֹרַת הַזָּב
וַאֲשֶׁר תֵּצֵא מִמֶּנּוּ שִׁכְבַת־זֶרַע לְטָמְאָה־בָהּ׃ 33 וְהַדָּוָה
בְּנִדָּתָהּ וְהַזָּב אֶת־זוֹבוֹ לַזָּכָר וְלַנְּקֵבָה וּלְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכַּב
עִם־טְמֵאָה׃

פ פ פ

## CHAPTER XVI.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אַחֲרֵי מוֹת שְׁנֵי בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן
בְּקָרְבָתָם לִפְנֵי־יְהוָה וַיָּמֻתוּ׃ 2 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה
דַּבֵּר אֶל־אַהֲרֹן אָחִיךָ וְאַל־יָבֹא בְכָל־עֵת אֶל־הַקֹּדֶשׁ מִבֵּית
לַפָּרֹכֶת אֶל־פְּנֵי הַכַּפֹּרֶת אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָאָרֹן וְלֹא יָמוּת כִּי
בֶּעָנָן אֵרָאֶה עַל־הַכַּפֹּרֶת׃ 3 בְּזֹאת יָבֹא אַהֲרֹן אֶל־הַקֹּדֶשׁ
בְּפַר בֶּן־בָּקָר לְחַטָּאת וְאַיִל לְעֹלָה׃ 4 כְּתֹנֶת־בַּד קֹדֶשׁ

אֲשֶׁר יִרְכַּב עָלָיו הַזָּב יִטְמָא׃ 10 וְכָל־הַנֹּגֵעַ בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר
יִהְיֶה תַחְתָּיו יִטְמָא עַד־הָעָרֶב וְהַנּוֹשֵׂא אוֹתָם יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו
וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 11 וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר יִגַּע־בּוֹ הַזָּב
וְיָדָיו לֹא־שָׁטַף בַּמָּיִם וְכִבֶּס בְּגָדָיו וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם וְטָמֵא
עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 12 וּכְלִי־חֶרֶשׂ אֲשֶׁר־יִגַּע־בּוֹ הַזָּב יִשָּׁבֵר וְכָל־
כְּלִי־עֵץ יִשָּׁטֵף בַּמָּיִם׃ 13 וְכִי־יִטְהַר הַזָּב מִזּוֹבוֹ וְסָפַר
לוֹ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים לְטָהֳרָתוֹ וְכִבֶּס בְּגָדָיו וְרָחַץ בְּשָׂרוֹ בְּמַיִם
חַיִּים וְטָהֵר׃ 14 וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי יִקַּח־לוֹ שְׁתֵּי תֹרִים אוֹ
שְׁנֵי בְּנֵי יוֹנָה וּבָא ׀ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֶל־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד
וּנְתָנָם אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן׃ 15 וְעָשָׂה אֹתָם הַכֹּהֵן אֶחָד חַטָּאת
וְהָאֶחָד עֹלָה וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן לִפְנֵי יְהוָה מִזּוֹבוֹ׃ ס
16 וְאִישׁ כִּי־תֵצֵא מִמֶּנּוּ שִׁכְבַת־זָרַע וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם אֶת־כָּל־
בְּשָׂרוֹ וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 17 וְכָל־בֶּגֶד וְכָל־עוֹר אֲשֶׁר־
יִהְיֶה עָלָיו שִׁכְבַת־זָרַע וְכֻבַּס בַּמַּיִם וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃
18 וְאִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכַּב אִישׁ אֹתָהּ שִׁכְבַת־זָרַע וְרָחֲצוּ בַמַּיִם
וְטָמְאוּ עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ פ 19 וְאִשָּׁה כִּי־תִהְיֶה זָבָה דָּם יִהְיֶה
זֹבָהּ בִּבְשָׂרָהּ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים תִּהְיֶה בְנִדָּתָהּ וְכָל־הַנֹּגֵעַ בָּהּ
יִטְמָא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 20 וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁכַּב עָלָיו בְּנִדָּתָהּ
יִטְמָא וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־תֵּשֵׁב עָלָיו יִטְמָא׃ 21 וְכָל־הַנֹּגֵעַ
בְּמִשְׁכָּבָהּ יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃
22 וְכָל־הַנֹּגֵעַ בְּכָל־כְּלִי אֲשֶׁר־תֵּשֵׁב עָלָיו יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו
וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 23 וְאִם עַל־הַמִּשְׁכָּב הוּא
אוֹ עַל־הַכְּלִי אֲשֶׁר־הִוא יֹשֶׁבֶת־עָלָיו בְּנָגְעוֹ־בוֹ יִטְמָא
עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 24 וְאִם שָׁכֹב יִשְׁכַּב אִישׁ אֹתָהּ וּתְהִי נִדָּתָהּ
עָלָיו וְטָמֵא שִׁבְעַת יָמִים וְכָל־הַמִּשְׁכָּב אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׁכַּב עָלָיו

הַבַּיִת כִּי נִרְפָּא הַנָּגַע׃ 49 וְלָקַח לְחַטֵּא אֶת־הַבַּיִת שְׁתֵּי
צִפֳּרִים וְעֵץ אֶרֶז וּשְׁנִי תוֹלַעַת וְאֵזֹב׃ 50 וְשָׁחַט אֶת־הַצִּפֹּר
הָאֶחָת אֶל־כְּלִי־חֶרֶשׂ עַל־מַיִם חַיִּים׃ 51 וְלָקַח אֶת־עֵץ־
הָאֶרֶז וְאֶת־הָאֵזֹב וְאֵת׀ שְׁנִי הַתּוֹלַעַת וְאֵת הַצִּפֹּר הַחַיָּה
וְטָבַל אֹתָם בְּדַם הַצִּפֹּר הַשְּׁחוּטָה וּבַמַּיִם הַחַיִּים וְהִזָּה
אֶל־הַבַּיִת שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים׃ 52 וְחִטֵּא אֶת־הַבַּיִת בְּדַם הַצִּפּוֹר
וּבַמַּיִם הַחַיִּים וּבַצִּפֹּר הַחַיָּה וּבְעֵץ הָאֶרֶז וּבָאֵזֹב וּבִשְׁנִי
הַתּוֹלָעַת׃ 53 וְשִׁלַּח אֶת־הַצִּפֹּר הַחַיָּה אֶל־מִחוּץ לָעִיר
אֶל־פְּנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה וְכִפֶּר עַל־הַבַּיִת וְטָהֵר׃ 54 זֹאת הַתּוֹרָה
לְכָל־נֶגַע הַצָּרַעַת וְלַנָּתֶק׃ 55 וּלְצָרַעַת הַבֶּגֶד וְלַבָּיִת׃
56 וְלַשְׂאֵת וְלַסַּפַּחַת וְלַבֶּהָרֶת׃ 57 לְהוֹרֹת בְּיוֹם הַטָּמֵא
וּבְיוֹם הַטָּהֹר זֹאת תּוֹרַת הַצָּרָעַת׃ פ

## CHAPTER XV.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶל־אַהֲרֹן לֵאמֹר׃ 2 דַּבְּרוּ
אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַאֲמַרְתֶּם אֲלֵהֶם אִישׁ אִישׁ כִּי יִהְיֶה זָב
מִבְּשָׂרוֹ זוֹבוֹ טָמֵא הוּא׃ 3 וְזֹאת תִּהְיֶה טֻמְאָתוֹ בְּזוֹבוֹ
רָר בְּשָׂרוֹ אֶת־זוֹבוֹ אוֹ־הֶחְתִּים בְּשָׂרוֹ מִזּוֹבוֹ טֻמְאָתוֹ
הִוא׃ 4 כָּל־הַמִּשְׁכָּב אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכַּב עָלָיו הַזָּב יִטְמָא וְכָל־
הַכְּלִי אֲשֶׁר־יֵשֵׁב עָלָיו יִטְמָא׃ 5 וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִגַּע בְּמִשְׁכָּבוֹ
יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 6 וְהַיֹּשֵׁב
עַל־הַכְּלִי אֲשֶׁר־יֵשֵׁב עָלָיו הַזָּב יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם
וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 7 וְהַנֹּגֵעַ בִּבְשַׂר הַזָּב יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְרָחַץ
בַּמַּיִם וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 8 וְכִי־יָרֹק הַזָּב בַּטָּהוֹר וְכִבֶּס
בְּגָדָיו וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 9 וְכָל־הַמֶּרְכָּב

בְּטָהֳרָתֽוֹ׃ פ 33 וַיְדַבֵּ֣ר יְהוָ֔ה אֶל־מֹשֶׁ֥ה וְאֶֽל־אַהֲרֹ֖ן
לֵאמֹֽר׃ 34 כִּ֤י תָבֹ֙אוּ֙ אֶל־אֶ֣רֶץ כְּנַ֔עַן אֲשֶׁ֥ר אֲנִ֛י נֹתֵ֥ן לָכֶ֖ם
לַאֲחֻזָּ֑ה וְנָתַתִּי֙ נֶ֣גַע צָרַ֔עַת בְּבֵ֖ית אֶ֥רֶץ אֲחֻזַּתְכֶֽם׃ 35 וּבָא֙
אֲשֶׁר־ל֣וֹ הַבַּ֔יִת וְהִגִּ֥יד לַכֹּהֵ֖ן לֵאמֹ֑ר כְּנֶ֕גַע נִרְאָ֥ה לִ֖י בַּבָּֽיִת׃
36 וְצִוָּ֨ה הַכֹּהֵ֜ן וּפִנּ֣וּ אֶת־הַבַּ֗יִת בְּטֶ֨רֶם יָבֹ֤א הַכֹּהֵן֙ לִרְא֣וֹת
אֶת־הַנֶּ֔גַע וְלֹ֥א יִטְמָ֖א כָּל־אֲשֶׁ֣ר בַּבָּ֑יִת וְאַ֛חַר כֵּ֥ן יָבֹ֥א הַכֹּהֵ֖ן
לִרְא֥וֹת אֶת־הַבָּֽיִת׃ 37 וְרָאָ֣ה אֶת־הַנֶּ֗גַע וְהִנֵּ֤ה הַנֶּ֙גַע֙ בְּקִירֹ֣ת
הַבַּ֔יִת שְׁקַעֲרוּרֹת֙ יְרַקְרַקֹּ֔ת א֖וֹ אֲדַמְדַּמֹּ֑ת וּמַרְאֵיהֶ֥ן שָׁפָ֖ל מִן־
הַקִּֽיר׃ 38 וְיָצָ֧א הַכֹּהֵ֛ן מִן־הַבַּ֖יִת אֶל־פֶּ֣תַח הַבָּ֑יִת וְהִסְגִּ֥יר
אֶת־הַבַּ֖יִת שִׁבְעַ֥ת יָמִֽים׃ 39 וְשָׁ֥ב הַכֹּהֵ֖ן בַּיּ֣וֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִ֑י
וְרָאָ֕ה וְהִנֵּ֛ה פָּשָׂ֥ה הַנֶּ֖גַע בְּקִירֹ֥ת הַבָּֽיִת׃ 40 וְצִוָּה֙ הַכֹּהֵ֔ן
וְחִלְּצוּ֙ אֶת־הָ֣אֲבָנִ֔ים אֲשֶׁ֥ר בָּהֵ֖ן הַנָּ֑גַע וְהִשְׁלִ֤יכוּ אֶתְהֶן֙
אֶל־מִח֣וּץ לָעִ֔יר אֶל־מָק֖וֹם טָמֵֽא׃ 41 וְאֶת־הַבַּ֛יִת יַקְצִ֥עַ
מִבַּ֖יִת סָבִ֑יב וְשָֽׁפְכ֗וּ אֶת־הֶֽעָפָר֙ אֲשֶׁ֣ר הִקְצ֔וּ אֶל־מִח֣וּץ לָעִ֔יר
אֶל־מָק֖וֹם טָמֵֽא׃ 42 וְלָֽקְחוּ֙ אֲבָנִ֣ים אֲחֵר֔וֹת וְהֵבִ֖יאוּ אֶל־
תַּ֣חַת הָאֲבָנִ֑ים וְעָפָ֥ר אַחֵ֛ר יִקַּ֖ח וְטָ֥ח אֶת־הַבָּֽיִת׃ 43 וְאִם־
יָשׁ֤וּב הַנֶּ֙גַע֙ וּפָרַ֣ח בַּבַּ֔יִת אַחַ֖ר חִלֵּ֣ץ אֶת־הָאֲבָנִ֑ים וְאַחֲרֵ֛י
הִקְצ֥וֹת אֶת־הַבַּ֖יִת וְאַחֲרֵ֥י הִטּֽוֹחַ׃ 44 וּבָא֙ הַכֹּהֵ֔ן וְרָאָ֕ה
וְהִנֵּ֛ה פָּשָׂ֥ה הַנֶּ֖גַע בַּבָּ֑יִת צָרַ֨עַת מַמְאֶ֥רֶת הִ֛וא בַּבַּ֖יִת טָמֵ֥א
הֽוּא׃ 45 וְנָתַ֣ץ אֶת־הַבַּ֗יִת אֶת־אֲבָנָיו֙ וְאֶת־עֵצָ֔יו וְאֵ֖ת כָּל־
עֲפַ֣ר הַבָּ֑יִת וְהוֹצִיא֙ אֶל־מִח֣וּץ לָעִ֔יר אֶל־מָק֖וֹם טָמֵֽא׃
46 וְהַבָּא֙ אֶל־הַבַּ֔יִת כָּל־יְמֵ֖י הִסְגִּ֣יר אֹת֑וֹ יִטְמָ֖א עַד־הָעָֽרֶב׃
47 וְהַשֹּׁכֵ֣ב בַּבַּ֔יִת יְכַבֵּ֖ס אֶת־בְּגָדָ֑יו וְהָאֹכֵ֣ל בַּבַּ֔יִת יְכַבֵּ֖ס
אֶת־בְּגָדָֽיו׃ 48 וְאִם־בֹּ֨א יָבֹ֜א הַכֹּהֵ֗ן וְרָאָה֙ וְהִנֵּה֙ לֹֽא־פָשָׂ֣ה
הַנֶּ֔גַע בַּבַּ֔יִת אַחֲרֵ֖י הִטֹּ֣חַ אֶת־הַבָּ֑יִת וְטִהַ֤ר הַכֹּהֵן֙ אֶת־

בַּשֶּׁ֗מֶן אֲשֶׁר֙ עַל־כַּ֣ף הַכֹּהֵ֔ן יִתֵּ֖ן עַל־רֹ֣אשׁ הַמִּטַּהֵ֑ר וְכִפֶּ֥ר
עָלָ֛יו הַכֹּהֵ֖ן לִפְנֵ֥י יְהוָֽה׃ 19 וְעָשָׂ֤ה הַכֹּהֵן֙ אֶת־הַֽחַטָּ֔את
וְכִפֶּ֕ר עַל־הַמִּטַּהֵ֖ר מִטֻּמְאָת֑וֹ וְאַחַ֖ר יִשְׁחַ֥ט אֶת־הָעֹלָֽה׃
20 וְהֶעֱלָ֧ה הַכֹּהֵ֛ן אֶת־הָעֹלָ֥ה וְאֶת־הַמִּנְחָ֖ה הַמִּזְבֵּ֑חָה וְכִפֶּ֥ר
עָלָ֛יו הַכֹּהֵ֖ן וְטָהֵֽר׃ ס 21 וְאִם־דַּ֣ל ה֗וּא וְאֵ֣ין יָדוֹ֮
מַשֶּׂ֒גֶת֒ וְלָ֠קַח כֶּ֣בֶשׂ אֶחָ֥ד אָשָׁ֛ם לִתְנוּפָ֖ה לְכַפֵּ֣ר עָלָ֑יו
וְעִשָּׂר֨וֹן סֹ֜לֶת אֶחָ֨ד בָּל֥וּל בַּשֶּׁ֛מֶן לְמִנְחָ֖ה וְלֹ֥ג שָֽׁמֶן׃
22 וּשְׁתֵּ֣י תֹרִ֗ים א֤וֹ שְׁנֵי֙ בְּנֵ֣י יוֹנָ֔ה אֲשֶׁ֥ר תַּשִּׂ֖יג יָד֑וֹ וְהָיָ֤ה
אֶחָד֙ חַטָּ֔את וְהָאֶחָ֖ד עֹלָֽה׃ 23 וְהֵבִ֨יא אֹתָ֜ם בַּיּ֧וֹם הַשְּׁמִינִ֛י
לְטָהֳרָת֖וֹ אֶל־הַכֹּהֵ֑ן אֶל־פֶּ֥תַח אֹ֖הֶל מוֹעֵ֖ד לִפְנֵ֥י יְהוָֽה׃
24 וְלָקַ֧ח הַכֹּהֵ֛ן אֶת־כֶּ֥בֶשׂ הָאָשָׁ֖ם וְאֶת־לֹ֣ג הַשָּׁ֑מֶן וְהֵנִ֨יף
אֹתָ֧ם הַכֹּהֵ֛ן תְּנוּפָ֖ה לִפְנֵ֥י יְהוָֽה׃ 25 וְשָׁחַט֮ אֶת־כֶּ֣בֶשׂ הָאָשָׁם֒
וְלָקַ֤ח הַכֹּהֵן֙ מִדַּ֣ם הָאָשָׁ֔ם וְנָתַ֥ן עַל־תְּנ֥וּךְ אֹֽזֶן־הַמִּטַּהֵ֖ר
הַיְמָנִ֑ית וְעַל־בֹּ֤הֶן יָדוֹ֙ הַיְמָנִ֔ית וְעַל־בֹּ֥הֶן רַגְל֖וֹ הַיְמָנִֽית׃
26 וּמִן־הַשֶּׁ֖מֶן יִצֹ֣ק הַכֹּהֵ֑ן עַל־כַּ֥ף הַכֹּהֵ֖ן הַשְּׂמָאלִֽית׃
27 וְהִזָּ֤ה הַכֹּהֵן֙ בְּאֶצְבָּע֣וֹ הַיְמָנִ֔ית מִן־הַשֶּׁ֖מֶן אֲשֶׁ֣ר עַל־
כַּפּ֣וֹ הַשְּׂמָאלִ֑ית שֶׁ֥בַע פְּעָמִ֖ים לִפְנֵ֥י יְהוָֽה׃ 28 וְנָתַ֨ן הַכֹּהֵ֜ן
מִן־הַשֶּׁ֣מֶן ׀ אֲשֶׁ֣ר עַל־כַּפּ֗וֹ עַל־תְּנ֞וּךְ אֹ֤זֶן הַמִּטַּהֵר֙ הַיְמָנִ֔ית
וְעַל־בֹּ֤הֶן יָדוֹ֙ הַיְמָנִ֔ית וְעַל־בֹּ֥הֶן רַגְל֖וֹ הַיְמָנִ֑ית עַל־מְק֖וֹם
דַּ֥ם הָאָשָֽׁם׃ 29 וְהַנּוֹתָ֗ר מִן־הַשֶּׁ֙מֶן֙ אֲשֶׁר֙ עַל־כַּ֣ף הַכֹּהֵ֔ן
יִתֵּ֖ן עַל־רֹ֣אשׁ הַמִּטַּהֵ֑ר לְכַפֵּ֥ר עָלָ֖יו לִפְנֵ֥י יְהוָֽה׃ 30 וְעָשָׂ֣ה
אֶת־הָאֶחָד֙ מִן־הַתֹּרִ֔ים א֖וֹ מִן־בְּנֵ֣י הַיּוֹנָ֑ה מֵאֲשֶׁ֥ר תַּשִּׂ֖יג
יָדֽוֹ׃ 31 אֵ֣ת אֲשֶׁר־תַּשִּׂ֞יג יָד֗וֹ אֶת־הָאֶחָ֥ד חַטָּ֛את וְאֶת־הָאֶחָ֥ד
עֹלָ֖ה עַל־הַמִּנְחָ֑ה וְכִפֶּ֧ר הַכֹּהֵ֛ן עַ֥ל הַמִּטַּהֵ֖ר לִפְנֵ֥י יְהוָֽה׃
32 זֹ֣את תּוֹרַ֔ת אֲשֶׁר־בּ֖וֹ נֶ֣גַע צָרָ֑עַת אֲשֶׁ֛ר לֹא־תַשִּׂ֥יג יָד֖וֹ

הַתּוֹלַעַת וְאֶת־הָאֵזֹב וְטָבַל אוֹתָם וְאֵת ׀ הַצִּפֹּר הַחַיָּה
בְּדַם הַצִּפֹּר הַשְּׁחֻטָה עַל הַמַּיִם הַחַיִּים׃ 7 וְהִזָּה עַל־
הַמִּטַּהֵר מִן־הַצָּרַעַת שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים וְטִהֲרוֹ וְשִׁלַּח אֶת־
הַצִּפֹּר הַחַיָּה עַל־פְּנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה׃ 8 וְכִבֶּס הַמִּטַּהֵר אֶת־בְּגָדָיו
וְגִלַּח אֶת־כָּל־שְׂעָרוֹ וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם וְטָהֵר וְאַחַר יָבוֹא אֶל־
הַמַּחֲנֶה וְיָשַׁב מִחוּץ לְאָהֳלוֹ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים׃ 9 וְהָיָה בַיּוֹם
הַשְּׁבִיעִי יְגַלַּח אֶת־כָּל־שְׂעָרוֹ אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ וְאֶת־זְקָנוֹ וְאֵת
גַּבֹּת עֵינָיו וְאֶת־כָּל־שְׂעָרוֹ יְגַלֵּחַ וְכִבֶּס אֶת־בְּגָדָיו וְרָחַץ
אֶת־בְּשָׂרוֹ בַּמַּיִם וְטָהֵר׃ 10 וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי יִקַּח שְׁנֵי־
כְבָשִׂים תְּמִימִם וְכַבְשָׂה אַחַת בַּת־שְׁנָתָהּ תְּמִימָה וּשְׁלֹשָׁה
עֶשְׂרֹנִים סֹלֶת מִנְחָה בְּלוּלָה בַשֶּׁמֶן וְלֹג אֶחָד שָׁמֶן׃
11 וְהֶעֱמִיד הַכֹּהֵן הַמְטַהֵר אֵת הָאִישׁ הַמִּטַּהֵר וְאֹתָם
לִפְנֵי יְהוָה פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד׃ 12 וְלָקַח הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־
הַכֶּבֶשׂ הָאֶחָד וְהִקְרִיב אֹתוֹ לְאָשָׁם וְאֶת־לֹג הַשָּׁמֶן וְהֵנִיף
אֹתָם תְּנוּפָה לִפְנֵי יְהוָה׃ 13 וְשָׁחַט אֶת־הַכֶּבֶשׂ בִּמְקוֹם
אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁחַט אֶת־הַחַטָּאת וְאֶת־הָעֹלָה בִּמְקוֹם הַקֹּדֶשׁ
כִּי כַּחַטָּאת הָאָשָׁם הוּא לַכֹּהֵן קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים הוּא׃
14 וְלָקַח הַכֹּהֵן מִדַּם הָאָשָׁם וְנָתַן הַכֹּהֵן עַל־תְּנוּךְ אֹזֶן
הַמִּטַּהֵר הַיְמָנִית וְעַל־בֹּהֶן יָדוֹ הַיְמָנִית וְעַל־בֹּהֶן רַגְלוֹ
הַיְמָנִית׃ 15 וְלָקַח הַכֹּהֵן מִלֹּג הַשָּׁמֶן וְיָצַק עַל־כַּף הַכֹּהֵן
הַשְּׂמָאלִית׃ 16 וְטָבַל הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־אֶצְבָּעוֹ הַיְמָנִית מִן
הַשֶּׁמֶן אֲשֶׁר עַל־כַּפּוֹ הַשְּׂמָאלִית וְהִזָּה מִן־הַשֶּׁמֶן בְּאֶצְבָּעוֹ
שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים לִפְנֵי יְהוָה׃ 17 וּמִיֶּתֶר הַשֶּׁמֶן אֲשֶׁר עַל־כַּפּוֹ
יִתֵּן הַכֹּהֵן עַל־תְּנוּךְ אֹזֶן הַמִּטַּהֵר הַיְמָנִית וְעַל־בֹּהֶן יָדוֹ
הַיְמָנִית וְעַל־בֹּהֶן רַגְלוֹ הַיְמָנִית עַל דַּם הָאָשָׁם׃ 18 וְהַנּוֹתָר

אֲשֶׁר־יִהְיֶה בוֹ הַנָּגַע כִּי־צָרַעַת מַמְאֶרֶת הִוא בָּאֵשׁ תִּשָּׂרֵף׃
53 וְאִם יִרְאֶה הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה לֹא־פָשָׂה הַנֶּגַע בַּבֶּגֶד אוֹ בַשְּׁתִי
אוֹ בָעֵרֶב אוֹ בְּכָל־כְּלִי־עוֹר׃ 54 וְצִוָּה הַכֹּהֵן וְכִבְּסוּ אֵת
אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ הַנָּגַע וְהִסְגִּירוֹ שִׁבְעַת־יָמִים שֵׁנִית׃ 55 וְרָאָה
הַכֹּהֵן אַחֲרֵי ׀ הֻכַּבֵּס אֶת־הַנֶּגַע וְהִנֵּה לֹא־הָפַךְ הַנֶּגַע אֶת־
עֵינוֹ וְהַנֶּגַע לֹא־פָשָׂה טָמֵא הוּא בָּאֵשׁ תִּשְׂרְפֶנּוּ פְּחֶתֶת
הִוא בְּקָרַחְתּוֹ אוֹ בְגַבַּחְתּוֹ׃ 56 וְאִם רָאָה הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה
כֵּהָה הַנֶּגַע אַחֲרֵי הֻכַּבֵּס אֹתוֹ וְקָרַע אֹתוֹ מִן־הַבֶּגֶד אוֹ
מִן־הָעוֹר אוֹ מִן־הַשְּׁתִי אוֹ מִן־הָעֵרֶב׃ 57 וְאִם־תֵּרָאֶה
עוֹד בַּבֶּגֶד אוֹ־בַשְּׁתִי אוֹ־בָעֵרֶב אוֹ בְכָל־כְּלִי־עוֹר פֹּרַחַת
הִוא בָּאֵשׁ תִּשְׂרְפֶנּוּ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ הַנָּגַע׃ 58 וְהַבֶּגֶד אוֹ־
הַשְּׁתִי אוֹ־הָעֵרֶב אוֹ־כָל־כְּלִי הָעוֹר אֲשֶׁר תְּכַבֵּס וְסָר מֵהֶם
הַנָּגַע וְכֻבַּס שֵׁנִית וְטָהֵר׃ 59 זֹאת תּוֹרַת נֶגַע־צָרַעַת בֶּגֶד
הַצֶּמֶר ׀ אוֹ הַפִּשְׁתִּים אוֹ הַשְּׁתִי אוֹ הָעֵרֶב אוֹ כָּל־כְּלִי־
עוֹר לְטַהֲרוֹ אוֹ לְטַמְּאוֹ׃

פ פ פ

## CHAPTER XIV.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 זֹאת תִּהְיֶה תּוֹרַת
הַמְּצֹרָע בְּיוֹם טָהֳרָתוֹ וְהוּבָא אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן׃ 3 וְיָצָא הַכֹּהֵן
אֶל־מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה וְרָאָה הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה נִרְפָּא נֶגַע־הַצָּרַעַת
מִן־הַצָּרוּעַ׃ 4 וְצִוָּה הַכֹּהֵן וְלָקַח לַמִּטַּהֵר שְׁתֵּי־צִפֳּרִים
חַיּוֹת טְהֹרוֹת וְעֵץ אֶרֶז וּשְׁנִי תוֹלַעַת וְאֵזֹב׃ 5 וְצִוָּה הַכֹּהֵן
וְשָׁחַט אֶת־הַצִּפּוֹר הָאֶחָת אֶל־כְּלִי־חֶרֶשׂ עַל־מַיִם חַיִּים׃
6 אֶת־הַצִּפֹּר הַחַיָּה יִקַּח אֹתָהּ וְאֶת־עֵץ הָאֶרֶז וְאֶת־שְׁנִי

הוּא׃ 37 וְאִם־בְּעֵינָיו עָמַד הַנֶּתֶק וְשֵׂעָר שָׁחֹר צָמַח־בּוֹ
נִרְפָּא הַנֶּתֶק טָהוֹר הוּא וְטִהֲרוֹ הַכֹּהֵן׃ ס 38 וְאִישׁ
אוֹ־אִשָּׁה כִּי־יִהְיֶה בְעוֹר־בְּשָׂרָם בֶּהָרֹת בֶּהָרֹת לְבָנֹת׃
39 וְרָאָה הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה בְעוֹר־בְּשָׂרָם בֶּהָרֹת כֵּהוֹת לְבָנֹת
בֹּהַק הוּא פָּרַח בָּעוֹר טָהוֹר הוּא׃ ס 40 וְאִישׁ כִּי
יִמָּרֵט רֹאשׁוֹ קֵרֵחַ הוּא טָהוֹר הוּא׃ 41 וְאִם מִפְּאַת פָּנָיו
יִמָּרֵט רֹאשׁוֹ גִּבֵּחַ הוּא טָהוֹר הוּא׃ 42 וְכִי־יִהְיֶה בַקָּרַחַת
אוֹ בַגַּבַּחַת נֶגַע לָבָן אֲדַמְדָּם צָרַעַת פֹּרַחַת הִוא בְּקָרַחְתּוֹ
אוֹ בְגַבַּחְתּוֹ׃ 43 וְרָאָה אֹתוֹ הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה שְׂאֵת־הַנֶּגַע
לְבָנָה אֲדַמְדֶּמֶת בְּקָרַחְתּוֹ אוֹ בְגַבַּחְתּוֹ כְּמַרְאֵה צָרַעַת
עוֹר בָּשָׂר׃ 44 אִישׁ־צָרוּעַ הוּא טָמֵא הוּא טַמֵּא יְטַמְּאֶנּוּ
הַכֹּהֵן בְּרֹאשׁוֹ נִגְעוֹ׃ 45 וְהַצָּרוּעַ אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ הַנֶּגַע בְּגָדָיו
יִהְיוּ פְרֻמִים וְרֹאשׁוֹ יִהְיֶה פָרוּעַ וְעַל־שָׂפָם יַעְטֶה וְטָמֵא ׀
טָמֵא יִקְרָא׃ 46 כָּל־יְמֵי אֲשֶׁר הַנֶּגַע בּוֹ יִטְמָא טָמֵא הוּא
בָּדָד יֵשֵׁב מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה מוֹשָׁבוֹ׃ ס 47 וְהַבֶּגֶד כִּי־יִהְיֶה
בוֹ נֶגַע צָרָעַת בְּבֶגֶד צֶמֶר אוֹ בְּבֶגֶד פִּשְׁתִּים׃ 48 אוֹ
בִשְׁתִי אוֹ בְעֵרֶב לַפִּשְׁתִּים וְלַצָּמֶר אוֹ בְעוֹר אוֹ בְּכָל־
מְלֶאכֶת עוֹר׃ 49 וְהָיָה הַנֶּגַע יְרַקְרַק ׀ אוֹ אֲדַמְדָּם בַּבֶּגֶד
אוֹ בָעוֹר אוֹ־בַשְּׁתִי אוֹ־בָעֵרֶב אוֹ בְכָל־כְּלִי־עוֹר נֶגַע
צָרַעַת הוּא וְהָרְאָה אֶת־הַכֹּהֵן׃ 50 וְרָאָה הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַנֶּגַע
וְהִסְגִּיר אֶת־הַנֶּגַע שִׁבְעַת יָמִים׃ 51 וְרָאָה אֶת־הַנֶּגַע בַּיּוֹם
הַשְּׁבִיעִי כִּי־פָשָׂה הַנֶּגַע בַּבֶּגֶד אוֹ־בַשְּׁתִי אוֹ־בָעֵרֶב אוֹ
בָעוֹר לְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־יֵעָשֶׂה הָעוֹר לִמְלָאכָה צָרַעַת מַמְאֶרֶת
הַנֶּגַע טָמֵא הוּא׃ 52 וְשָׂרַף אֶת־הַבֶּגֶד אוֹ אֶת־הַשְּׁתִי ׀ אוֹ
אֶת־הָעֵרֶב בַּצֶּמֶר אוֹ בַפִּשְׁתִּים אוֹ אֶת־כָּל־כְּלִי הָעוֹר

פְּשַׂ֣תָה צָרֶ֥בֶת הַשְּׁחִ֖ין הִ֑וא וְטִהֲר֖וֹ הַכֹּהֵֽן׃ ס 24 א֣וֹ
בָשָׂ֔ר כִּֽי־יִהְיֶ֥ה בְעֹר֖וֹ מִכְוַת־אֵ֑שׁ וְהָיְתָ֞ה מִחְיַ֣ת הַמִּכְוָ֗ה
בַּהֶ֛רֶת לְבָנָ֥ה אֲדַמְדֶּ֖מֶת א֥וֹ לְבָנָֽה׃ 25 וְרָאָ֣ה אֹתָ֣הּ הַכֹּהֵ֡ן
וְהִנֵּ֣ה נֶהְפַּךְ֩ שֵׂעָ֨ר לָבָ֜ן בַּבַּהֶ֗רֶת וּמַרְאֶ֙הָ֙ עָמֹ֣ק מִן־הָע֔וֹר
צָרַ֣עַת הִ֔וא בַּמִּכְוָ֖ה פָּרָ֑חָה וְטִמֵּ֤א אֹתוֹ֙ הַכֹּהֵ֔ן נֶ֥גַע צָרַ֖עַת
הִֽוא׃ 26 וְאִ֣ם ׀ יִרְאֶ֣נָּה הַכֹּהֵ֗ן וְהִנֵּ֤ה אֵֽין־בַּבַּהֶ֙רֶת֙ שֵׂעָ֣ר
לָבָ֔ן וּשְׁפָלָ֥ה אֵינֶ֛נָּה מִן־הָע֖וֹר וְהִ֣וא כֵהָ֑ה וְהִסְגִּיר֥וֹ הַכֹּהֵ֖ן
שִׁבְעַ֥ת יָמִֽים׃ 27 וְרָאָ֥הוּ הַכֹּהֵ֖ן בַּיּ֣וֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִ֑י אִם־פָּשֹׂ֤ה
תִפְשֶׂה֙ בָּע֔וֹר וְטִמֵּ֤א הַכֹּהֵן֙ אֹת֔וֹ נֶ֥גַע צָרַ֖עַת הִֽוא׃ 28 וְאִם־
תַּחְתֶּ֩יהָ֩ תַעֲמֹ֨ד הַבַּהֶ֜רֶת לֹא־פָשְׂתָ֤ה בָעוֹר֙ וְהִ֣וא כֵהָ֔ה שְׂאֵ֥ת
הַמִּכְוָ֖ה הִ֑וא וְטִהֲרוֹ֙ הַכֹּהֵ֔ן כִּֽי־צָרֶ֥בֶת הַמִּכְוָ֖ה הִֽוא׃ פ
29 וְאִישׁ֙ א֣וֹ אִשָּׁ֔ה כִּֽי־יִהְיֶ֥ה ב֖וֹ נָ֑גַע בְּרֹ֖אשׁ א֥וֹ בְזָקָֽן׃ 30 וְרָאָ֨ה
הַכֹּהֵ֜ן אֶת־הַנֶּ֗גַע וְהִנֵּ֤ה מַרְאֵ֙הוּ֙ עָמֹ֣ק מִן־הָע֔וֹר וּב֛וֹ שֵׂעָ֥ר
צָהֹ֖ב דָּ֑ק וְטִמֵּ֨א אֹת֤וֹ הַכֹּהֵן֙ נֶ֣תֶק ה֔וּא צָרַ֧עַת הָרֹ֛אשׁ א֥וֹ
הַזָּקָ֖ן הֽוּא׃ 31 וְכִֽי־יִרְאֶ֨ה הַכֹּהֵ֜ן אֶת־נֶ֣גַע הַנֶּ֗תֶק וְהִנֵּ֤ה אֵין־
מַרְאֵ֙הוּ֙ עָמֹ֣ק מִן־הָע֔וֹר וְשֵׂעָ֥ר שָׁחֹ֖ר אֵ֣ין בּ֑וֹ וְהִסְגִּ֧יר
הַכֹּהֵ֛ן אֶת־נֶ֥גַע הַנֶּ֖תֶק שִׁבְעַ֥ת יָמִֽים׃ 32 וְרָאָ֨ה הַכֹּהֵ֤ן אֶת־
הַנֶּ֙גַע֙ בַּיּ֣וֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִ֔י וְהִנֵּה֙ לֹא־פָשָׂ֣ה הַנֶּ֔תֶק וְלֹא־הָ֥יָה ב֖וֹ
שֵׂעָ֣ר צָהֹ֑ב וּמַרְאֵ֣ה הַנֶּ֔תֶק אֵ֥ין עָמֹ֖ק מִן־הָעֽוֹר׃ 33 וְהִ֨תְגַּלָּ֔ח
וְאֶת־הַנֶּ֖תֶק לֹ֣א יְגַלֵּ֑חַ וְהִסְגִּ֨יר הַכֹּהֵ֧ן אֶת־הַנֶּ֛תֶק שִׁבְעַ֥ת
יָמִ֖ים שֵׁנִֽית׃ 34 וְרָאָה֩ הַכֹּהֵ֨ן אֶת־הַנֶּ֜תֶק בַּיּ֣וֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִ֗י
וְ֠הִנֵּה לֹא־פָשָׂ֤ה הַנֶּ֙תֶק֙ בָּע֔וֹר וּמַרְאֵ֕הוּ אֵינֶ֥נּוּ עָמֹ֖ק מִן־
הָע֑וֹר וְטִהַ֤ר אֹתוֹ֙ הַכֹּהֵ֔ן וְכִבֶּ֥ס בְּגָדָ֖יו וְטָהֵֽר׃ 35 וְאִם־פָּשֹׂ֥ה
יִפְשֶׂ֛ה הַנֶּ֖תֶק בָּע֑וֹר אַחֲרֵ֖י טָהֳרָתֽוֹ׃ 36 וְרָאָ֙הוּ֙ הַכֹּהֵ֔ן וְהִנֵּ֛ה
פָּשָׂ֥ה הַנֶּ֖תֶק בָּע֑וֹר לֹֽא־יְבַקֵּ֨ר הַכֹּהֵ֜ן לַשֵּׂעָ֥ר הַצָּהֹ֖ב טָמֵ֥א

שֵׁנִית וְהִנֵּה כֵּהָה הַנֶּגַע וְלֹא־פָשָׂה הַנֶּגַע בָּעוֹר וְטִהֲרוֹ
הַכֹּהֵן מִסְפַּחַת הִוא וְכִבֶּס בְּגָדָיו וְטָהֵר׃ 7 וְאִם־פָּשֹׂה
תִפְשֶׂה הַמִּסְפַּחַת בָּעוֹר אַחֲרֵי הֵרָאֹתוֹ אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן לְטָהֳרָתוֹ
וְנִרְאָה שֵׁנִית אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן׃ 8 וְרָאָה הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה פָּשְׂתָה
הַמִּסְפַּחַת בָּעוֹר וְטִמְּאוֹ הַכֹּהֵן צָרַעַת הִוא׃ פ 9 נֶגַע
צָרַעַת כִּי תִהְיֶה בְּאָדָם וְהוּבָא אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן׃ 10 וְרָאָה הַכֹּהֵן
וְהִנֵּה שְׂאֵת־לְבָנָה בָּעוֹר וְהִיא הָפְכָה שֵׂעָר לָבָן וּמִחְיַת
בָּשָׂר חַי בַּשְׂאֵת׃ 11 צָרַעַת נוֹשֶׁנֶת הִוא בְּעוֹר בְּשָׂרוֹ
וְטִמְּאוֹ הַכֹּהֵן לֹא יַסְגִּרֶנּוּ כִּי טָמֵא הוּא׃ 12 וְאִם־פָּרוֹחַ
תִּפְרַח הַצָּרַעַת בָּעוֹר וְכִסְּתָה הַצָּרַעַת אֵת כָּל־עוֹר הַנֶּגַע
מֵרֹאשׁוֹ וְעַד־רַגְלָיו לְכָל־מַרְאֵה עֵינֵי הַכֹּהֵן׃ 13 וְרָאָה
הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה כִסְּתָה הַצָּרַעַת אֶת־כָּל־בְּשָׂרוֹ וְטִהַר אֶת־
הַנָּגַע כֻּלּוֹ הָפַךְ לָבָן טָהוֹר הוּא׃ 14 וּבְיוֹם הֵרָאוֹת בּוֹ
בָּשָׂר חַי יִטְמָא׃ 15 וְרָאָה הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַבָּשָׂר הַחַי וְטִמְּאוֹ
הַבָּשָׂר הַחַי טָמֵא הוּא צָרַעַת הוּא׃ 16 אוֹ כִי־יָשׁוּב הַבָּשָׂר
הַחַי וְנֶהְפַּךְ לְלָבָן וּבָא אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן׃ 17 וְרָאָהוּ הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה
נֶהְפַּךְ הַנֶּגַע לְלָבָן וְטִהַר הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַנֶּגַע טָהוֹר הוּא׃
פ 18 וּבָשָׂר כִּי־יִהְיֶה בוֹ־בְעֹרוֹ שְׁחִין וְנִרְפָּא׃ 19 וְהָיָה
בִּמְקוֹם הַשְּׁחִין שְׂאֵת לְבָנָה אוֹ בַהֶרֶת לְבָנָה אֲדַמְדָּמֶת
וְנִרְאָה אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן׃ 20 וְרָאָה הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה מַרְאֶהָ שָׁפָל
מִן־הָעוֹר וּשְׂעָרָהּ הָפַךְ לָבָן וְטִמְּאוֹ הַכֹּהֵן נֶגַע־צָרַעַת הִוא
בַּשְּׁחִין פָּרָחָה׃ 21 וְאִם ׀ יִרְאֶנָּה הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה אֵין־בָּהּ שֵׂעָר
לָבָן וּשְׁפָלָה אֵינֶנָּה מִן־הָעוֹר וְהִיא כֵהָה וְהִסְגִּירוֹ הַכֹּהֵן
שִׁבְעַת יָמִים׃ 22 וְאִם־פָּשֹׂה תִפְשֶׂה בָּעוֹר וְטִמֵּא הַכֹּהֵן
אֹתוֹ נֶגַע הִוא׃ 23 וְאִם־תַּחְתֶּיהָ תַּעֲמֹד הַבַּהֶרֶת לֹא

יָמִים כִּימֵי נִדַּת דְּוֺתָהּ תִּטְמָא׃ 3 וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי יִמּוֹל
בְּשַׂר עָרְלָתוֹ׃ 4 וּשְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם וּשְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים תֵּשֵׁב בִּדְמֵי
טָהֳרָה בְּכָל־קֹדֶשׁ לֹא־תִגָּע וְאֶל־הַמִּקְדָּשׁ לֹא תָבֹא עַד־
מְלֹאת יְמֵי טָהֳרָהּ׃ 5 וְאִם־נְקֵבָה תֵלֵד וְטָמְאָה שְׁבֻעַיִם
כְּנִדָּתָהּ וְשִׁשִּׁים יוֹם וְשֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תֵּשֵׁב עַל־דְּמֵי טָהֳרָה׃
6 וּבִמְלֹאת ׀ יְמֵי טָהֳרָהּ לְבֵן אוֹ לְבַת תָּבִיא כֶּבֶשׂ בֶּן־
שְׁנָתוֹ לְעֹלָה וּבֶן־יוֹנָה אוֹ־תֹר לְחַטָּאת אֶל־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל־
מוֹעֵד אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן׃ 7 וְהִקְרִיבוֹ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וְכִפֶּר עָלֶיהָ
וְטָהֲרָה מִמְּקֹר דָּמֶיהָ זֹאת תּוֹרַת הַיֹּלֶדֶת לַזָּכָר אוֹ
לַנְּקֵבָה׃ 8 וְאִם־לֹא תִמְצָא יָדָהּ דֵּי שֶׂה וְלָקְחָה שְׁתֵּי־
תֹרִים אוֹ שְׁנֵי בְּנֵי יוֹנָה אֶחָד לְעֹלָה וְאֶחָד לְחַטָּאת
וְכִפֶּר עָלֶיהָ הַכֹּהֵן וְטָהֵרָה׃ פ

## CHAPTER XIII.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶל־אַהֲרֹן לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 אָדָם
כִּי־יִהְיֶה בְעוֹר־בְּשָׂרוֹ שְׂאֵת אוֹ־סַפַּחַת אוֹ בַהֶרֶת וְהָיָה
בְעוֹר־בְּשָׂרוֹ לְנֶגַע צָרָעַת וְהוּבָא אֶל־אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן אוֹ
אֶל־אַחַד מִבָּנָיו הַכֹּהֲנִים׃ 3 וְרָאָה הַכֹּהֵן ׀ אֶת־הַנֶּגַע
בְּעוֹר־הַבָּשָׂר וְשֵׂעָר בַּנֶּגַע הָפַךְ לָבָן וּמַרְאֵה הַנֶּגַע עָמֹק
מֵעוֹר בְּשָׂרוֹ נֶגַע צָרַעַת הוּא וְרָאָהוּ הַכֹּהֵן וְטִמֵּא אֹתוֹ׃
4 וְאִם־בַּהֶרֶת לְבָנָה הִוא בְּעוֹר בְּשָׂרוֹ וְעָמֹק אֵין־מַרְאֶהָ
מִן־הָעוֹר וּשְׂעָרָה לֹא־הָפַךְ לָבָן וְהִסְגִּיר הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַנֶּגַע
שִׁבְעַת יָמִים׃ 5 וְרָאָהוּ הַכֹּהֵן בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי וְהִנֵּה
הַנֶּגַע עָמַד בְּעֵינָיו לֹא־פָשָׂה הַנֶּגַע בָּעוֹר וְהִסְגִּירוֹ הַכֹּהֵן
שִׁבְעַת יָמִים שֵׁנִית׃ 6 וְרָאָה הַכֹּהֵן אֹתוֹ בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי

יֻתָּץ טְמֵאִים הֵם וּטְמֵאִים יִהְיוּ לָכֶם׃ 36 אַךְ מַעְיָן וּבוֹר
מִקְוֵה־מַיִם יִהְיֶה טָהוֹר וְנֹגֵעַ בְּנִבְלָתָם יִטְמָא׃ 37 וְכִי
יִפֹּל מִנִּבְלָתָם עַל־כָּל־זֶרַע זֵרוּעַ אֲשֶׁר יִזָּרֵעַ טָהוֹר הוּא׃
38 וְכִי יֻתַּן־מַיִם עַל־זֶרַע וְנָפַל מִנִּבְלָתָם עָלָיו טָמֵא הוּא
לָכֶם׃ ס 39 וְכִי יָמוּת מִן־הַבְּהֵמָה אֲשֶׁר־הִיא לָכֶם
לְאָכְלָה הַנֹּגֵעַ בְּנִבְלָתָהּ יִטְמָא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 40 וְהָאֹכֵל
מִנִּבְלָתָהּ יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב וְהַנֹּשֵׂא אֶת־נִבְלָתָהּ
יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 41 וְכָל־הַשֶּׁרֶץ הַשֹּׁרֵץ
עַל־הָאָרֶץ שֶׁקֶץ הוּא לֹא יֵאָכֵל׃ 42 כֹּל הוֹלֵךְ עַל־גָּחוֹן
וְכֹל ׀ הוֹלֵךְ עַל־אַרְבַּע עַד כָּל־מַרְבֵּה רַגְלַיִם לְכָל־הַשֶּׁרֶץ
הַשֹּׁרֵץ עַל־הָאָרֶץ לֹא תֹאכְלוּם כִּי־שֶׁקֶץ הֵם׃ 43 אַל־
תְּשַׁקְּצוּ אֶת־נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם בְּכָל־הַשֶּׁרֶץ הַשֹּׁרֵץ וְלֹא תִטַּמְּאוּ
בָּהֶם וְנִטְמֵתֶם בָּם׃ 44 כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְהִתְקַדִּשְׁתֶּם
וִהְיִיתֶם קְדֹשִׁים כִּי קָדוֹשׁ אָנִי וְלֹא תְטַמְּאוּ אֶת־נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם
בְּכָל־הַשֶּׁרֶץ הָרֹמֵשׂ עַל־הָאָרֶץ׃ 45 כִּי ׀ אֲנִי יְהוָה הַמַּעֲלֶה
אֶתְכֶם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם לִהְיֹת לָכֶם לֵאלֹהִים וִהְיִיתֶם
קְדֹשִׁים כִּי קָדוֹשׁ אָנִי׃ 46 זֹאת תּוֹרַת הַבְּהֵמָה וְהָעוֹף וְכֹל
נֶפֶשׁ הַחַיָּה הָרֹמֶשֶׂת בַּמָּיִם וּלְכָל־נֶפֶשׁ הַשֹּׁרֶצֶת עַל־הָאָרֶץ׃
47 לְהַבְדִּיל בֵּין הַטָּמֵא וּבֵין הַטָּהֹר וּבֵין הַחַיָּה הַנֶּאֱכֶלֶת
וּבֵין הַחַיָּה אֲשֶׁר לֹא תֵאָכֵל׃

פ פ פ

## CHAPTER XII.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר׃ 2 דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר אִשָּׁה כִּי תַזְרִיעַ וְיָלְדָה זָכָר וְטָמְאָה שִׁבְעַת

וְאֶת־הַדּוּכִיפַת וְאֶת־הָעֲטַלֵּף׃ 20 כֹּל שֶׁרֶץ הָעוֹף הַהֹלֵךְ
עַל־אַרְבַּע שֶׁקֶץ הוּא לָכֶם׃ 21 אַךְ אֶת־זֶה תֹּאכְלוּ מִכֹּל
שֶׁרֶץ הָעוֹף הַהֹלֵךְ עַל־אַרְבַּע אֲשֶׁר־לֹא כְרָעַיִם מִמַּעַל
לְרַגְלָיו לְנַתֵּר בָּהֵן עַל־הָאָרֶץ׃ 22 אֶת־אֵלֶּה מֵהֶם תֹּאכֵלוּ
אֶת־הָאַרְבֶּה לְמִינוֹ וְאֶת־הַסָּלְעָם לְמִינֵהוּ וְאֶת־הַחַרְגֹּל
לְמִינֵהוּ וְאֶת־הֶחָגָב לְמִינֵהוּ׃ 23 וְכֹל שֶׁרֶץ הָעוֹף אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ
אַרְבַּע רַגְלָיִם שֶׁקֶץ הוּא לָכֶם׃ 24 וּלְאֵלֶּה תִּטַּמָּאוּ כָּל־
הַנֹּגֵעַ בְּנִבְלָתָם יִטְמָא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 25 וְכָל־הַנֹּשֵׂא מִנִּבְלָתָם
יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 26 לְכָל־הַבְּהֵמָה אֲשֶׁר
הִוא מַפְרֶסֶת פַּרְסָה וְשֶׁסַע ׀ אֵינֶנָּה שֹׁסַעַת וְגֵרָה אֵינֶנָּה
מַעֲלָה טְמֵאִים הֵם לָכֶם כָּל־הַנֹּגֵעַ בָּהֶם יִטְמָא 27 וְכֹל ׀
הוֹלֵךְ עַל־כַּפָּיו בְּכָל־הַחַיָּה הַהֹלֶכֶת עַל־אַרְבַּע טְמֵאִים
הֵם לָכֶם כָּל־הַנֹּגֵעַ בְּנִבְלָתָם יִטְמָא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃ 28 וְהַנֹּשֵׂא
אֶת־נִבְלָתָם יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעָרֶב טְמֵאִים הֵמָּה
לָכֶם׃ ס 29 וְזֶה לָכֶם הַטָּמֵא בַּשֶּׁרֶץ הַשֹּׁרֵץ עַל־הָאָרֶץ
הַחֹלֶד וְהָעַכְבָּר וְהַצָּב לְמִינֵהוּ׃ 30 וְהָאֲנָקָה וְהַכֹּחַ
וְהַלְּטָאָה וְהַחֹמֶט וְהַתִּנְשָׁמֶת׃ 31 אֵלֶּה הַטְּמֵאִים לָכֶם
בְּכָל־הַשָּׁרֶץ כָּל־הַנֹּגֵעַ בָּהֶם בְּמֹתָם יִטְמָא עַד־הָעָרֶב׃
32 וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־יִפֹּל עָלָיו מֵהֶם ׀ בְּמֹתָם יִטְמָא מִכָּל־כְּלִי־
עֵץ אוֹ בֶגֶד אוֹ־עוֹר אוֹ שָׂק כָּל־כְּלִי אֲשֶׁר־יֵעָשֶׂה מְלָאכָה
בָּהֶם בַּמַּיִם יוּבָא וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעֶרֶב וְטָהֵר׃ 33 וְכָל־כְּלִי־
חֶרֶשׂ אֲשֶׁר־יִפֹּל מֵהֶם אֶל־תּוֹכוֹ כֹּל אֲשֶׁר בְּתוֹכוֹ יִטְמָא
וְאֹתוֹ תִשְׁבֹּרוּ׃ 34 מִכָּל־הָאֹכֶל אֲשֶׁר יֵאָכֵל אֲשֶׁר יָבוֹא
עָלָיו מַיִם יִטְמָא וְכָל־מַשְׁקֶה אֲשֶׁר יִשָּׁתֶה בְּכָל־כְּלִי יִטְמָא׃
35 וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־יִפֹּל מִנִּבְלָתָם ׀ עָלָיו יִטְמָא תַּנּוּר וְכִירַיִם

## CHAPTER XI.

1 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶל־אַהֲרֹן לֵאמֹר אֲלֵהֶם׃
2 דַּבְּרוּ אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר זֹאת הַחַיָּה אֲשֶׁר תֹּאכְלוּ
מִכָּל־הַבְּהֵמָה אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָאָרֶץ׃ 3 כֹּל ׀ מַפְרֶסֶת פַּרְסָה
וְשֹׁסַעַת שֶׁסַע פְּרָסֹת מַעֲלַת גֵּרָה בַּבְּהֵמָה אֹתָהּ תֹּאכֵלוּ׃
4 אַךְ אֶת־זֶה לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִמַּעֲלֵי הַגֵּרָה וּמִמַּפְרִסֵי הַפַּרְסָה
אֶת־הַגָּמָל כִּי־מַעֲלֵה גֵרָה הוּא וּפַרְסָה אֵינֶנּוּ מַפְרִיס טָמֵא
הוּא לָכֶם׃ 5 וְאֶת־הַשָּׁפָן כִּי־מַעֲלֵה גֵרָה הוּא וּפַרְסָה לֹא
יַפְרִיס טָמֵא הוּא לָכֶם׃ 6 וְאֶת־הָאַרְנֶבֶת כִּי־מַעֲלַת גֵּרָה
הִוא וּפַרְסָה לֹא הִפְרִיסָה טְמֵאָה הִוא לָכֶם׃ 7 וְאֶת־
הַחֲזִיר כִּי־מַפְרִיס פַּרְסָה הוּא וְשֹׁסַע שֶׁסַע פַּרְסָה וְהוּא
גֵּרָה לֹא־יִגָּר טָמֵא הוּא לָכֶם׃ 8 מִבְּשָׂרָם לֹא תֹאכֵלוּ
וּבְנִבְלָתָם לֹא תִגָּעוּ טְמֵאִים הֵם לָכֶם׃ 9 אֶת־זֶה תֹּאכְלוּ
מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר בַּמָּיִם כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ סְנַפִּיר וְקַשְׂקֶשֶׂת בַּמַּיִם
בַּיַּמִּים וּבַנְּחָלִים אֹתָם תֹּאכֵלוּ׃ 10 וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר אֵין־לוֹ
סְנַפִּיר וְקַשְׂקֶשֶׂת בַּיַּמִּים וּבַנְּחָלִים מִכֹּל שֶׁרֶץ הַמַּיִם
וּמִכֹּל נֶפֶשׁ הַחַיָּה אֲשֶׁר בַּמָּיִם שֶׁקֶץ הֵם לָכֶם׃ 11 וְשֶׁקֶץ
יִהְיוּ לָכֶם מִבְּשָׂרָם לֹא תֹאכֵלוּ וְאֶת־נִבְלָתָם תְּשַׁקֵּצוּ׃
12 כֹּל אֲשֶׁר אֵין־לוֹ סְנַפִּיר וְקַשְׂקֶשֶׂת בַּמָּיִם שֶׁקֶץ הוּא
לָכֶם׃ 13 וְאֶת־אֵלֶּה תְּשַׁקְּצוּ מִן־הָעוֹף לֹא יֵאָכְלוּ שֶׁקֶץ
הֵם אֶת־הַנֶּשֶׁר וְאֶת־הַפֶּרֶס וְאֵת הָעָזְנִיָּה׃ 14 וְאֶת־הַדָּאָה
וְאֶת־הָאַיָּה לְמִינָהּ׃ 15 אֵת כָּל־עֹרֵב לְמִינוֹ׃ 16 וְאֵת בַּת
הַיַּעֲנָה וְאֶת־הַתַּחְמָס וְאֶת־הַשָּׁחַף וְאֶת־הַנֵּץ לְמִינֵהוּ׃
17 וְאֶת־הַכּוֹס וְאֶת־הַשָּׁלָךְ וְאֶת־הַיַּנְשׁוּף׃ 18 וְאֶת־הַתִּנְשֶׁמֶת
וְאֶת־הַקָּאָת וְאֶת־הָרָחָם׃ 19 וְאֵת הַחֲסִידָה הָאֲנָפָה לְמִינָהּ